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During the mid-twentieth century, urban police, educators, and civic leaders developed and implemented school-police partnerships in response to juvenile delinquency rates. These programs attempted to socialize adolescents into productive, virtuous, and law-abiding citizens. This was not a new endeavor for urban reformers. Nineteenth century child-savers believed that changes to urban society brought by industrialization, immigration, and political shifts affected youth adversely. However, during and after World War II social changes through wartime stress, Cold War anxiety, rising youth culture, and civil rights movements created an environment in which local and national leaders, parents, police, and educators believed juvenile delinquency was an urgent problem in need of reform. From this alarm, school-police partnerships emerged in the 1950s and 1960s. At face-value, partnerships increased police presence in schools and introduced curriculum programs designed to deter delinquent activity through education, counseling, and portraying an ideal image of law enforcement. Although programs garnered widespread support, conflicting beliefs and values concerning the roles of law enforcement and public education caused local controversy. Despite inconclusive evidence about the effectiveness of these partnerships, police
presence in urban public schools increased throughout the twentieth century. Through case studies, this dissertation comparatively analyzes Flint, Michigan’s Police School Liaison (PSL), Tucson, Arizona’s School Resource Officer (SRO), and Cincinnati, Ohio’s Police-Attitude Project. Each partnership began as a local initiative spearheaded by police, educators, and municipal leaders to address juvenile delinquency—an urban problem that gained nationwide attention in the post-WWII era. This dissertation argues that educators collaborated with municipal law enforcement to reduce juvenile delinquency, but did so in ways that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION


Each of these incidents are extreme examples of violence, and reactions from media outlets, parents, educators, and politicians has sparked national concern for school safety in recent years.1 Between July of 2011 and June of 2012, there were approximately “45 student, staff, and nonstudent school-associated violent deaths” on school campuses.2 In 2013, there were approximately 1.4 million “nonfatal victimizations at schools.”3 Although non-violent crimes have decreased since the mid-1990s, violent crimes have remained relatively consistent.4


3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.
Since the 1980s, concerns over safety, illegal drug use, and mass shootings have caused an increase in police presence in public schools. As of the 2013-2014 school year, approximately 43% of public schools housed a police or security officer.\(^5\) For urban areas, that amount was 45%.\(^6\) Public schools with proportionately higher white populations that year had a lower fraction of police presence compared to schools that were more racially balanced or were predominantly African American.\(^7\) Urban schools composed of higher marginalized populations have been likened to prisons and students as convicts. Creating a safe space and protecting students is important, but how did U.S. public schools get to this point? A review of current scholarship provides rich understanding of current trends, but neglects historical perspectives.

Over the last three decades, research on school-police partnerships has steadily increased. Scholars in sociology, criminology, and education argue that rises in police presence challenge civil rights, evade due process, intensify the frequency and severity of punishments, target students of color and the poor, do not always encourage positive relationships with juveniles, undermine educators and counselors, and are ineffective in reducing delinquent behavior.\(^8\) However, parents’ concerns over safety, attention from parents, and perceptions of change in school safety has contributed to increased police presence.

---


\(^6\) Ibid.

\(^7\) Ibid.

media, and the politicization of school violence have caused an upsurge in partnerships since the 1980s. The result has been the increase of carceral-like punishments through zero tolerance policies that are more likely to effect marginalized youth than white middle-class and affluent Anglo-Americans.\(^9\)

Social justice scholars in education and criminology have taken a critical stance on police presence in public schools. Despite interpretive variations, social justice perspectives ultimately approach research in terms of fairness.\(^{10}\) Because social justice typically critiques societal structures and institutions to effect change toward equity, this theoretical perspective is often connected to critical theory. Broadly, critical theorists utilize their research to identify and dismantle systemic cultural and social dominance within curriculum, pedagogy, and administration to promote equity in education.\(^{11}\) From this perspective, scholars have criticized school-police partnerships for contributing to a carceral environment within schools through zero tolerance policies and the school-to-prison pipeline.\(^{12}\)

---


Sociologist Randall Beger, for instance, contends that public anxiety has prompted school officials and lawmakers to implement severe measures to increase safety in schools.\textsuperscript{13} Education scholar Kathleen Nolan agrees, arguing that zero tolerance policies, school-appointed security officers, and school resource officers have increased since the mid-1990s taking a more “aggressive stance against guns and drugs in schools” calling for “swift punishment in the form of suspension, expulsion, and, at times, police intervention for all violators.”\textsuperscript{14} As a result, Beger reasons that an increase in police and security measures have diminished students’ rights.\textsuperscript{15}

While safety appears to be lawmakers’ primary concern, Beger claims that strict rules and police presence in schools are ineffective. For example, responsibility for school discipline has shifted from education professionals trained in classroom management, child development, and discipline strategies to police officers and security guards with minimal to no training to handle adolescents. Because of this, students receive harsher punishments sometimes being treated as “adults for a wide range of offenses that traditionally have been handled informally by adults.”\textsuperscript{16} The October 2015 incident at Spring Valley High School in South Carolina in which a School Resource Officer violently removed a sixteen year-old African American female from her desk, slammed her to the ground, and arrested her for disrupting class and not cooperating with administrators is a recent example of problems that occur from placing untrained

\textsuperscript{13} Beger, “Expansion of Police Power in Public Schools and the Vanishing Rights of Students,” 119.

\textsuperscript{14} Nolan, Police in the Hallways: Discipline in an Urban High School, 30.

\textsuperscript{15} Beger, “Expansion of Police Power in Public Schools and the Vanishing Rights of Students,” 126-127.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
law enforcement in public schools. Additionally, Beger highlights the potential disregard for students’ rights to due process, illegal search and seizures, self-incrimination, and being questioned without parental consent.¹⁷

Looking closer at students’ rights, criminologist Nicole Bracy argues that “tougher policies to make schools safer…have contributed to the physical and ideological transformation of public schools into regimented, high-security environments.”¹⁸ To deter crime, administrators and politicians have implemented strict security measures by placing police officers within schools. At surface-level, SRO duties appear to have a positive impact on the school environment. However, Bracy maintains that schools with a police presence are dominated by discipline and punishments in which “students’ rights are treated as an obstacle” to be circumvented and “are an afterthought considered by a judge in a courtroom.”¹⁹ For instance, Bracy observed students’ Fourth Amendment rights evaded when a SRO participated in a search. In this case, the student was physically searched by an administrator after leaving and then returning to school without consent. Although leaving campus without permission is not illegal, it is typically against school policy and therefore administration has the right to search students for potential contraband. Although the SRO did not conduct the search, he was present making the student susceptible to arrest if in possession of an illegal substance. In this example, Bracy claims that officers can circumvent probable cause by observing

¹⁷ Ibid., 126.


¹⁹ Ibid., 309.
an administrative-led search. For Bracy, the carceral state has infiltrated American public education through police presence.  

Criminologist Ben Brown and Sociologist William Benedict identify students’ perceptions of school police and security officers. Focusing on Hispanic and immigrant populations at a Los Angeles County school, Brown and Benedict claim that the growing presence of police warrants greater understanding of how students respond to law enforcement and the greater environmental impact officers have on schools. Although most students report positive accounts and interactions, many others believe police were ineffective in reducing drug activity and violence. Brown and Benedict find that minority students tend to view police unfavorably compared to the majority students. The researchers recommend that school-police partnerships work to foster positive relationships with students through cultural respect and understanding.

Criminologists Aaron Kupchik and Geoff Ward’s study examines the variations in punishment that exist among security measures and how this relates to race, ethnicity, and class. The researchers contend that punitive policies such as police presence, use of metal detectors, and drug searches “are more prevalent at schools with more racial/ethnic minority and low-income students.” Conversely, Kupchik and Ward find that less invasive, therapeutic measures such as counseling or positive reinforcement

20 Ibid., 307.


23 Ibid., 348.
are used in schools with proportionately high white and affluent populations.\textsuperscript{24}

Therefore, marginalized students are more likely to experience law enforcement and punitive punishments than their privileged counterparts.

Although scholars from education, sociology, and criminology have studied the intersection between public education and law enforcement, historians of education have largely neglected this topic. For instance, histories of the truant officer mostly appear alongside progressive education reforms and the implementation of compulsory attendance laws.\textsuperscript{25} In these accounts, the officer is largely portrayed as ineffective in enforcing attendance laws due to underfunding, an uncooperative police force, and lacking community support for compulsory education.\textsuperscript{26} More recently, historian Judith Kafka has written a critical history about carceral-like punishments within urban public schools.\textsuperscript{27} Kafka argues that zero tolerance policies resulted from increased centralization of discipline in public schools that “disproportionately affects minority youth, while offering no real social benefit.”\textsuperscript{28} Although the primary focus is zero tolerance, Kafka’s work does explore the relationship between the Los Angeles Police

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{26} Stambler, “The Effect of Compulsory Education and Child Labor Laws on High School Attendance in New York City, 1898-1917,” 203 & 205.

\textsuperscript{27} Judith Kafka, \textit{The History of “Zero Tolerance” in American Public Schooling}, 2.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 5.
Department and the L.A. Unified School District as part of school discipline and security measures. For Kafka, police presence was implemented to enforce punitive policies. In these accounts, historians have tangentially discussed school-police partnerships leaving a wide gulf for further study. In accounting for school-police partnerships, this dissertation contributes to and expands on histories from urban education reform, child & youth, juvenile delinquency, and ethnicity and race in education.

School-police partnerships were designed to deter juvenile delinquency by socializing students into productive, law-abiding citizens of good moral character directed by middle-class and affluent Anglo-American values. Although having a permanent police presence was new, this was not the first-time public schools were used to socialize students in this way. Nineteenth century common schools promoted republican, capitalist, and Protestant virtues to Americanize immigrant and urban youth to maintain a politically loyal, economically productive, and morally virtuous society. However, it is evident from historian Hilary J. Moss that when race is considered in the common school narrative, constructing the ideal American often prized whiteness over people of color.

---

29 Ibid., 112.


The construction of race and American identity are closely entangled and vital to understanding educational reforms throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For instance, historian James Anderson argues that public education following the Civil War and African American emancipation “reflect[ed] fundamentally, though not exclusively, the long struggle between two social systems—slavery and peasantry on one hand, and capitalism and free labor on the other.”32 From this binary emerged segregated public schools in which white Americans enjoyed the privileges of a free and democratic society, and students of color were often relegated to a substandard, poorly-resourced, and vocational-focused education. This is not to downplay the strides minority populations made in establishing their own schools, legally challenging and defeating de jure segregation, and actively protesting instances of discrimination in public spaces. However, public school reformers attempted to socialize students into specific roles that reflected America’s caste system. Similarly, mid-twentieth century school-police partnerships targeted African American and Mexican American students often identifying them as delinquents. Anderson’s dual education system can be used to interpret how race correlated to an increase in police presence in public schools. Approaching the turn of the century, Progressive Era reforms reaffirmed public education’s purpose to socialize a rapidly changing society within America’s caste system.

By the end of the nineteenth century, middle class and affluent Americans responded to a continued influx of immigrants, flourishing cities, and an expanding industrial society through political, economic, and social reforms to restore capitalism and democracy. Education reformers looked toward public schools to maintain an ordered and efficient society. Progressives bureaucratized the school administrative structure by prioritizing a growing middle-class body of professional schoolmen and elite businessmen to direct educational decision-making sidelining localized authority. Additionally, reformers restructured curriculum and pedagogy promoting a moral and practical education that would prepare students to live productively in a modernized urban society. The ideological thread linking educational reform situates the school as a focal point for social change. Similarly, white middle class public school reformers implemented school-police partnerships in reaction to mid-twentieth century social changes—desegregation, activism, and youth culture—that were often labeled as


36 Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, 118.
delinquent activities. Cast as a problem, reformers believed it could be resolved by increasing police presence in urban public schools.

Given my focus on police presence in public schools, this dissertation intersects with histories of children & youth and juvenile delinquency. Adolescents and delinquency are socially constructed concepts that have shifted over time coinciding with educational reforms during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. During the 1800s, reformers sought to protect children from the city’s perils. Overcrowding, poverty, vice, and a flood of new cultures and people challenged middle class Protestant values leading benevolent child savers to develop institutional structures that would oversee and socialize wayward children. From this movement emerged reform schools, houses of refuge, child welfare agencies, and the Juvenile Justice System. Public education reforms were directly tied to this socializing movement to mold adolescent behavior and morals. By mid-twentieth century, delinquency and youth crime rates alarmed parents, educators, police, and municipal leaders. Historians have attributed this concern to wartime stress, Cold War anxiety, expanding youth culture, and activism that challenged adult authority, traditional middle class values, and white supremacy. Communities and local organizations acted by designing programs to

---


occupy youthful leisure time in constructive ways. During the same period, urban public schools were once again shaping students into productive, loyal, law abiding, democratic citizens by deterring juvenile delinquency through partnerships with local police.

School-police partnerships were implemented to deter juvenile delinquency in urban public schools. As advertised, local police worked directly with educators and students by counseling youth, investigating school-related crimes, teaching classes, developing curriculum and patrolling school grounds. However, these partnerships emerged in the wake of the Brown v. Board decision that legally ended public school segregation. From the 1950s to the 1970s, America’s cities experienced racial and ethnic tensions as African American and Mexican American activists struggled to secure their civil rights. Public education was often a battleground during this tumultuous period. After segregation was legally overturned, massive white resistance manifested in two ways. Through acts of terror and violence, individuals and organizations like the Ku Klux Klan threatened black parents and their children to keep them from integrating white schools. A second, more sophisticated, form of white supremacy was exercised by groups like the White Citizens Council who circumvented and impeded


desegregation through taking advantage of legal loopholes, establishing voucher-funded private academies, sanctioning black employees, and gerrymandering school zones.\textsuperscript{40} The increasing presence of police in urban public schools during this period aligns with the white backlash narrative.

Responding to juvenile delinquency rates, negative images of police, and poor youth attitudes toward law enforcement, local and state police in conjunction with school boards, private organizations, and municipal agencies began instituting a variety of school-police partnerships in the 1950s and 1960s.\textsuperscript{41} These programs included Flint, Michigan’s Police-School Liaisons (PSL) and Tucson, Arizona’s School Resource


Officers (SRO) placing police—usually a single officer—within schools. During this period, Cincinnati’s Police-Attitude Project brought police and educators together to develop curricula and lessons implemented in junior high school social studies classrooms. Although they were not permanent faculty members under the Cincinnati partnership, police perspectives shaped what students learned regarding law and law enforcement. Additionally, the curriculum promoted an ideal image of law enforcement that was constructed by police officers working with educators.

During the early- to mid-twentieth century, sociologists and education scholars studied crime rates, juvenile delinquency, and police perceptions of crime. After World War II, increased academic study on juvenile delinquency and reports from local, state, and federal law enforcement brought attention to a youth crime problem: one significant enough for action by local and state boards of education and eventually the federal government. Beginning in 1958, PSL, SRO, and curriculum-based programs developed and spread throughout the United States reaching large and mid-sized cities as a strategy in preventing further increases in juvenile related crime. Acknowledging the United States’ crime rate, President Lyndon Johnson authorized a fact-finding task force on July 23, 1965. Collaborating with federal, state, and local agencies in law

---


enforcement and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the commission’s general goal was to report on the state of crime across the nation and to make recommendations on how to reduce the trend. As part of this report, the commission found that “the number of delinquency arrests has increased sharply in the United States” stating that from 1960 to 1965, “arrests of persons under 18 years of age jumped 52 percent.” This increase in juvenile related crime was a concern for law enforcement, municipal governments, private organizations, and public schools alike.

By 1971, the National Council of Chiefs of Police recognized that school districts in forty states had implemented a school-police partnership of some kind. The educational phenomenon this dissertation accounts for is the response to delinquency through school-police partnerships beginning in the 1950s and 1960s.

This dissertation will answer three central questions. First, what urban social concerns led advocates to support school-police partnerships beginning in the 1950s? Second, how, why, and where did these partnerships emerge across the United States despite conflicting views from educators, parents, law enforcement, and municipal leaders? Third, what were the racial and social implications of these partnerships? Because this dissertation will focus on increasing police presence in schools, it is necessary to understand the socially constructed perspectives of delinquency and reactions to delinquency that influenced decisions to implement school-police partnerships.

44 Ibid., v.

45 Ibid., 56.

Social constructionism supports the perspective that knowledge and understanding are not discovered or objective. Instead, knowledge is constructed through social interaction, the transmission of ideas, and interactions with a physical and social world. From this view, movements, events, and ideas, are subjective to time, place, culture, and society. Although many historians tend to shy away from explicit theoretical perspectives, it is important to acknowledge that the ways in which ideas are transmitted, developed, and implemented into policy or codified into law are dependent upon historical, social, and cultural contexts. Police presence in public schooling is connected to a perception of growing juvenile delinquency during the twentieth century. To make this claim, this dissertation examines how educators, law enforcement, scholars, and policymakers constructed ideas about juvenile delinquency over time resulting in various laws, institutions, and programs to manage and correct this perceived national crisis ultimately leading to school-police partnerships.

Chapter 2 serves two purposes. First, it will give insight into how views about juvenile delinquency were socially constructed among educators, law enforcement, and reformers during the 1800s and early 1900s. Second, it will reveal how this understanding changed and became codified and managed under houses of refuge, reform schools, child welfare bureaus, and the Juvenile Justice System during the same

---


period. One challenge for this study is to recognize that perspectives on juvenile delinquency changed over time. For nineteenth century reformers, delinquency and moral corruption was a byproduct of urban sprawl, inner-city poverty, racial and ethnic tensions, and an influx of immigrants. I argue that responses from reformers, educators, law enforcement, and municipal leaders to urban societal problems were antecedents to police formally entering urban public schools beginning in the 1950s. This places school-police partnerships into a longer narrative intersecting histories of urban education, school reform movements, juvenile delinquency, child & youth, and race and class in education.

By the mid-twentieth century, urban environmental factors remained a concern, but were exacerbated by social and family pressures from two World Wars, the Great Depression, Cold War anxiety, rising youth culture, and civil rights activism. During WWII, the Federal Bureau of Investigation drew attention to increasing juvenile crime arguing that the war’s “economic and emotional stress” brought turmoil to American homes and families increasing “the tendency toward neglect of youth and children”


causing rises in delinquency.\textsuperscript{52} Law enforcement, educators, and municipal leaders viewed lacking supervision and parental authority as a cause for delinquency. In the postwar period, parents, educators, and politicians often attributed a dramatic shift in youth culture, counterculture, and student activism to delinquency rates.\textsuperscript{53} Social historian James Gilbert argues that parents, politicians, scholars, and social critics blamed an onslaught of advertising, comic books, films, and rock ‘n’ roll music directed at America’s youth for contributing to juvenile delinquency. Cold War anxiety exacerbated adult fears of a potential youth rebellion against authority and tradition.\textsuperscript{54} As perspectives on delinquency shifted, so too did the actions taken by law enforcement, schools, municipal agencies, and private organizations. Chapter 2 accounts for these origins and explores the ideological perspectives that underpinned police involvement in public education: a phenomenon that developed in the postwar period, but was rooted in nineteenth and early-twentieth century constructions of juvenile delinquency.

Next, I will focus on three pioneering school-police partnerships that began in the 1950s and 1960s. Specifically, this dissertation examines responses to delinquency by highlighting three key cities—Flint, Michigan, Tucson, Arizona, and Cincinnati, Ohio—in

\textsuperscript{52} J. Edgar Hoover, “A ‘Third Front’—Against Juvenile Crime” \textit{The New York Times} (New York, NY), February 27, 1944. According to the article, arrests for girls under twenty-one increased by 57%. Property crimes linked to juvenile delinquency rose 33.6% and infractions against common decency increased by 69.6% compared to 1942 records.


\textsuperscript{54} Gilbert, \textit{A Cycle of Outrage}, 14.
which partnerships emerged. I chose these cities because of the types of programs established, the influence each had on other programs, and the larger historical and social contexts in which the school-police partnership phenomenon developed. Flint’s Police-School Liaison was the first formal partnership in the United States and was often used as a model for subsequent programs.

Chapter 3 examines the Police-School Liaison program established in Flint, Michigan in 1958 with funding and direction from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Only four years after the Brown v. Board decision ending legal segregation in public schools, Flint became the groundbreaking program in which law enforcement was integrated into public schools. Racial tension was not uncommon among Flint residents, as housing and economic restrictions relegated African Americans to the poorest and most industrialized areas in the city. The first PSL program was established in Bryant Community Junior High School, a new public school located in a low-income, racially integrated district. The program placed a single, plain-clothed police officer within the school patrolling grounds, investigating potential delinquent acts, assisting school personnel with discipline matters, providing security for school functions, connecting with parents and communities, and handling problems beyond the general scope of school officials. By 1960, Flint’s PSL program expanded to include a counseling team aimed at identifying troubled youth. Its express purpose was

---

55 Information on Flint is provided from the Charles Stewart Mott collection housed at the University of Michigan-Flint. This collection includes documents from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation—a philanthropist organization that assisted in developing and funding Flint’s PSL—correspondence among various contributors to the PSL program, and annual reports from the Mott Foundation. School Board records and police reports pertaining to the PSL program can be accessed from the Genesee County public archives and the Sloan Museum Archives located in Flint, MI. Flint’s local newspaper, The Flint Journal, provides insight into the development of and reaction to the PSL.
to identify student characteristics that indicated potential delinquent activities. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, African American teachers, parents, and leaders began voicing concern about the PSL targeting black and poor students. Moreover, some educators expressed concerns that a police presence would usurp administrative, counseling, and teacher authority. The value in studying Flint’s PSL is that it was the first time in the United States that police had been formally integrated into a public school and therefore became a model for partnerships that developed in the following decades.

Chapter 4 investigates the School Resource Officer program in Tucson, Arizona established in 1962. Tucson’s SRO program emphasized policing duties over the counseling role, acting more like a neighborhood patrolman and detective responding to problems that fell under police jurisdiction. The SRO’s primary goal was to implement preventative measures in reducing juvenile crime while promoting a positive image of law enforcement. Local police, school officials, and community leaders praised the partnership. However, by 1966, the Tucson branch of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and some parents and teachers grew concerned that a police presence

---


57 For information on Tucson’s SRO program, records from the Ernest Tilford collection will provide insight into conflict arising from the SRO program and concerns over student rights. Tilford was a member of the Arizona Civil Liberties Union that brought a case to block the SRO in 1966. The records are located at the Arizona Historical Society Archives in Tucson, Arizona. Further information includes the Arizona Civil Liberties Union records, police reports, and various newspapers including the *Tucson Citizen* and *Tucson Weekly* are available in the University of Arizona Special Collections.


59 Ibid., 329.
diminished students’ civil rights and undermined educators’ authority. Students were reportedly questioned by SROs without parental consent or legal counsel. The ACLU investigated search and seizure tactics, invasion of privacy, and harassment claims from Tucson students. Moreover, opponents questioned SRO training and counseling role. For opponents, the SRO program resembled a police state: one in which citizens were under constant surveillance. From 1963 to 1966, Tucson’s SRO program operated virtually unchecked and without established guidelines. For some Tucsonans, this environment was unacceptable. For others, the SRO program was a clear and effective method in deterring juvenile delinquency. Additionally, this Chapter 4 considers the racial and social implications of this partnership. Like Flint, marginalized youth were the first to experience a police presence in urban public schools.

Chapter 5 examines the Cincinnati Police-Juvenile Attitude Project, a curriculum-based program developed in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1966. Responding to growing crime rates and violence among youth during the mid-twentieth century, district schools partnering with local law enforcement and the University of Cincinnati implemented the curriculum program to foster a positive relationship between police and students. Twenty-four curriculum designers and officers created instructional materials and lesson plans for six week units to teach knowledge of law enforcement and portray an ideal

---

60 Portune, Changing Adolescent Attitudes Toward Police: A Practical Sourcebook for Schools and Police Departments, 46. Furthermore, police and school records including information on juvenile delinquency are located at the Cincinnati History Library and Archives (formerly the Cincinnati Historical Society). Lastly, the Cincinnati Enquirer and the University of Cincinnati’s newspaper the News Record are available at the University of Cincinnati Library and Special Collections.

61 Portune, Changing Adolescent Attitudes Toward Police: A Practical Sourcebook for Schools and Police Departments, 41.
police image. The program was notable because of its comprehensive approach between police and schools to develop curricula targeting juvenile delinquency and addressing student perceptions of police. However, the lessons taught and the image represented resembled a curriculum designed to indoctrinate students. Directed by education scholar Robert Portune, the program was developed from a middle-class professional perspective in cooperation with local police. This presented an ideal image that contradicted the realities marginalized children experienced with law enforcement in the 1960s. Therefore, Chapter 5 explores the explicit and implicit lessons this curriculum project taught Cincinnati public school students.

Using the case-study approach has its pros and cons for any qualitative or historical study. The primary concern is the representativeness of a small sampling to a larger phenomenon. Chapter 6 compares Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati as pioneering programs within their individual approaches to preventing juvenile delinquency. Although each city has a unique history, emphasizing their commonalities provides a contextual backdrop shared among the first school-police partnerships. Moreover, Chapter 6 analyzes juvenile delinquency as an urban issue that police, educators, and civic leaders struggled to resolve. Partnerships may have differed structurally, but each had the mutual aim to deter delinquency among urban public junior high school adolescents. Finally, Chapter 6 explores the social and racial implications these partnerships had for the students, educators, and communities directly impacted. To a

---

62 Ibid., 122.

degree, each partnership was distinct. However, their shared roots, features, and goals divulge that Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati were illustrative of the growing police presence phenomenon in urban public schools during the latter half of the twentieth century.

Historians of education are confined to their present context. For this reason, history is a process in which understanding and knowledge of the past can change according to present conditions and contemporary issues motivating historians to consider new questions that help reflect upon old problems.64 This is not to suggest that historical insight can resolve a current debate. However, it can add complexity to discussion and generate specific queries that non-historians may not contemplate.

Today, in the United States, police presence in public schools is common. Since the 1980s, growing concerns in school safety, illegal drug use, and mass shootings have caused a dramatic increase in school-police partnerships. This dissertation provides historical insight to understand this contentious trend. Additionally, this study fills a void in histories of urban education, school reform movements, juvenile delinquency, students’ rights, children & youth, and race, ethnicity and class in education. During the mid-twentieth century, urban police, educators, and civic leaders developed and implemented school-police partnerships in response to juvenile delinquency rates. These programs attempted to socialize adolescents into productive, virtuous, and law-abiding citizens. This was not a new endeavor for urban reformers. Nineteenth century child-savers believed that changes to urban society brought by

industrialization, immigration, and political shifts affected youth adversely. However, during and after World War II social changes through wartime stress, Cold War anxiety, rising youth culture, and civil rights movements created an environment in which local and national leaders, parents, police, and educators believed juvenile delinquency was an urgent problem in need of reform. From this alarm, school-police partnerships emerged in the 1950s and 1960s. At face-value, partnerships increased police presence in schools and introduced curriculum programs designed to deter delinquent activity through education, counseling, and portraying an ideal image of law enforcement. Although programs garnered widespread support, conflicting beliefs and values concerning the roles of law enforcement and public education caused local controversy. Despite inconclusive evidence about the effectiveness of these partnerships, police presence in urban public schools increased throughout the twentieth century. Through case studies, this dissertation comparatively analyzes Flint, Michigan’s Police School Liaison (PSL), Tucson, Arizona’s School Resource Officer (SRO), and Cincinnati, Ohio’s Police-Attitude Project. Each partnership began as a local initiative spearheaded by police, educators, and municipal leaders to address juvenile delinquency—an urban problem that gained nationwide attention in the post-WWII era. This dissertation argues that educators collaborated with municipal law enforcement to reduce juvenile delinquency, but did so in ways that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.
CHAPTER 2
IDEOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ORIGINS OF THE SCHOOL-POLICE PARTNERSHIP PHENOMENON

The first school-police partnerships of the 1950s and 1960s were designed and implemented during a period of social change, youthful rebellion, and civil rights activism. Reformers argued that a permanent police presence in public schools would reduce juvenile delinquency rates, but did so in ways that diminished students’ rights, challenged educator authority, and continued to marginalize minority and low-income students. To understand these claims, it is necessary to investigate the ideological perspectives that fashioned the institutional antecedents to school-police partnerships.

For historian Carl Kaestle, ideology is “a set of apparently compatible propositions about human nature and society that help an individual to interpret complex human problems and take action that the individual believes is in his or her best interest and the best interest of the society as a whole.”¹ I agree with Kaestle’s argument that ideology is a powerful catalyst for reform. Operating under this assumption, I argue that ideology guided middle-class and affluent White Anglo-Saxon Protestant reformers to serve, in their minds, the best interests of American urban society from the 1800s to the early-1900s. Although separated by time, mid-twentieth century partnerships can trace their ideological underpinnings to these urban social, educational, and institutional reformers.

Historically, public schools have modeled and transmitted morals and values to socialize students into categorical roles within American society. For instance, mid-nineteenth century common school reformers argued that teachers should not only

possess an unquestionable content knowledge, but impart behavior that included “the elements of…equity, benevolence, [and] conscience” emblematic of a productive, loyal, and morally sound society.\(^2\) Aside from demographic, political, and economic shifts in the early 1800s, Kaestle contends that Native Protestant Ideology, as well as perspectives on republicanism and capitalism, buttressed the changes and developments that erected the common school movement. Likewise, historian James Anderson claims that public education following the Civil War and African American emancipation reflected a dual system separated by race and class.\(^3\) Segregated public schools emerged in the nineteenth century allowing white Americans to enjoy the rights and privileges of a free and republican society. However, black Americans often experienced substandard, poorly-resourced, and vocational-focused educations relegating them to second-class citizenry.

Responding to rapid urbanization, industrialization, and immigration, middle class and elite progressives directed reforms to maintain an ordered and efficient society by the turn of the century. Progressive reformers consolidated the school structure replacing localized control with a growing middle-class body of professional schoolmen and elite businessmen directing educational decision-making. School reform was one way to manage the perceived social ills attributed to urban expansion. Professional educators and scholars—an intellectual elite—also restructured curriculum and pedagogy to prepare students for a modern industrial society. Additionally, character education


was implemented to not only preserve middle-class Protestant values, but guide
students to navigate “under the altered circumstances of the twentieth century without
losing their integrity and without falling victim to the worst temptations of the day.” The
ideological thread linking educational reform situated the school as a focal point for
social change by the early-twentieth century.

In each reform period, schools attempted to socialize students into specific roles
that reflected the ideological values of America’s dominant caste. Similarly, school-
police partnerships aimed to socialize urban adolescents into productive, law-abiding,
citizens. The central purpose was to reduce delinquency through fostering positive
interactions between police and adolescents, educating students on law, and
counseling adolescents exhibiting poor behavior while presenting an ideal image of the
law enforcement officer. Chapter 2 argues that reforms to public schools and juvenile
justice during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries were the ideological and
institutional precursors of the school-police partnership phenomenon that began in
1950s and 1960s. First, I will identify the ideological impulses that guided school
reforms in nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Second, Chapter 2 will examine how reformers understood and approached
juvenile delinquency. Nineteenth century “child savers” wanted to protect “children from
the physical and moral dangers of an increasingly industrialized and urban society.”

---


Specialized agencies, courts, and detention centers designed to reform juveniles into productive, law-abiding citizens flourished in urban centers during the nineteenth century. In each of these programs, law enforcement worked with schools, welfare agencies, and local organizations to develop specialized methods and institutions to address delinquency and poverty among youths. In tracing the origins of school-police partnerships, Chapter 2 will discuss nineteenth century interpretations of juvenile delinquency, while spotlighting the development of the Juvenile Justice System in the United States.

Chapter 2 will serve two purposes. Because this dissertation focuses on increasing police presence in schools, it is necessary to understand the socially constructed perspectives on and reactions to delinquency that influenced decisions to implement school-police partnerships. Police presence in public schooling correlates with juvenile delinquency rates during the mid-twentieth century. To make this claim, it is necessary to examine how reformers constructed juvenile delinquency over time resulting in various laws, institutions, and programs. First, Chapter 2 will provide insight into how various reformers viewed adolescent delinquency and how their interpretations changed over time and became codified under juvenile laws and specialized courts during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Second, Chapter 2 will provide a social and historical context from which school-police partnerships emerged by considering how legal systems and reformers perceived different populations in terms of race, ethnicity, and class. Although the best of intentions may have guided reformers to
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implement school-police partnerships, these programs affected some populations adversely. Overall, this account will help illuminate the expansion of police involvement in public education: a phenomenon that developed in the postwar period, but was rooted in nineteenth and twentieth century social and educational reforms.

**Ideology and Education Reform, 1800-1880**

Urban education in the early 1800s was not systematic or standardized. Between 1800 and the 1830s, multiple educational forms served America’s growing urban student populations and were funded by tuition, philanthropists, or churches. For instance, Sabbath schools offered the urban poor free rudimentary education and moral training reflecting the church doctrine that provided the charity.\(^8\) Carl Kaestle reports that by 1830 approximately 200,000 children nationwide attended Sunday Schools.\(^9\) However, the most prevalent form of schooling in the early 1800s was the independent pay school. These localized institutions reflected the communities in which they operated and therefore varied in “curriculum, cost, organization, and philosophy.”\(^10\)

Because they were tuition-based, children from the middling and affluent classes often attended these schools.\(^11\) Kaestle points out that a significant difference existed in the culture of each educational form. Pay-schools often reflected the values of the attending students. But the charity school, serving recent immigrants and the poor, “was an explicit attempt to intervene between the parents and children of a supposedly alien
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By the 1820s and 1830s, reformers began consolidating charity schools into a rudimentary form of organized public education. The motivation behind this movement stemmed from the reformer’s perspective that education promoted urban stability.\textsuperscript{13}

Between the 1830s and 1860s, the United States experienced large-scale shifts that challenged the nation’s fundamental social, economic, and political structures.\textsuperscript{14} Demographically, the United States was becoming more ethnically diverse as immigrants, mostly Irish, flooded the nation’s port cities seeking opportunity.\textsuperscript{15} The economy expanded as the North transitioned to manufacturing and trade supported by southern, slave-produced raw materials.\textsuperscript{16} While capitalism was being fueled by African American blood and sweat, universal manhood suffrage was passed in several states striking down property ownership requirements for white males to vote.\textsuperscript{17} With urban, economic, and political expansion came fears of disunity, social and cultural fragmentation, and the failure of the great American experiment.\textsuperscript{18} In response, reformers argued that “improved public education could alleviate a host of worrisome problems and secure the nation’s destiny.”\textsuperscript{19} The common school movement was
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launched with the mission to preserve republican, capitalist, and Protestant virtues by educating students to be productive, loyal, and moral citizens.\textsuperscript{20}

As cities flourished in the antebellum North, reformers looked to public education to socialize an increasingly pluralist population. Promoting republican, capitalist, and Protestant values, common schools sought to Americanize immigrant and urban youth to maintain a politically loyal, economically productive, and morally virtuous society that identified with and was directed by middle class White Anglo-Saxon Protestant values. Despite its successes, some political and economic conservatives, religious sects, and northern and southern elites opposed common school reform.\textsuperscript{21} Nonetheless, reformers persevered in their mission to deliver a tax-supported education system that, in their minds, would protect republican, capitalist, and Protestant values from a shifting society.\textsuperscript{22}

Although Kaestle's interpretation of the common school movement discusses the ideological impulses that motivated reformers, he does not fully account for the racial dimensions of public schooling in antebellum America. To his credit, Kaestle does state that racism often made it difficult for "public-school advocates to argue for the integration of black children into common schools."\textsuperscript{23} Because of this, free black communities and a small number of white philanthropists and abolitionists supported
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private schools for African American children. Moreover, black leaders made attempts to integrate public schools, but were met with opposition from whites and blacks. Many African American parents favored segregated schools questioning the quality of education their children would receive from white teachers.\footnote{Beverly A. Bunch Lyons, \textit{Contested Terrain: African American Women Migrate from the South to Cincinnati, Ohio, 1900-1950} (New York: Routledge, 2002): 78; David A. Gerber, \textit{Black Ohio and the Color Line, 1860-1915} (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976): 451; Kaestle, \textit{Pillars of the Republic}, 175-176.} Despite these few actions, African Americans were, according to Kaestle, mostly bystanders during the common school movement.

Historian Hilary Moss, however, centers race in the common school narrative. School reformers not only emphasized republican, capitalist, and Protestant virtues, but also prized whiteness when socializing children.\footnote{Hilary J. Moss, \textit{Schooling Citizens: The Struggle for African American Education in Antebellum America} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009) 9.} Focusing on New Haven, Baltimore, and Boston, Moss examines the “widespread, often violent, white opposition to African American education that erupted in northern and southern communities…that coincides with the birth of public education.”\footnote{Ibid., 3.} Moss argues that the expansion of common schools that paralleled with white backlash against black education was paradoxical during a period when schooling was both propagated and restricted. Moss does not dispute that common schools were charged with a mission to Americanize an increasingly pluralist nation. However, she stresses that citizenship was linked to whiteness because blacks were often excluded from equal access to public education. Moss finds that even though slave holding Baltimore had tighter restrictions excluding African Americans from
any form of public education, there was less violent reaction toward private black schooling. Conversely, African Americans in Boston and New Haven legally had greater access to public schooling, but faced harsher opposition from whites.\textsuperscript{27} Important to Moss’s depiction is that the African American struggle for equitable education can be traced back to the nation’s first public schools in the nineteenth century.

Race and American identity are closely entwined and vital to any examination of school reforms during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While African Americans struggled to attain an education equal to their Anglo-American counterparts, reformers designed a school system that relegated blacks to second-class citizenship.\textsuperscript{28} James Anderson argues that despite efforts from newly freed southern blacks to create their own schools after the Civil War, education reformers firmly established a racially segregated system.\textsuperscript{29} Through industrial schooling, students of color experienced a substandard, poorly-resourced, and vocational-focused education.\textsuperscript{30} According to Anderson, reformers Samuel Chapman Armstrong and his pupil Booker T. Washington “developed a pedagogy and ideology designed to avoid…confrontations and to maintain within the South a social consensus that did not challenge traditional inequalities of wealth and power.”\textsuperscript{31} The “Hampton-Tuskegee Idea” countered black agency by attempting to socialize African Americans into a laboring class based on race.\textsuperscript{32}
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Although industrial schools were largely a southern phenomenon, they were often financed by northern philanthropists.\textsuperscript{33} Funding black industrial education in the South was emblematic of the philanthropists’ educational ideology. According to reformers and their financial backers, “the right schooling could train laborers to be better citizens and more efficient workers” and therefore, education was “a sound investment in social stability and economic prosperity.”\textsuperscript{34} As a result, educating the laboring class complemented nineteenth century urban and industrial development.

In each of these examples, schools attempted to socialize students into America’s caste system. Common schools and industrial education emerged during periods of social transformation that challenged middle-class and affluent, White Anglo-Saxon Protestants’ social, political, economic, and cultural hegemony. Beginning in the 1830s, education reformers consolidated charity schools into a standardized public school system designed to Americanize immigrant and urban children to preserve the nation’s republican, capitalist, and Protestant values. After the Civil War and the end to slavery, reformers responded by creating a segregated school system that relegated black children to a second-class, labor-based education. For each racial and social group, reformers designed an education system to create loyal, productive, and moral democratic citizens. I do not claim that a straight line can be drawn between early nineteenth century education reforms and mid-twentieth century school-police partnerships. However, the explicit purpose behind police presence in schools was to deter delinquency through nurturing positive relationships, educating pupils, and
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counseling adolescents. Reformers, reacting to delinquency as a challenge to middle-class norms and adult authority, used public schools to socialize students into productive, law-abiding, moral, and loyal citizens, but did so in ways that diminished students’ rights and continued marginalizing students of color and the poor. Socialization through education and marginalizing students based on class, race, and ethnicity are the ideological threads shared by these various educational reform movements and are linked by the Progressive Era.

**Progressive Education Reform, 1890-1930**

A “rather vague and not altogether cohesive or consistent movement,” argues Richard Hofstadter, the Progressive Era “was not nearly so much the movement of any particular class or group as it was a rather widespread…effort of the greater part of society to achieve some not very clear specified self-reformation.”35 For Hofstadter, the period between 1890 and the late 1930s represented a time of reform in which Americans adapted to a swiftly changing society. Late nineteenth century societal and economic shifts—industrialization, urbanization, and immigration—prompted reactions to restore capitalism and democracy perceived to be corrupted by expansive corporations and political machines.36 Although Hofstadter does not directly discuss education, progressive reformers fixated on efficiently schooling students for a modern, industrial society.

Historian Lawrence Cremin characterizes progressive reforms as “part of a vast humanitarian effort to apply the promise of American life—the ideal of government by, of,
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and for the people—to the puzzling new urban-industrial civilization."³⁷ Like Hofstadter, Cremin argues that these were adjustment measures designed to cope with a changing landscape, economy, and culture.³⁸ “The school,” Cremin argues, “is cast as a lever of social change.”³⁹ Education was a remedy to cure perceived domestic problems—immigration, political disunity, economic shift toward industry. For historians of education, progressive reforms developed in three areas: administration, curriculum, and pedagogy. Administrative reformers incorporated larger trends toward professionalization, bureaucratic management, and consolidated authority. Taking a cue from Hofstadter’s and Cremin’s accounts, education historians identify shifts in Progressive Era schools that often resembled a top-down reordering and specialization of school administrators.

In urban America, wards sectioned by race, ethnicity, and class created a varied and often mismanaged collection of schools by the 1890s. Raymond Callahan and Joel Spring argue that progressive-minded businessmen intended to create an efficient, structured, and organized society around the corporate image.⁴⁰ Reform emphasized scientific management, corporate values, and professionalization producing business-minded men concerned with economic efficiency, but “did not understand education.”⁴¹ Spring identifies progressive businessmen as the agents in shaping public education to
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politically, economically, and socially control middle and working class people and maintain elite authority. Under corporate consolidation, school boards resembled boards of directors, superintendents became business managers, principals as bosses, and teachers were treated as laborers.

Although Callahan and Spring maintain that administrative reform was directed by business ideology, Robert Wiebe argues that this perspective was not necessarily elitist. When locally controlled schools centralized, administrative roles such as superintendent and principals were filled by middle class professionals. Countering Hofstadter, Wiebe argues progressive reform originated from a rising professional class encountering a turbulent cultural and social clash. Homogeneous “island communities” reflecting rural, Protestant, white values disintegrated from urban growth, immigration, and industrialization. Consolidation occurred in rural areas as the community relinquished local control to larger districts and outside professionals designed to create social and regional uplift. Reformers viewed progressive schools as the “physical and geographical center of the rural community and…would permanently project the power of the state and symbolize a modernized society.” Progressive reformers were an outside force that dismantled localized authority over public education.
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Historian David Tyack argues that rural consolidation was a microcosm of the urban response to “chaotic growth, fears aroused by ethnic and class discord, and the adaptation and diffusion of new organizational forms.” Characterizing reform as a middle class movement, Callahan claims that school administrators were attempting to legitimate education and their profession by adopting business-like structures. Administrative progressives recognized the potential to direct society through educational institutions; a cooperative effort among middle and upper class business professionals that blamed urban societal ills on immigrants and the industrialized working class.

Revisionist and post-revisionist historians have focused primarily on structural and administrative progressive reforms. The progressive impulse also manifested in pedagogical and curricular reforms. For Larry Cuban, pedagogy is a “continuum…of indicators describing important dimensions of what teachers do in their classrooms.” Cuban identifies progressive pedagogical reforms as moving toward student-centered instruction opposed to the teacher-centered status-quo. For Arthur Zilversmit, pedagogical reform derived from John Dewey’s perspective that schools should be “humane institutions that respected childhood” and educated students to “create a
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better society." Although progressive, student-centered instruction was promoted by educational researchers, Cuban finds that teacher-centered instruction persisted because cultural and social factors guided by epistemological perspectives about the nature of teaching and learning dominated the individual beliefs held by teachers and schools. Although Dewey and Dewey-inspired pedagogues sought to nurture children through student-centered instruction built upon individual ability and interest, Progressive reforms as a whole highlighted differences among education scholars and “represented a constellation of ideas, not a set program.” Meaning, progressive reform was not a monolithic movement based on a single ideological perspective.

Moving from pedagogical to curricular reform, Herbert Kliebard concurs with Zilversmit that "different interest groups competing for dominance over the curriculum and, at different times, achieving some measure of control depending on local as well as general social conditions." Curriculum shifts during the Progressive Era resulted from competing epistemological and ideological conceptions of education–humanism, developmentalism, social efficiency, and social meliorism–that ultimately fused into "a sometimes conscious, sometimes unconscious, potpourri." Despite differences, each curricular perspective attempted to alter schools to cope with society’s rapid change.
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Kliebard also states that the “emphasis on local efforts at curriculum change was replaced by a pattern of centrally controlled curriculum revision” highlighting the general Progressive shift toward professionalization and consolidated authority.\textsuperscript{59} Since schools during the Progressive Era became more centralized, curricular reform—much like administrative reform—was directed from outsiders to manage and cope with a rapidly expanding and socially diversifying nation.\textsuperscript{60}

Revisionist and post-revisionist historians of the Progressive Era tend to write from a top-down perspective focusing on the intellectual, political, and social elites as a source of change. While it is true that society’s elite members often directed progressive reform in centralizing schools, influencing curricula, and altering pedagogical methods, it is necessary to acknowledge the grassroots efforts that were not only a source of reform, but often opposed the elite. Historian William Reese argues that “school innovation was a dynamic, interactive process involving diverse community groups.”\textsuperscript{61} Women’s organizations, labor unions, Social Gospelers, Socialists, and parent groups were significant forces in the Progressive Era. Facing elite-minded reforms, grassroots activists often stood in defiance to maintain local controls over education; control that was shifting towards highly organized hierarchical power structures led by business and
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political elites.\textsuperscript{62} Although grassroots organizations were not successful in undermining centralization, they were successful in preventing total control by elites and were able to effect progressive changes in schools such as lunch programs, free text books, medical care, and, albeit limited, local representation on school boards.

Late nineteenth and early twentieth century reforms in education occurred as reactions to a nation shifting away from its homogeneous, agrarian beginnings. The US economy was quickly becoming a notable leader in manufacturing and trade as large and mid-sized cities increasingly industrialized. In the post-Civil War era, emancipation had brought freedom to millions of African Americans now seeking economic opportunities beyond the South’s agricultural economy and oppressive governance sparking mass migration to northern cities. Likewise, southern and eastern European immigrants brought new ethnicities and cultures to America’s urban centers. Although the allure of opportunity in America’s cities appealed to a more diverse labor-force, this influx posed a challenge to White Anglo-Protestant cultural and social dominance. Thus, Progressive education reformers sought to socialize efficiently a growing population for an industrial world. With increasing urban opportunities came poverty, crime, and social tension. Reacting to increases in delinquency and potential environmental factors that could lead youth to crime, reformers created specialized courts, programs, and detention centers for juvenile offenders. These progressive reformers and the institutions they created to address nineteenth and early twentieth century delinquency
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were the antecedents to school-police partnerships that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s.

The Social Construction of Juvenile Delinquency, 1890-1950

American perspectives on adolescents and delinquency shifted from the nineteenth to the twentieth century. By the 1890s, argues legal scholar Barry Feld, “a more modern view predominated of childhood and adolescence as periods of life during which adults protected, nurtured, and prepared young people for the future.” As the United States industrialized, work and home separated and urban populations swelled. Similar to the sporadic nature of schooling before mid-nineteenth century common schools, “society fostered a movement from informal systems to formal organizations of social control” that altered the relationships between children and parents, as well as adolescents and society. Simultaneously, labor laws, social welfare programs, compulsory attendance laws, and state-sponsored reformatories emerged and further “reflected and advanced the new vision of childhood” as different and separate from adulthood.

The late nineteenth century Child-Study Movement segmented childhood into developmental stages. Often regarded as the father of the Child-Study Movement, G. Stanley Hall hypothesized a connection between evolutionary development of species and developmental stages in children. Feld argues that child-study further
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differentiated child from adult, and that adolescence as a concept “prolonged social and economic dependency of youths until they reached psychological and emotional maturity.” Although Hall’s studies were criticized as inadequate, child-study scholars such as James Mark Baldwin and John Dewey furthered the movement in areas of psychology, pedagogy, and social welfare.

Coinciding with the Child-Study Movement, late nineteenth century “child savers” were progressive-minded humanitarians who wanted to protect “children from the physical and moral dangers of an increasingly industrialized and urban society.” According to their view, environmental factors—overcrowding, poverty, and cultural dissonance—turned children toward delinquency. Sociologists and law enforcement officers increasingly viewed delinquency as a curable disorder and that a “reformatory system” could “demonstrate that delinquents were capable of being converted into law abiding citizens.” Progressive reformers developed state-directed institutions—reform schools and juvenile courts—to correct delinquency, an urban byproduct. Increased attention to child welfare through compulsory attendance laws, specialized courts, and correctional institutes increased the role of local and state government into the domestic sphere. Feld argues that family life and the home became a domestic haven separated from the public sphere. Progressive reformers created agencies, courts, and laws “to structure child development, to control and mold children, to protect them from
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exploitation, and to oversee their parents.”\(^{71}\) The responsibility of the family to raise productive, law-abiding children extended to the state.

The nineteenth century child-saving movement manifested in several institutions throughout the United States. Early houses of refuge, an antecedent to the juvenile court system, first appeared in New York City, Boston, and Philadelphia in the 1820s. Increased immigration was cited as the cause for rising poverty and crime rates among children and houses of refuge provided cities “an organization tool with which to remove the children of the urban immigrant and lower classes whose families did not provide adequate moral direction.”\(^ {72}\) Changing the environment, for child-savers, was essential in removing corruptive forces that caused delinquency among adolescents. Likewise, reform schools in the mid- to late-nineteenth century were established in rural settings to remove children from urban life providing a “wholesome agrarian environment.”\(^ {73}\) Child-savers and reformers believed that separation from not only urban life, but adult life was necessary in protecting the child’s innocence.

Culminating ideas from social welfare and child-study scholars eventually manifested in state and federal sponsored juvenile courts and children’s bureaus. The “widespread establishment of juvenile courts…represented one of the proudest achievements of progressive reformers.”\(^ {74}\) The first juvenile court in the United States was established in Chicago in 1899. Supported by child-savers, the court codified a
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distinction between child and adult within the American justice system. For reformers, the juvenile court provided the opportunity to “identify the causes of crime and delinquency in order to prescribe an appropriate remedy” for adolescent offenders.\textsuperscript{75} The juvenile court not only segregated children from adults, but shifted from penalizing criminal activity to rehabilitating the offender. According to Feld, the court was an extension of the child-saving progressive mindset that helped construct a new understanding of adolescence—one that “characterized children as innocent and free from vice, responsible neither for acting out their innate biological imperatives nor for failing to develop into responsible adults.”\textsuperscript{76} Legal historian David Tanenhaus agrees with Feld that youthful offenders were diverted away from adult courts, but argues juvenile courts also sought to Americanize an increasingly diverse nation.\textsuperscript{77}

According to Tanenhaus, Chicago was one of the nation’s fastest growing cities boasting a significant immigrant population by in the late nineteenth century. For progressive reformers, immigrants posed a threat to America’s social order. The juvenile court gave states the legal authority to intervene in family affairs becoming an agent in punishing delinquents.\textsuperscript{78} Once in the system, Cook County Juvenile Judge Richard S. Tuthill believed that it was the state’s duty to Americanize immigrant children
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to “preserve the nation’s values and perpetuate its institutions.” Like common school and progressive education reformers, the juvenile court system identified immigrant and poor children as the causes of urban unrest by challenging middle class White Anglo-Saxon Protestant values.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries both adolescence and delinquency were socially constructed and legally defined. Adolescence was separated from adulthood, viewed through a series of developmental stages, and in need of protection from corruptive urban environments. Reformers and the courts associated delinquency with urban-living and the immigrant child. As the juvenile justice system became more entrenched in American society, Feld argues that “courts brought within their ambit of control young people’s behavior that criminal courts previously ignored or handled informally.”

Truancy, sexual conduct, waywardness, idleness: reformers viewed these behaviors as a threat to a child’s well-being and a threat to America’s social and cultural values. Moreover, proper behavior and delinquency was also dictated by nineteenth century gender norms.

Boys and girls caused trouble, but the court viewed the types of delinquent acts through a gender binary identified by biological sex. For boys, delinquency was typically associated with vandalism, drinking alcohol, or truancy. However, troublesome girls “exemplified new economic, social, and sexual opportunities available to urban young
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women.”

According to historian Ruth Alexander, reformers identified female delinquency as behaviors aberrant to societal norms. For instance, girls and young women who exhibited precocious behavior, were employed, and/or engaged in sexual activity were often labeled as delinquents in the early to mid-twentieth century. Consequently, argues historian David Wolcott, punishment often reflected a protective action in which reformers saw themselves as saving girls from the city’s seductiveness. Irrespective of class, ethnicity, race, or gender, the juvenile court system was one method reformers utilized to reduce delinquency.

Juvenile courts are only one example of how delinquency was addressed. Another example can be found in early twentieth century federal and state children’s bureaus. Reflecting a progressive mindset to protect innocent children from corruptive environments and delinquent activity, the federal government under President Howard Taft enacted the U.S. Children’s Bureau as the “first government agency in the world to assume responsibility for improving the welfare of a nation’s children…with a social welfare mission.” Established on April 9, 1912, the Bureau oversaw, reported on, and investigated matters of child welfare including mortality rates among infants and children, the Juvenile Justice System, state orphanages and institutions directed at
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adolescents, healthcare, and child labor. Taking a cue from the federal government, many state and local children’s bureaus were established in the following decades.

The first state-level juvenile bureaus were antecedents to school-police partnerships of the 1950s and 1960s. “As early as 1914,” stated the New York City Mayor’s Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, “the Police Department was aware of the fact that juvenile offenders presented…a different problem from adult criminals.”88 That year, Police officers made guest lectures in local schools discussing issues of crime and safety with children. By 1918, New York City police began working with the city’s Welfare Bureau addressing adolescent needs and youth crime. In 1929, New York’s Crime Commission recommended a specialized and separate agency to promote positive interactions with children and assume responsibility for youth related crimes as a means to prevent juvenile delinquency. In December of 1930, the Crime Prevention Bureau was established and by 1935, the agency’s name was changed to the Juvenile Aid Bureau. Consisting of approximately 154 officers, the bureau was distributed among nine branch offices throughout New York City. In this case, there was a division in implementation between the federal bureau and New York’s bureau. Where the federal bureau was designed as a social welfare agency, New York’s bureau acted as a policing agency tied to the state’s burgeoning Juvenile Justice System.89

Children’s Bureaus varied among cities and states, but the central mission to address juvenile delinquency was consistent. The Passaic Children’s Bureau in New Jersey operated closely with local schools opposed to law enforcement. Established in
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1937, it coordinated the “various supervisory and counseling programs of the school district and cooperat[ed] with state, county, and municipal authorities as well as with public and private social and recreational agencies to help solve juvenile problems and provide service with a ‘team’ approach.”  

George Boone, director from 1943 to 1960, argues that Passaic’s bureau was needed to address concerns over gang activity from neighboring New York City and Newark, New Jersey, and the tensions developed from an ethnically and racially diverse population.  

With an “emphasis on prevention, protections, and readjustment rather than correction and punishment,” the bureau consisted of a Police Unit, a Census and Attendance Department, and a Psychologist and Social Worker all appointed by the Passaic Board of Education.  

Working within local schools, the bureau acted as a counseling team for children “socially deprived and emotionally maladjusted” who were “more apt to become victims of the adverse influences leading to delinquency.”  

Falling in line with Progressive Era child-savers, the Passaic Children's Bureau was an example of an early partnership between schools and police to turn juveniles away from delinquent behavior. Although police worked with schools in this case, it would not be until 1958 when the first formal school-police partnership physically placed law enforcement within a public school setting.
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Since the late nineteenth century, police have been the primary public authorities regulating juvenile delinquency. However, social reformers and police often clashed over differing perspectives on delinquency. Reformers tended to view delinquency "broadly, as a complex of behaviors...all resulting from the dual impacts of a degrading urban social environment and a troublesome family life." Conversely, police officers interpreted delinquency as rational, but misguided, circumstantial decisions. Despite contrasting perspectives, juvenile courts and laws during the early twentieth century nationally codified delinquency and youth crime.

In the postwar era, rising juvenile crime rates shifted popular views of delinquency. Historians have attributed adult anxiety and response to social, economic, and cultural changes resulting from WWII and the Cold War. World War II helped create a generation of children lacking parental supervision, increased independence, and ultimately a challenge to authority which "led to a significant increase in juvenile crime during the war years." To decrease delinquency, urban reformers responded with municipal programs composed of community members, school officials, and politicians to address causes of delinquency, recommend social reform, and strengthen
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law enforcement.\textsuperscript{99} Despite results, urban committees represented local, reform-minded initiatives to combat rising juvenile delinquency in urban areas.

While WWII’s societal impacts were blamed for increasing juvenile delinquency, so too was the postwar rise in youth culture. Directly related to the end of WWII was the rise of the Baby Boom Generation. By the 1950s and early 1960s “the enormous increase in the youth population overwhelmed institutions to socialize and control young people.”\textsuperscript{100} Further separated from adult society, adolescents were housed in America’s schools in which a youth counter-culture emerged. Cold War anxiety contributed to adult fears of a potential adolescent rebellion against authority and tradition. Parents, politicians, scholars, and social critics largely blamed advertising, comic books, films, and rock ‘n’ roll music for America’s delinquency problem.\textsuperscript{101} Although difficult to correlate mass culture with misbehavior, critics viewed “juvenile delinquency and even youth culture…as proof that the traditional transmission of values from institutions of social order through parents to children had been seriously weakened” replacing middle class social norms with mass produced low-class values.\textsuperscript{102} Reaction called for censorship and investigations into potentially subversive materials to protect

\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., 20; and Joseph T. Rydar, \textit{The Flint Youth Bureau: It’s Purpose, Organization, & Function} (1945): 1-3, folder 27.1, Box 2, Charles S. Mott Collection, University of Michigan, Flint, Frances Wilson Thompson Library, Genesee Historical Collections Center. Milwaukie, Wisconsin’s Metropolitan Youth Commission and Flint, Michigan’s Youth Bureau are two examples of community-based municipal reform efforts.
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adolescents from hazardous influences and to homogenize culture under middle-class, Protestant ideals.\(^{103}\)

The 1950s and 1960s also witnessed the rise in student activism through civil rights action. Feld argues that “as racial diversity increased outside the South,” due to black migration in the mid-twentieth century, “racial tensions escalated.”\(^{104}\) Civil rights protests, sometimes met with violent resistance, contributed to an increasing role of youth courts, and police intervention into juvenile delinquency. As Baby Boomers reached their teenage years, Feld argues that “the rates of serious violent and property crimes increase more than 75 percent.”\(^{105}\) The population increase alone accounts for much of this rise in crime. However, a change in perception that equated youth culture and civil rights action as delinquent and sometimes as criminal activity created the perception of an ever-increasing youth crime problem.

Although perspectives on juvenile delinquency changed over time, the progressive child-saving mentality persisted. Problems associated with urban sprawl—poverty, overcrowding, cultural and social conflict—remained a constant threat to adolescents, but the postwar brought attention to a different set of underlying causes of delinquency: wartime stress on families, youth culture, and civil rights activism.\(^{106}\) Approaching the 1950s, juvenile crime was at a record high and steadily increasing. Shifting from community-based municipal response, cities turned to police-focused
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crime prevention. Although the Progressive Era had ended with the Great Depression and WWII, the ideological underpinnings of progressive-minded reform to create a productive and moral society persevered. The first school-police partnership emerged in 1958 reflecting this child-saving mentality. Throughout the mid to late twentieth century urban police and schools increasingly developed Police School Liaisons, School Resource Officers, and curriculum-based programs to prevent juvenile delinquency. The increase in police presence in public schools challenges historian B. Edward McClellan’s account that “schools seemed to move inexorably away from moral education” by the 1960s.¹⁰⁷ School-police partnerships were not a spontaneous development reacting to mass shootings, school violence, or drug abuse. More so, programs reflected a Progressive Era mentality that not only protected children from urban life, but also socialized children to perpetuate middle class and affluent, White Anglo-Saxon Protestant cultures and values. To illustrate this movement, I will now turn to Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, as three case studies exemplifying school-police partnerships that began as local initiatives organized by police, educators, and municipal leaders to address juvenile delinquency, but did so in ways that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.
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Rapid industrialization during the first half of the twentieth century enticed a diverse population looking for opportunity to the newly expanding Great Lakes auto industry. This growth was part of a larger global economic expansion occurring from the 1890s to the 1960s. Moving into the 1900s, scientific and technological advancements coupled with efficient manufacturing methods made corporate growth and expanding markets possible. The United States, largely unscathed from World War II, emerged as the world leader in mass production of consumer goods.

As business expanded, so too did wealth among America’s workforce. The business elite and captains of industry became immensely powerful in society and politics. Blue collar Americans filled manufacturing jobs in America’s industrializing cities. Furthermore, the expanding middle class professionalized and entered management and service-oriented occupations. In part, this development can be attributed to the upsurge in postwar college enrollments made possible by the 1943 Serviceman’s Readjustment Act. Better known as the G.I. Bill, Congress enacted this
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legislation to prevent a potential second economic depression after WWII. The long-term effects for veterans and their families included opportunities in post-secondary education, home ownership, and small business development leading to a professionalized middle class. For working-class and middle-class America, this translated to an increase in wealth, expendable income, and leisure time to enjoy their consumer goods. Economic historian Ronald Edsforth argues that the automobile “was the primary driving force behind” America’s economic growth and new “consumer-oriented capitalism.” Cities like Detroit and Flint, Michigan, experienced the benefits and pitfalls of this invigorated postwar economy.

While increasing population and wealth came to cities such as Detroit and Flint, so too did societal issues including poverty, racial and ethnic tension, and crime. Not only did these problems affect adults, but adolescents were also susceptible to urban harms. For Flint, the earliest attempts to reduce delinquency manifested in supervised safe places beginning in the 1920s as clubs, extracurricular activities, and weekend programs. While these efforts met with limited success before 1939, an increasing
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population during the Second World War’s industrial boom called for a more concerted effort to deter crime. Furthermore, the early postwar years witnessed a dramatic shift in youth culture, counter-culture, and student activism. By 1958, local law enforcement, the Flint school board, and the Charles S. Mott Foundation piloted a Police-School Liaison (PSL) program at Bryant Community Junior High School in order to quell youth related crime. In general, the PSL’s objectives included fostering a positive relationship between youth and law officers by taking a preemptive approach to policing with the ultimate “aim of reducing the incidence and severity of juvenile crime and delinquency.” Chapter 3 will explore how and why Flint’s PSL emerged when it did, the purpose and function it served, the local conflict it created, and the racial and social implications of this school-police partnership.

Chapter 3 will attempt to answer four essential questions in understanding the development of Flint’s PSL program. First, in what ways did Flint respond to juvenile delinquency rates from the 1920s to the 1970s? Second, what policy decisions made by local law enforcement, school officials, and community leaders in Flint contributed to an increase in police intervention in public schools? Third, what racial and social
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implication did the PSL have for Flint’s marginalized populations? Fourth, why did the Charles S. Mott Foundation contribute to and finance school-police partnerships in Flint? Chapter 3 will provide insight into how Flint—through its school-system, community organizations, local government agencies, law enforcement, and a philanthropic foundation—confronted juvenile delinquency rates from the early to mid-twentieth century. The increasing police presence in schools was not an automatic or obvious response in Flint. Instead, I argue that under the direction and funding of the Charles S. Mott Foundation, a series of community-based programs pooling local resources, led to the development of a school-police partnership in Flint schools contributing to a national increase in police presence in urban public schools during the latter half of the twentieth century. Flint’s PSL was designed as a new method to deter juvenile delinquency, but did so in ways that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.

**Industrial Growth in the Vehicle City, 1900-1945**

Located in Genesee County, sixty miles northwest of Detroit and fifty miles east of Lansing, a small mid-nineteenth century lumber town grew to be the world’s second largest automobile manufacturing city by the first-half of the twentieth century. Flint—nicknamed Vehicle City—was intimately tied to United States industrialization and urban
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growth.\textsuperscript{16} An economic shift in Flint’s lumber industry by the late nineteenth century transitioned the town from extracting raw materials to producing wooden wheels, wagons, and carts. From 1900 to the mid-twentieth century, Flint was a “recitation of the exploits of the men whose names are known to every American motorist”–William C. Durant, Josiah D. Dort, Louis Chevrolet, and David Buick.\textsuperscript{17} In 1903, the Flint Wagon Works company purchased the Detroit-based Buick Motor Company.\textsuperscript{18} By the following year, approximately thirty Buick Model-B’s rolled off the assembly line.\textsuperscript{19} During that time, the Durant-Dort Carriage Company was also operating in Flint. Durant, a skilled entrepreneur, partnered with Buick and Flint Wagon Works in 1907, and by 1908 merged with AC Spark and Chevrolet to form the General Motors Company (GM).\textsuperscript{20} In 1910, GM produced 21,000 Buicks. The business mergers were a clear success for Durant and his new corporation.

As the automobile industry firmly took hold, Flint’s population rapidly expanded attracting skilled and unskilled laborers needed to work the factory lines. By 1910, GM factories in Flint employed over 10,000 workers. That amount was five-times the number of laborers only a decade earlier.\textsuperscript{21} Flint’s population grew from 13,000 in 1900
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to approximately 156,000 by 1930.\textsuperscript{22} During that period, Flint’s factory laborers were predominantly transient. Demand for autoworkers increased at a higher rate than what Flint’s permanent population could supply. To accommodate this early growth, temporary structures and tent cities housed workers and their families.\textsuperscript{23} A substantial part of this influx included recent immigrants from eastern and southern Europe including Hungarians, Poles, and Italians. As housing caught up to Flint’s population, first-generation immigrants typically resided in poorer, segregated districts.\textsuperscript{24} Despite residential restrictions, ethnic neighborhoods aided immigrants in maintaining their cultural heritage. Churches, businesses, and social and political organizations flourished.\textsuperscript{25} Similarly, southern blacks migrated to Flint seeking opportunity.

To keep production moving forward, General Motors recruited out-of-state laborers–largely from the South. Given that GM actively recruited southerners, and the restrictions on economic opportunity in the South, a small, but substantial number of African Americans migrated to Flint. Like other industrial areas during this period, many black southerners sought out northern cities to not only attain greater economic mobility, but to escape the restrictive Jim Crow South.\textsuperscript{26} Approaching the 1930s, Flint’s
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population began to transition from transience to permanence. Because of this shift, Flint’s African American population by 1930 was approximately 5,790 (3.7%).

African Americans migrating to Flint were met with white resistance. In the 1920s, African Americans were forced to settle in segregated neighborhoods. In this early wave, black workers were often denied employment at GM. Edsforth argues that this animosity is not surprising, stating that since the company’s outset, GM’s “racist and sexist hiring policies…had reinforced the prejudices most white males brought with them” when migrating to Flint. For instance, black laborers were often relegated to lower-paying janitorial or foundry jobs with no opportunity for advancement. “We always get the hardest jobs…the lowest pay,” stated Charles Skinner recalling his years in the Buick factory. Race-based residential and economic barriers stressed relations between Flint’s black and white population. Despite discrimination, black communities, like immigrant populations, developed their own businesses, churches, and organizations. For instance, black neighborhoods banded together in 1933 to create the Negro Recreational Council to address the community’s political needs that were largely ignored by white municipal leaders.

Resistance against African Americans and immigrants extended beyond segregation and discrimination sometimes turning violent. During this pre-WWII period,
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the Ku Klux Klan became active in Flint and other Midwestern industrial cities. Largely, the K.K.K. presence in Flint was political, as it attempted to sway elections throwing support to conservative Republican politicians who supported their Protestant, nativist, and white nationalist values.\(^{32}\) For instance, Judson Transue, a Klan supported candidate, defeated incumbent David R. Cuthbertson in the 1924 Mayoral election. Although it is unclear if Transue was a Klansman, he was a known associate and had met with Flint’s K.K.K. chapter in the weeks prior to the election.\(^{33}\) During the organization’s peak years in Flint, membership was estimated at nearly 12,000. By the 1930s, the Klan’s membership declined, but was still linked to threats of violence, political intimidation, and implicated in a string of mysterious murders.\(^{34}\) The decline could have been associated with economic downturn as many workers were laid off and Flint’s population declined in the 1930s.

Like most American cities, the Great Depression decreased Flint’s production causing the population to fall to 151,000 by 1940, but the city quickly recovered as its factories mobilized for World War II.\(^{35}\) Converting to wartime production, Flint continued to grow as large numbers of men and women joined the military effort. Mobilization during WWII not only called for military participation, but also extended to the home front, as businesses, schools, and day-to-day lives were re-tooled to fight Germany and
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Japan. In Flint, GM added approximately 25,000 new jobs during the wartime industrial boom. Most African Americans migrating to Flint before WWII worked outside of the auto industry. As wartime jobs opened, white autoworkers and union leaders vocalized their resistance to promoting black workers. By the end of the war, black employees were often fired to open positions for returning white veterans.

With Flint’s population stabilizing between 1930 and 1950, migrant populations began to dissipate. The African American population slowly grew to approximately 14,000 (8.5%) by 1950. Furthermore, Flint's immigrant population declined from 13.4% in 1930 to 7.8% in 1950. Flint’s demographics shifted in the mid-twentieth century as the population increased. Racial and social tensions sustained with the population’s continued rise. Residential restrictions based on race and socioeconomic class relegated African Americans to poorer, typically more industrialized sections of Flint. According to Willie Nolden, a longtime Flint resident, “there was no black people that lived across Saginaw Street and the black community on the North side was basically Baker Street on the East end.” Melvin McCree commenting on residential discrimination in the 1960s stated that “a lot of realtors would not show homes to black

---

36 Ibid., i.

37 Edsforth, Class Conflict and Cultural Consensus, 197.

38 Ibid.211.

39 Ibid., 212.

40 1950 U.S. Census, “Genesee County, Michigan, Racial Demographics.”

people, if the home was in a particular area.” These barriers were not based on economic condition. Even more affluent African Americans in Flint were restricted from living in white, middle-class neighborhoods. In 1965, Dr. Wendell Williams, a local African American pediatrician and member of the Flint School Board, “was unsuccessful in buying a house of the other side” of town. In the 1950s and 1960s, discrimination extended beyond housing restrictions.

Daily life for African Americans in the 1950s and 1960s had not changed much since the first wave of migrants settled Flint in the early 1900s. Because many black families migrated to northern cities from the 1900s to the 1960s, they still had familial ties to the South. For them, southern racism was used as a measure to compare their northern experiences. For instance, Art McGhee stated that “there was some discrimination here, but it wasn’t as bad as the south.” However, Margaret Blount recalled that after moving from North Carolina, “I left there thinking I am getting away from racism and I came here and I ran right smack into it.” For Blount and others, racism in Flint was often described as a subtler form when compared with the South. Despite Flint’s racism being Jim Crow’s more sophisticated cousin, African Americans did experience more overt and violent forms of discrimination. For example, a nurse
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who had relocated to Flint from Tennessee recollected that “when I moved on the North side…I was the only black person in that neighborhood.”47 In response, neighborhood whites set fire to the house.48 In another account, Nat Burtley remembered an act of defiance one summer in the 1960s when several black adolescents were arrested for swimming in a whites only public pool. Burtley stated that the kids kept returning until the city finally closed the pool for the remainder of the summer.49 Evidently, Flint was embroiled in racial and social tension during the first half of the twentieth century. Dilapidated housing, social tension, overcrowding, and an increase in crime, especially among juveniles, caught the attention of industrial philanthropist, Charles S. Mott.

Persuaded by Durant, Mott came to Flint in 1908.50 By 1913, Mott’s company—Weston-Mott—was fully incorporated into General Motors.51 From 1912 to 1918, Mott served Flint as Mayor initially running against a union-friendly—believed to be socialist—incumbent. By 1926, Mott created the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation as a community-building philanthropic organization with the chief aim to uplift “the level of community life through the improvement of child welfare and health conditions of the youth of Flint,…the encouragement of constructive leisure-time activities,” and
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51 “C.S. Mott Recalls Early Days of Auto Industry in Flint” The Flint Journal (Flint, MI), November 24, 1943. General Motors purchased 49% of the Weston-Mott company in 1908 when Mott relocated to Flint. Weston-Mott exclusively produced axels and wheels for General Motors from 1908 to 1913. By 1913, GM purchased Weston-Mott’s remaining 51% of shares fully incorporating the company.
developing adult education programs available to all Flint citizens.\textsuperscript{52} Between the mid-1930s to the early 1960s, the Mott Foundation contributed approximately $20 million to Flint public schools sponsoring programs in health, adult education, curriculum development, extracurricular activities, community outreach, and police intervention as part of a larger initiative: the Community School Program.\textsuperscript{53}

The Mott Foundation’s stated mission was to build up Flint as a model industrial city through the community schooling initiative.\textsuperscript{54} For Mott, the community school concept repositioned the physical school as a civic focal point. Not only for children’s formal instruction, tax-supported public schools would be utilized “for recreational activities, informal education, socialization, health needs, and community sociopolitical action.”\textsuperscript{55} Flint’s first community school–Fairview Elementary–was piloted in 1947. This educational form should be viewed within a longer series of institutions, programs, and methods Mott and Flint leadership used to impose their perception of social-betterment and community uplift in a city that was increasingly suffering from societal problems–namely, juvenile delinquency. Mott, local law enforcement, and school officials looked toward community-based action through a series of programs that led to a permanent police presence in Flint schools.
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Responses to Flint’s Rapid Growth and Delinquency Problem, 1920-1945

“I cannot see why anyone entertains any doubt concerning the future of Flint,” Mott responded in 1920 to pessimistic claims about Flint’s place in the burgeoning auto industry and concerns of economic downturn.56 Despite his optimism, Mott recognized the Vehicle City’s increasing societal challenges. Concerns centered on rising trends in juvenile delinquency. Between 1925 and 1934, Flint’s Probate Court filed 3,307 juvenile cases.57 Common crimes associated with juvenile delinquency included vandalism, consuming alcohol, truancy, theft, breaking curfew and sexual activity.58 For early twentieth century social reformers and law enforcement officers, perspectives on delinquency were often contested. For instance, reformers largely contended that children subjected to an immoral social environment and unstructured family life were more susceptible to delinquency.59 Conversely, police officers typically believed that adolescents made rational, but unwise, decisions to given circumstances.60 Not only was delinquency an elastic term—based on a particular group’s definition—but also shifted over time and place.61 Ultimately, juvenile courts and laws during the early twentieth century helped codify, and therefore standardize, national definitions of
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delinquency. For Flint, defining delinquency was not the concern; it was identifying the source and formulating a community-based response.

Officials and law enforcement attributed delinquency’s rise to Flint’s rapid population growth and increasing poverty rate. Southern migrants, African Americans, and unskilled poor laborers were primarily viewed as the source of the city’s increased crime and poverty.\(^\text{62}\) Minna Faust’s 1934 study, *Juvenile Delinquency in Flint: In the Light of Social, Economic, and Cultural Factors, 1925-1934*, divides Flint into residential districts based on class and race. Faust determined that higher rates of juvenile delinquency typically occurred in districts with lower income populations. These districts often consisted of dilapidated housing located in Flint’s more industrialized areas “near factories and railroad tracks.”\(^\text{63}\) Faust further notes that these districts were mostly populated by African Americans “caused by the residential restrictions” forcing them “to remain in these poor locations.”\(^\text{64}\) Faust links residential restrictions with African Americans’ immobile status as contributing to high poverty rates and therefore high delinquency rates. For Faust, the solution was simple: “move the residents into a more wholesome and livable neighborhood” ending residential segregation.\(^\text{65}\) However, residential desegregation was not a solution for Flint leadership. Therefore, alternative
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approaches to decrease and prevent juvenile delinquency were implemented in the
three decades before the first school-police partnership was piloted.\textsuperscript{66}

For Flint, the earliest attempts to reduce juvenile delinquency manifested in
supervised safe places beginning in the 1920s as clubs, extracurricular activities, and
weekend programs. The Mott Foundation funded various educational, healthcare, and
recreational programs for children and adults by mobilizing “all the physical resources of
a character-building nature that are available in the city.”\textsuperscript{67} It was this unique partnership
between Mott’s paternalistic philanthropy, community leaders, and school officials that
spearheaded initiatives to deter delinquency and uplift Flint’s population.\textsuperscript{68}

Among the first programs funded by the Mott Foundation was the Mott Boy’s
Club in 1929. Designed to provide young males with a positive place to socialize after
school hours and on weekends, boys engaged in supervised educational activities,
structured play, and sports. Given that boys contributed to nearly 78% of delinquent
behavior in Flint, it is not surprising that most efforts to decrease youthful misbehavior
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to education and community betterment, this paper will focus explicitly on notable programs directed at
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the Mott Camp, Flint Plan for Recreation, and the Stepping Stone Program for Girls will help weave
together the complex relationships between philanthropy, schools, and law enforcement responding to
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was directed at male adolescents and teenagers.\textsuperscript{69} By 1933, this program extended to the Mott Camp for Boys focusing on outdoor education, physical fitness, character building, and civic responsibility for inner-city youth.\textsuperscript{70} Located seventeen miles from Flint on a small lake, Mott’s camp invited boys ages ten to fifteen “selected by their school principals according to financial, physical, and social needs.”\textsuperscript{71} Working closely with Flint schools, the Mott Foundation chose students deemed at risk for delinquent behavior if left unsupervised away from school during the summer months. Aside from providing a watchful eye, Mott’s camp acted as a tool to socialize students toward “acceptable standards of conduct” and “to develop character through co-operation, social responsibility, and ideals of democratic living.”\textsuperscript{72} By removing these boys from Flint’s inner-city, it was the camp’s mission to not only uplift character, but to ultimately deter delinquency—a benefit to the community.

In 1927 Frank J. Manley, having recently graduated from Michigan Normal College with his Bachelor’s degree in physical education, relocated to Flint.\textsuperscript{73} As Director of Physical Education for Flint schools, Manley was alarmed at the city’s high rates of juvenile delinquency, increasing traffic-related child deaths, and the general
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poor health of inner-city youth. Exacerbated by Depression-era unemployment and a fluctuating population, problems with crime and unsupervised youth persisted in Flint. Although Mott’s camp provided a constructive outlet for older adolescents, younger children were left out. Continuing its efforts to decrease juvenile delinquency and promote a positive environment in Flint’s inner-city, the Mott Foundation partnered with the Flint Automobile Club, Flint Police Department, and the Junior League to initiate the Flint Plan of Recreation—a community-based program providing younger children with supervised safe spaces. Under Manley’s direction, empty lots and private residential lawns near local schools were converted into playgrounds to escape the potential danger and allure of youthful delinquency.

By 1935 the program served approximately 6,500 children extending to five area elementary and junior high schools selected due to high rates of juvenile delinquency. Increased funding from the Mott Foundation provided training for supervisors and extended the program to include the winter and summer breaks from school. Manley’s success with the recreation plan translated to a personal career advancement as he became the Director of Mott Programs of the Flint Board of Education in November of 1935—a position specifically created to manage the collaborative projects between the Mott Foundation and local schools. By extending this program into the schools and creating Manley’s new position, the Mott Foundation became more entrenched in Flint’s education system. The foundation’s Recreation Plan “launched a unique type of community service, involving a definite co-operative effort between private philanthropy
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and certain governmental agencies.\textsuperscript{76} Their shared objective was to deter juvenile delinquency through a community-coordinated effort.

A 1936 study conducted by the University of Michigan’s Juvenile Delinquency Information Service, in conjunction with the Flint Institute of Research and Planning, identified approximately 300 cases of problem youth and maladjustment.\textsuperscript{77} The study recommended several actions—juvenile record keeping, special attention to problem children, counseling services, character building, healthcare, parenting classes and recreational programs—that not only encouraged Mott, local officials, and educators to expand their efforts, but justified past and current action against delinquency.\textsuperscript{78} These efforts were continued in 1938 giving special attention to girls.

Initial attempts to deter juvenile delinquency in Flint mostly focused on boys. Extracurricular activities, the Mott Camp, and even the Recreation Plan were designed for Flint’s young male population. Given that only 22% of reported delinquent acts from 1925 to 1934 were committed by girls, Flint officials and the Mott Foundation gave little attention to females.\textsuperscript{79} Reformers and authorities viewed delinquency through a gender binary defined by biological sex. For boys, delinquency was typically associated with vandalism, fighting, or truancy. Troublesome girls “exemplified new economic, social,

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
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and sexual opportunities available to urban young women." Girls and young women who displayed precocious conduct, worked outside the home, and engaged in sexual intimacy were often labeled as delinquents in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Therefore, punishment often reflected a protective action in which authorities believed they were saving girls from the seductive city. Flint similarly mirrored this perspective.

Beginning in 1938, the Mott foundation financed the Stepping Stone Program for Girls. Designed as an extracurricular activity in conjunction with Flint’s Board of Education, Stepping Stone provided support and development of personal responsibility and moral characteristics to deter delinquency and overcome potential social pressures. Located at Hamady House, the program was composed of twenty-two separate clubs that served as a laboratory providing spiritual and moral guidance to at-risk girls. By 1943, the Mott Foundation increased its contribution to the program. Acknowledging Mott’s generosity, Flint Superintendent L. A. Pratt stated that “at this time we are all concerned because of the increase…in the delinquency rate among girls” and that “the problem of the girl youth is one that has been neglected too long in Flint.” Recognizing this gap between boys and girls gradually brought greater attention to female
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delinquency in Flint. However, the focus on boys remained primary as more programs to deter juvenile delinquency developed.

Philanthropy by the 1940s was not new to educational funding. Flint’s examples provide insight into the concerns and values driving industrialist contributions in the mid-twentieth century extending into the postwar era. For Mott, juvenile delinquency was not only a detriment to children’s social development, but also threatened Flint’s economic future. For Mott, a deteriorating, crime-ridden city embroiled in racial and class tension was bad for business. Economically, the Depression had created a downturn for industrial cities like Flint contributing to Mott’s motivation to fund these programs.

By 1939, the United States was on the cusp of a transitional period. Economic depression, the liberal New Deal state, and the outset of World War II presented both uncertainty and potential to the United States. Mott, defending war industry production, argued that “if Red Russia and Nazi Germany are successful in their present wars, it would mean the wiping out of the democratic countries of Britain and France…then it would be our turn to carry the burden of resistance.” In these tumultuous times, Mott claimed that he was not fearful for the future of America’s children “as long as we stick to the American way of doing things.” For Mott, this meant a retraction from the New Deal as well as defending America’s republican and capitalist values. In a 1939 interview with The Flint Journal, Mott expressed his distaste for the New Deal and increased federal presence stating that “new business is stifled” and that it “isn’t
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possible to go ahead with many enterprises which could employ more people."\textsuperscript{88} Furthermore, Mott argued that the Stepping Stone program cultivated "good citizenship, patriotism, high moral and social ideals, homemaking skills and leadership training": all attributes Mott believed girls needed to support the United States during war.\textsuperscript{89} As the country mobilized, so too did Flint’s struggle against juvenile delinquency. This suggests a complex motivation for Mott’s philanthropy: one that not only attempted to deter delinquency, but promoted conservative political and economic values in helping children “to become better and useful citizens.”\textsuperscript{90} These values aligned with middle class and affluent, republican, capitalist, and Protestant perspectives that set the stage for increased efforts to deter delinquency in the postwar era. These efforts increased police presence in schools through the Police-School Liaison program.

**Police-School Liaison: Combating Delinquency in the Postwar, 1945-1970s**

In February of 1944, J. Edgar Hoover published an article discussing juvenile delinquency in the *New York Times*. In it, the FBI director stated that the “causes of this situation are not new, but they have been accentuated many times over by changed conditions brought on by the war.”\textsuperscript{91} Citing crime statistics, Hoover contended that

\textsuperscript{88} Irving Chimovitz, “Flint Philanthropist Cautions Against ‘Isms” *The Flint Journal* (Flint, MI), December 22, 1939.


\textsuperscript{90} Chimovitz, “Flint Philanthropist Cautions Against ‘Isms.” Mott’s brand of conservatism resembled the industrialist’s opposition to New Deal policy. Kim Phillips-Fein argues that the growth of conservatism under the Republican Party did not begin with the moral majority or evangelical Christians in the 1960s and 70s. Rather, reactions to the New Deal from business leaders provided a foundation for conservative opposition to liberal politics in the 1930s grew in strength and influence throughout the twentieth century resulting in Ronald Reagan’s presidency in the 1980s.

WWII, with its “economic and emotional stress,” brought turmoil to American homes and families increasing “the tendency toward neglect of youth and children” causing rises in delinquency.\textsuperscript{92} With parents contributing to the war effort–either overseas or spending countless hours producing war goods on the factory floor–“youngsters…are left to roam the streets” and “have turned to pastimes which can lead only to sorrow and often disgrace.”\textsuperscript{93} Continuing, Hoover accounted various crimes including armed robbery and larceny, impersonating an enlisted man, and vandalism adding that these transgressions “are a threat to our united war offensive.”\textsuperscript{94} By making this connection with WWII, Hoover acknowledged the youth problem as a national defense concern–one that called for a more concerted response from parents, community leaders, and law enforcement.

Hoover’s article stressed parental responsibility to save wayward youth, implementing community-based social and educational programs to curb restless behavior, and because law enforcement is tied to criminal activity any “successful crime prevention program must provide for the effective cooperation of the police.”\textsuperscript{95} On March 9, 1944, Director Edwin J. Lukas of the Society for the Prevention of Crime (SPC) sent a letter to the Mott Foundation drawing attention to Hoover’s article.\textsuperscript{96} Lukas informed the

\textsuperscript{92} Ibid. According to the article, arrests for girls under twenty-one increased by 57%. Property crimes linked to juvenile delinquency rose 33.6% and infractions against common decency increased by 69.6% compared to 1942 records.
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\textsuperscript{96} Founded in New York in 1877, the Society for the Prevention of Crime originally began as a temperance group lobbying for legislative action and providing educational materials on the harmful effects of alcohol. In 1894, the society began investigating law enforcement practices. Throughout the early- to mid-twentieth century, the organization disseminated educational materials and broadcasted
foundation about a joint project being planned by the SPC and the American Prison Association to research and develop “a complete and unified community program” involving schools and police in preventing juvenile delinquency. Seeking a contribution from the Mott Foundation, Lukas stressed Hoover’s call for a rigorous community-based effort pooling both educational and police resources to combat this national problem.

Prior to World War I, coping with juvenile delinquency had been varied and often contested among police, social workers, and educators. During the interwar period, law enforcement attitudes reflected sociological perspectives, as they adopted “a social welfare model of reform by creating or reshaping juvenile bureaus.” This change resulted in creating separate facilities and laws for juveniles including reform schools, juvenile court, and detention centers. During WWII and the immediate postwar years, it is evident that ideas and moods had, once again, shifted. First, given the dramatic increase in youth crime, localized concern became a national phenomenon indicated by Hoover and Lukas. Second, policing and managing delinquency shifted from a reactionary approach to implementing preventative methods. Third, independent action from single agencies shifted to a collaborative effort merging law enforcement, schools, and community organizations. In Flint, this shift first manifested in the creation of the Flint Youth Bureau.
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On April 4, 1944, the Council of Social Agencies, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Optimists’ Club, YMCA, and the Mott Foundation organized with the Flint Police Department to create the Flint Youth Bureau. By April 11th, the American Legion, Urban League, and NAACP joined the bureau. Frank Manley—by now the director of the Mott Foundation and Assistant Superintendent of Flint Schools—expressed the Mott Foundation’s interest in funding the Youth Bureau and assisted in selecting a director. On June 15, 1944, Joseph T. Ryder was unanimously selected by the bureau’s advisory committee and by August, the bureau began coordinating the partnering agencies, community organizations, the Flint Police Department, and local schools.\(^{100}\) The bureau recruited, trained, and connected adult mentors “with the hundreds of juvenile maladjusted children living in Genesee County.”\(^{101}\) By the end of 1947, the bureau had assisted 305 boys, trained and provided 150 male mentors, and found employment for 190 teenagers.\(^{102}\) In conjunction with Flint schools, the bureau assisted students in graduating, providing tutoring services, and helped fund tuition costs for low-income students entering post-secondary programs.\(^{103}\)

Despite efforts from Flint’s many organizations, the city’s problems with juvenile delinquency continued. WWII “gave new life to Flint’s industrial economy” attracting migrants searching for employment opportunities absent during the Great Depression.


\(^{101}\) Ibid, 1.


\(^{103}\) Ibid., 5.
Depression. By 1950, Flint’s population grew to over 163,000 with a projection that it would swell to 240,000 by 1980. During the 1953 Flint Schools Workshop—an annual meeting sponsored by the Michigan Education Association—over 100 attending teachers discussed potential problems that could be caused from Flint’s growth. According to the Flint Board of Education, estimated student growth projected “more than 5,000 additional students…by 1957.” Aside from supplying enough staff and adequate resources, teachers were concerned with an increase in student dropouts, poor attitudes toward teachers and school work, truancy, and lower performance: conditions that potentially encouraged juvenile delinquency.

Teachers’ concerns in Flint became a reality during the 1950s. As the student population increased from 27,732 in 1953 to 35,834 in 1957—approximately 3,000 more than the 1953 projection—so too did juvenile crime rates. Juvenile arrests increased from 1,081 in 1953 to 1,791 in 1957. Educators, local leaders, and law enforcement conjectured that Flint’s increasing youth crime rate had three causes. First, poverty, class and racial tension, residential segregation, and economic restriction created an incubator for crime. Second, wartime pressures on the family unit from absent parents mobilized in the factory or the military allowed unsupervised children to roam the
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streets. Third, the rise in postwar youth culture led children to disobey authority and shirk middle-class values.

Expounding on the reasons behind this increase, social historian James Gilbert discusses that “debate raged over whether or not mass culture...aimed at youth, had misshaped a generation of American boys and girls.”\textsuperscript{110} Gilbert argues that parents, politicians, and scholars largely blamed an onslaught of media and entertainment directed at adolescents for the increase in delinquency. Although difficult to prove if mass culture actually caused youth to disrespect adults and commit crimes, Gilbert argues that critics viewed “juvenile delinquency and even youth culture...as proof that the traditional transmission of values from institutions of social order through parents to children had been seriously weakened” replacing middle class social norms with mass produced low-class values.\textsuperscript{111} Reactions called for censorship and banning media as well as investigations into potentially subversive materials. In Flint, regardless of perspective on what caused rising youth crime, the reaction was evident: a partnership between schools and police.

In the immediate postwar years, Flint’s population had fully transitioned from transient workers to permanent settlers. General Motors employed approximately two-thirds of Flint’s working population offering competitive wages and benefits.\textsuperscript{112} Between 1951 and 1957, the average hourly wage for autoworkers had risen by 37% increasing Flint’s standard of living, creating more leisure time for families, and an expendable
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income to indulge in 1950s mass produced culture.\textsuperscript{113} For Flint schools, a more permanent and economically stable population translated into higher enrollment rates. By the beginning of the 1957/58 school year, approximately 36,000 students were being served by Flint public schools. The increasing population demanded new school construction to accommodate incoming students.

William Cullen Bryant Community Junior High School opened its doors for the 1958/59 academic year.\textsuperscript{114} As a community school, Bryant was designed—like all other Flint schools by 1958—to be a focal point “for recreational, educational, and cultural activities for all residents…from preschoolers to senior citizens” in the neighborhoods it served.\textsuperscript{115} In addition to providing a quality education for students, the community school performed several outreach programs including basic healthcare services, adult education classes, meeting places for local organizations, and event space.

The Mott Foundation is largely credited with the development and success of the community school initiative. In 1953, adult education supervisor Dr. Myrtle F. Black pointed out the unique relationship between the Mott Foundation and Flint schools expressing that the goal was to create a model community exemplifying greater social cohesiveness solving “the problem of indifference, misunderstanding, and competition with destructive influences.”\textsuperscript{116} At Flint's second annual Community Education Workshop in 1958, State Superintendent Dr. Lynn M. Bartlett agreed with the
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community school mission stating that “if we involve people in the schools...make them part of the team...we can solve problems” in Flint.\textsuperscript{117}

It is evident that Flint’s community school model was popular among educators throughout the state. During the late 1950s and into the 1960s, the community school model gained traction as a national movement. At the 28\textsuperscript{th} annual Michigan Association of School Administrators conference, the community school was spotlighted by Stanford University professor of education Dr. Paul R. Hana as “the most dynamic invention in education of our century.”\textsuperscript{118} By 1966, Olivet College, Northern Michigan University, Stanford University, and the State University of Iowa began studying and promoting community schools.\textsuperscript{119} By that same year school districts in Dade County and Sarasota in Florida, Atlanta, Georgia, and Chattanooga, Tennessee had launched community schools.\textsuperscript{120} While Bryant Junior High continued Flint’s popular educational trend, it also became a laboratory for a new method in preventing juvenile delinquency: the Police-School Liaison.

Initially proposed by Captain Carl Pendell of the Flint Police Department, Flint’s PSL program attempted to foster a positive relationship between youth and police, preemptively stop crime among juveniles, and provide counseling services for students
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believed to be at-risk of delinquency. The PSL program placed a single, plain-clothed police officer within a school setting patrolling the hallways and grounds, investigating delinquent acts, assisting with discipline matters, providing security, connecting with parents, and handling problems beyond the general scope of school officials. Bryant’s PSL was jointly funded by the Mott Foundation and Flint Police Department. Frank Manley—Mott Foundation Director—approved $9,500 for subsidizing half of all expenses including the officer’s salary, equipment, and automobile. Police and education leaders selected Bryant to pilot the program because it was newly opened and they believed the school would be “representative of the average community with a delinquency rate equal to other communities in the city.” As a new school environment, rules and methods for handling delinquency had not been established, making the PSL “more readily accepted.”

Local officials, law enforcement, and educators believed that police contact with juveniles often occurred on the streets as a reaction to criminal activity. By this point, youths were already susceptible to misbehavior, and it was too late to dissuade them from crime. Bryant’s Principal, Ben Owen stated that a “youngster’s first contact with the police and the treatment he receives is most important to his adjustments to society.”
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Police and school officials agreed that fostering positive experiences between police and students at an early age in an educational setting was the answer to Flint’s delinquency problem. By 1960, the PSL program expanded to include a counseling team aimed at identifying troubled youth. The team was composed of the PSL officer, the school nurse, the school counselor, the Dean of Girls, the Dean of Boys, a visiting teacher, and a Community Activities Director. The purpose was to identify student characteristics—absenteeism, hostile demeanor, and under-achievement—that indicated potential delinquent activities.\textsuperscript{126}

In the PSL’s first year, approximately eighty-three juvenile crimes were reported in the areas served by Bryant Junior High. By 1960, this number had reduced to forty-four even though enrollment had increased by over 1,000 students during the same period.\textsuperscript{127} Flint had a 12\% reduction in juvenile-related crime by 1962 as compared to the national rate that increased by 17\%.\textsuperscript{128} Although the PSL cannot be solely credited for this reduction, “it certainly was one of the predominating factors” according to Flint Police Chief George B. Paul.\textsuperscript{129} By 1964, the program was deemed a success by school officials, law enforcement, community leaders and parents calling for an expansion to other Flint schools.
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By the mid-to late 1960s, the PSL was receiving state-wide attention. In 1962, Flint police participated in the 64th annual Michigan Municipal League Convention in Detroit discussing the PSL’s success.\textsuperscript{130} In June of 1965, the PSL was featured in the 40th annual Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police.\textsuperscript{131} In April of 1967, the first national Police-School Liaison Workshop was conducted bringing in approximately 150 educators, judges, and police from around the country to Flint.\textsuperscript{132} By 1968, police interns from around the country enrolled in the Mott Institute for Police-School Liaison Officers as a means to learn about the PSL program to implement in their home communities.\textsuperscript{133} With local, state, and national attention, it is clear that Flint’s PSL program was highly acclaimed. Although the program was well-received, doubts grew among Flint residents about the potential negative effects a police presence may have on schools.

Criticism from educators discussed the role and responsibility of the police officer in the schools. In 1958, during initial planning, several school administrators expressed that a police officer was unnecessary claiming that principals “could take care of…[their] own problems in the schools.”\textsuperscript{134} For the PSL program to operate without conflict between administrators and police, a clear definition of responsibilities was needed. To assuage administrative concerns, Lt. Tom Waldron, director of the Flint Police Juvenile
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Bureau, ensured that the PSL “officer would be available as a resource person and aid in preventing juvenile delinquency,” but “would have no responsibility in the schools as far as rules and conduct of students was concerned.”

While administrators were concerned about police usurping authority, teachers questioned the motives behind the program and the character of the police officers in the schools.

Disagreeing with the PSL program, teachers argued that police presence was racially motivated. A 1971 report on Flint’s PSL indicated that some teachers believed police had no place in school arguing that the program was “aimed specifically at the Black Community and they are anathema to black people” by enforcing “middle class white ethics and mores.” In the same report, another teacher stated that a police presence was “a form of intimidation” and that “racist statements made by our police-liason officer make him unfit to be in a place where a free education is being offered.” Another teacher recommended that officers “should be screened concerning racial and religious prejudice.” According to black parents and teachers, the PSL targeted students of color.

Similar concerns came from community leaders. Director Olive R. Beasley of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission argued that although the Mott concept to prevent
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delinquency was good, “the program, as it operates, creates abrasiveness between the school administration and the black students.”\textsuperscript{139} Melvin Brannon, Director of the Flint Urban League, argued that the “black community in Flint views the program as an intimidating force.”\textsuperscript{140} Clearly, racial tension in Flint that manifested in residential and economic discrimination had transferred to the school setting. While Flint’s PSL sought to decrease juvenile delinquency, it is important to note the racial and social implications that such a program entailed. Like many industrialized cities in the early to mid-twentieth century, Flint was racially and socially segregated. Flint’s PSL program operated in communities predominantly populated by working class blacks and whites. Although the PSL was designed to deter juvenile delinquency, it did so in ways that perpetuated the marginalization of minority and low-income students.

Despite criticism, Flint’s PSL expanded to all area junior and senior high schools by 1965. Talk of expansion came quickly after the program’s first two years at Bryant Junior High. A marked decrease in area delinquency was credited to police presence in schools. In 1960, Superintendent Dr. Spencer Myers called for a second program to be established in Lowell Junior High. Agreeing, Flint Mayor Robert J. Egan argued that the program was an “effective deterrent to juvenile delinquency.”\textsuperscript{141} In 1969, School Board President, Stanley T. Richards, called for a second wave of PSL expansion responding to parents’ concerns for safety. The week prior, violence between black and white students erupted at Lowell Junior High resulting in twenty-five suspensions. Richards,
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referring to this incident, told reporters that it was the Board of Education’s responsibility to “assure protection of the children who come to school for an education” and “to assure the protection of teachers and administrators who are in our schools.”\textsuperscript{142} Richards claimed that black student agitators were responsible for the violence and that this behavior would no longer be tolerated stating that further incidents would be met with “prompt police action, arrest and prosecution.”\textsuperscript{143} To ensure this protection, four women—black and white—were assigned as floating PSL officers. Partially financed by the Mott Foundation, the female uniformed officers rotated among schools that needed assistance.\textsuperscript{144}

By 1969, the role of the PSL shifted. A little over a decade after police became a permanent fixture in Flint schools, responsibilities had expanded to not only prevent juvenile delinquency, but to police hallways ensuring that security was maintained. In 1972, the \textit{Flint Journal} interviewed a forum of students, administrators, and police from area schools. The purpose was to hold an open discussion on the role of PSL officers. Overwhelmingly, administrators and officers praised the program for its success in deterring violence and crime among juveniles. However, students viewed PSLs with mixed feelings as one expressed “It’s a good program, and it should continue. But the police must be careful in picking the ones to serve in the program because they all don’t do a good job.”\textsuperscript{145} One of the primary roles of the officer was to serve as a counselor.
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Once again, administrators viewed the officers as counselors first and policemen when necessary. However, students expressed uncertainty about this role stating that “if the officers are to be counselors, they need to be trained…they should be given some college training.”

From the discussion, it evident that administrators and students had contrasting views about the role and effectiveness of the PSL program. Although administrators generally praised the program, students tended to question the program’s effectiveness. The discussion included two police officers Det. Lt. Bryon Wirick of the Juvenile Bureau and Det. Sgt. Thomas Kaza, PSL for Northwestern High School. When questioned about the role of the PSL, both officers agreed that counseling was a secondary role. Kaza stated that “although I do a lot of counseling,” the original purpose of the program, “I find myself doing a lot more law enforcement now.”

Policing students had, according to these PSL officers, become the partnership’s primary function.

**Socializing Students through Police Presence**

“The streets of our cities,” Michigan Attorney General, Frank J. Kelley exclaimed during Flint’s first national Police-School Liaison Workshop in 1967, “have become jungles wherein the most predatory beasts of prey are…the children themselves.” Kelley was referring to the escalation in Flint’s youth crime and the dire need for strengthening and expanding efforts to reverse this growth. To accomplish this goal, Kelley recommended restoring police authority, harden juvenile laws and court rulings,
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implement rehabilitation programs, and establish training programs for convicted juveniles. For Kelley, police presence in schools and communities was critical to restore order.

Beginning in 1958, Flint’s PSL was implemented as a new tactic in deterring and preventing juvenile delinquency: one that was adjusted to fit the needs and vision of community leaders. Unique from previous programs, the PSL brought police directly and physically into Flint public schools. Community leaders recognized a problem and through a collaborative effort involving police, educators, and philanthropy devised a series of plans using the school to resolve a perceived threat to Flint’s social order that prized middle class and affluent values and whiteness. Mott’s involvement in deterring juvenile delinquency and the types of programs he funded gives insight into how industrial philanthropists viewed education. For Mott, education was essential in three ways. First, education was needed to perpetuate and develop the community “by preparing the pupils…to assume the responsibilities of citizenship.” Second, education was vital to develop the individual physically, morally, and intellectually in order to understand how one relates to society. Third, education was necessary to contribute to the survival and development of the United States. Within the postwar context, education for Mott was necessary in maintaining order against perceived threats that sought to destroy American “moral and spiritual ideals, our democratic and
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representative political concepts, and our religious and ethical standards." During the twentieth century, one of these threats came in the form of juvenile delinquency and for Mott and Flint the way to maintain social order was through a series of community-based programs that increased police presence in schools.

Although Flint’s PSL sought to decrease delinquency, it did so in ways that marginalized minority and low-income students. Like many industrialized cities in the early to mid-twentieth century, Flint was racially and socially segregated. Flint’s PSL program operated in communities predominantly populated by working class blacks and whites. Although juvenile delinquency appears to be the motive behind the PSL program, concerns over race and class relations from students, teachers, and community leaders troubled the PSL’s publicized purpose.

\[153\] Ibid., 45.
“This enticing, apparently easy remedy for the disorders of our time,” stated Kyle Haselden in *The Christian Century*, “destroys both the institutions and the internal fiber of a democratic society.”¹ Haselden’s 1966 editorial critiqued Tucson, Arizona’s School Resource Officer (SRO) program as a short-sighted and hazardous approach to managing juvenile delinquency. For Tucson police and school officials, the SRO program was a preventative measure instituted to reduce juvenile crime and promote a positive image of law enforcement. Tucson’s SRO program began in 1963. As a pioneering program, the District No. One school board in conjunction with Tucson Police placed officers in public schools to provide security, counsel youth, and act as a liaison among schools, community, and law enforcement.

Despite praise from police, school officials, and community leaders, concerns over students’ civil rights and due process drew attention from parents, teachers, and the Tucson branch of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) by 1966. Founded during World War I, the ACLU’s stated purpose was to defend and protect the civil liberties of American citizens. Since its beginning, the union has been involved in various civil liberties cases including due process, segregation, religion in schools, and students’ rights. The Tucson branch of the ACLU was established in 1959 and headed by Dr. Cornelius Steelink of the University of Arizona.² In Tucson, the ACLU became
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active in local affairs. In its first case, only a few months after being established, the ACLU defended eighteen-year-old Phillip Pilcher who was charged for petty larceny at seventeen for stealing hubcaps.\(^3\) Because Pilcher was seventeen at the time of the crime, he was sentenced to juvenile detention. Once he turned eighteen, Pilcher was charged again, this time as an adult, for the same crime. The ACLU argued that this was a case of double jeopardy and Pilcher should not be charged as an adult. Over time, the ACLU became increasingly involved with local teachers and juvenile related cases in Tucson. In October of 1959, the ACLU sponsored a meeting for the American Federation of Teachers discussing collective bargaining.\(^4\) In 1964, the ACLU represented a fifteen-year-old who had been denied legal counsel and sentenced to ten years in the state adult penitentiary.\(^5\) It is evident that the ACLU had an influential presence in civil rights and educational matters in Tucson.

In 1966, the ACLU became involved with the District No. One’s SRO program. Students were reportedly questioned by SROs without parents or legal counsel. Furthermore, the union investigated search and seizure tactics, invasion of privacy, and harassment claims from Tucson students. For opponents, the SRO program resembled a police state: one in which citizens were under constant surveillance. From 1963 to 1966, Tucson’s SRO program operated virtually unchecked and without established guidelines in dealing with students in a school setting. For some Tucsonans, this
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environment was unacceptable. For others, the SRO program was a clear and effective method in deterring juvenile delinquency. During the summer of 1966, debates sweltered publicly through local newspapers and community forums. Supporters wanted an SRO in every Tucson junior and senior high school. At most, opponents wanted to dissolve the SRO program, or at least, establish firm guidelines that regulated it. By July, the federal government became involved. The SRO was awarded federal funding under the 1965 Law Enforcement Assistance Act so long that guidelines protecting student rights were implemented.\(^6\) Although opponents were unable to abolish the program, they did succeed in establishing guideline.

Chapter 4 will provide a detailed account about how Tucson’s SRO program came into existence, how it was challenged, and how it was extended by federal involvement. To do so, it will answer three questions. First, what urban social concerns led advocates to support school-police programs in the latter half of the twentieth century? Second, how and why did this partnership emerge in Tucson despite conflicting attitudes and opposition from educators, parents, and organizations? Third, what were the social and racial implications of this partnership? To answer these questions, I will first explore the city’s growth from a desert presidio to a metropolitan oasis. Providing an historical background to Tucson’s development will aid in understanding the social dynamic in which the SRO emerged. Next, this chapter will discuss Tucson’s growing concerns with juvenile delinquency during the twentieth century and the solutions that state and local officials devised to quell this problem.

\(^6\) As per the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (OLEA), Tucson’s SRO would need to stipulate operational guidelines to ensure the student rights would be implemented.
Last, Chapter 4 will focus exclusively on police presence in Tucson’s public schools highlighting the establishment of, challenges to, and eventual federal involvement with the School Resource Officer program. Tucson educators collaborated with municipal law enforcement to reduce juvenile delinquency, but ultimately diminished students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.

**From Desert Presidio to Metropolitan Oasis: Tucson, 1775-1962**

Located approximately seventy miles north of the United States border with Mexico and 116 miles southeast of Phoenix, Tucson, Arizona grew from a small desert presidio to a metropolitan oasis. Native American groups called this lower Sonoran Desert basin home for centuries prior to Spanish settlement in 1775. Needing an outpost to oversee settlements and trade in present day Arizona and New Mexico, Tucson became a strategic asset for protecting Spain’s colonial endeavors.\(^7\) Mostly populated by Spaniards, relations with area Apache, Papago, and Pima tribes were volatile at best. Spanish encroachment into ancestral lands created tension exacerbated by colonial attempts to Christianize and Hispanicize indigenous peoples through mission schools.\(^8\) Under Spanish rule, education reflected the imposed social hierarchy placing European-born Spaniards at the top and Native Americans and African Americans at the bottom.\(^9\)
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By 1821, Mexico gained independence from Spain and established the Plan de Iguala. Under Mexican rule, presidios like Tucson shifted socially, economically, and educationally. Legally, Native Americans, Spanish, and Mestizo populations were granted equal citizenship including land-owning rights and political freedoms. Dismantling Spain’s restrictive policies, new trade routes connected Texas and California via Tucson, which increased the village’s population and improved the economy. As for education, schools became largely secularized breaking away from state-imposed settler and mission schools designed to perpetuate Spanish dominance and convert Native Americans. Despite the Plan de Iguala’s ideals, enforcement was inconsistent especially among Mexico’s more remote settlements. The racial and social hierarchy during the Mexican Era mimicked its Spanish predecessor “that prized whiteness and devalued the darker hued Indian, black, and Afromestizo members of its population.” This hierarchy would remain firmly in place after the United States defeated Mexico in 1848.

During the nineteenth century, immigrants from the United States, Britain, France, and Russia began settling Mexico’s northern frontier. Commonly referred to as Manifest Destiny, U.S. expansionism led to war with Mexico beginning in 1846. According to historian Victoria-Maria MacDonald, advocates of war “viewed Southwestern land as wasted in the hands of mongrel Mexicans.” The two-year
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conflict resulted in Mexico relinquishing approximately 500,000 square miles to the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. By 1849, the California Gold Rush attracted Anglo-Americans to the Southwest looking for wealth. As a result, isolated frontier towns like Tucson became way-stations for transients seeking out California riches.\textsuperscript{14} With this land transfer and increasing numbers of Anglo-Americans entering the Southwest, Mexicans gradually “became immigrants, colonized peoples on their former land.”\textsuperscript{15} In 1853, the United States acquired Tucson in the Gadsden Purchase completing the modern-day Southwest.

By 1860, Tucson’s population was 915.\textsuperscript{16} Of this population, approximately 653 (71\%) were Mexican, 168 (18\%) were Anglo, and the remaining were composed of Native Americans and African Americans.\textsuperscript{17} Although many Southwestern towns and cities were flooded by Anglo migrants during this period, Tucson’s Mexican population remained in the majority. Historian Oscar Martínez argues that when Anglos were the minority, they, for the most part, adapted to Mexican customs creating a peaceful and codependent society in Tucson.\textsuperscript{18} Tucson’s Mexican population welcomed incoming Anglos because it strengthened the area economically. This harmony, Martínez argues,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Officer, \textit{Hispanic America}, 221.
\item \textsuperscript{15} MacDonald, \textit{Latino Education in the United States}, 56.
\item \textsuperscript{16} 1860 U.S. Census Bureau, “Territory of New Mexico,” Population of Cities, Towns and Other Subdivisions Table 3.
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delayed racial and ethnic clashes that occurred in other Southwestern cities. However, Martinez also notes that as economic activity expanded, Anglos began controlling a disproportionate amount of local wealth. In 1860, Anglo assets amounted to $500,000, where Mexican assets were $73,000. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, Tucson served as a way station for mail couriers, travelers, and freighters passing through to California. Despite this transient population, Tucson’s climate and economic potential attracted permanent and diverse residents. According to C. L. Sonnichsen, “newcomers were a cosmopolitan lot, coming from all sections of the United States and from twelve foreign countries.” Catering to the transient population, settlers developed Tucson’s early economy toward commerce and vice. Prior to the 1890s, Tucson was the epitome of the “wild west” complete with twenty-four hour saloons, prostitution, gambling, and lawlessness.

Despite Tucson’s rough and tumble reputation, businessmen and families began settling the area throughout the 1860s and 1870s. By November of 1867, Public School District No. One was established and three years later the Sisters of Saint Joseph founded the Convent and Academy for females. Because of the growing population, Tucson’s leaders made a “vigorous effort to set up a creditable education program” by importing experienced teachers. Unlike many Southwestern areas, Arizona’s power
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structure and schools accommodated Mexican Americans. According to MacDonald, Mexican-born Estevan Ochoa, was a member of Tucson’s school board, elected mayor in 1875 and “helped found the Arizona public school system.”24 MacDonald also states that Arizona public schools were generally more accepting of bilingual education compared to Texas and California.25 Much of this acceptance can be attributed to Tucson’s demographic breakdown during this period and the presence of a Mexican elite class.26 This amicable relationship, however, would soon shift as a new transportation form made its way into the city.

Most of Tucson’s growth in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries can be attributed to the railroad. By March of 1880, the first train traveled through Tucson stimulating urban growth, new business, and investments.27 That same year, Tucson’s Mexican population had increased to 4,469, and the Anglo population to 2,023.28 Although Mexicans remained in the majority, the railroad shifted Tucson’s economic and political power structure. Because the Southern Pacific Railroad connected Tucson with California and Texas, trade shifted away from Mexico and was kept within the United States. Mexican-owned freighting businesses that transported goods and people throughout the Southwest became obsolete. Furthermore, the railroad’s hiring practices were discriminatory toward Mexicans. Where Anglos were hired at higher wages and
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into management positions, Mexicans were typically paid less and only hired for manual labor jobs.\(^{29}\) Martínez argues that this period—from the 1880s to the 1930s—was a time of decline for Mexican people in Tucson. The increasing Anglo population had no connection to or dependence on local Mexicans as previous immigrants had. Aside from economic shifts, Mexicans lost political influence throughout Arizona. For instance, at the Arizona State Constitutional Convention 52 delegates from around the territory were sent, only one was of Mexican descent. Furthermore, Pima County court records indicate that from 1882-1889 Mexicans received harsher punishments and longer prison sentences than their Anglo counterparts.\(^{30}\)

During this time, families continued to settle the area bringing in an organized effort to change Tucson’s reputation. Benevolent societies, such as the Anti-Saloon League, in collaboration with local leaders, set out to end prostitution and regulate alcohol.\(^{31}\) With more families also came a greater need for educational expansion. The University of Arizona opened in October of 1891. Because a formal high school would not be established in Tucson until 1930, the university provided area students with a secondary-school curriculum.\(^{32}\) Other forms of education in the area included the Tucson Indian Training School founded in 1888. In the same mentality as Richard Henry Pratt’s paternalistic vision to save Native Americans from savagery, the institution

\(^{29}\) Martínez, “Hispanics in Arizona,” 100-101.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 98.

\(^{31}\) Sonnichsen, Tucson, 134.

was a manual labor-focused industrial school that reinforced Euro-American cultural norms, moral training, and Protestant teachings.  

Arizona achieved statehood in 1912. By 1930, Tucson had reached a population of 32,506. Of this number, there were approximately 20,814 (62%) Anglo-Americans, and 10,235 (31%) Mexican Americans. Since 1880, Tucson’s population had shifted from a Mexican American majority to an Anglo-American majority. Racial and ethnic tension increased with this shift and is evident among the working-class during the Great Depression. According to Eric Meeks, Arizona unions called for anti-immigration legislation and restricted access to railroad and mining jobs during the 1930s to “protect the status of ‘white citizen laborers.’” Jobs that many Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants typically held before the Depression were given to unemployed whites. After the Depression and during and after World War II as the economy recovered, Mexicans were rehired into menial labor jobs that white Americans found undesirable. Meeks argues that discriminatory hiring practices mythologized white superiority and “it was precisely this myth that would remain at the heart of the racially ordered class system in
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Arizona well into the postwar period.”\(^{37}\) This racial and ethnic divide would continue into the postwar era and contributed to residential and educational segregation in Tucson.

Like many U.S. cities, Tucson economically benefited from World War II. Although not known as an industrial city, Sonnichsen explains, Tucson’s climate and ample unoccupied land “became one vast training center for troops who had to be conditioned for desert warfare in Africa, for engineers testing military equipment, and especially for young men learning to fly airplanes.”\(^{38}\) By 1940, Tucson’s airport was converted into Davis-Monthan Air Force Base housing the 41\(^{st}\) Bombardment Group and the 31\(^{st}\) Airbase Corps.\(^{39}\) Additionally, the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation opened in Tucson to modify and prepare B52 Bombers for war.\(^{40}\) Approximately 3,000 servicemen would pass through Tucson during the war. This influx stimulated Tucson’s economy catering to commercial and residential needs. After the war, many servicemen remained in Tucson. Likewise, increased industry attracted newcomers to the city. By 1960, the population had increased to 212,000.\(^{41}\)

This rapid growth caused Tucson to expand outward bringing new development, business, and housing to the outskirts. According to historians Juan Gomez-Novy and Stefanos Polyzoides, Tucson’s Anglo and affluent populations were lured “by seemingly

\(^{37}\) Ibid., 108.
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boundless open space, newer schools, newer and larger buildings" and "lost interest in the city center." As white affluent families migrated to the suburbs, businesses followed. The shopping mall and grocery store replaced the need for local, specialty retailers. Over time, only government buildings and “those who could not afford to move to the suburbs: Tucson’s rooted Hispanic” and African American populations remained downtown. The result: Tucson’s once prosperous and bustling economic center began to decay during the 1950s.

Nationwide, city centers fell into disrepair during the mid-twentieth century. In response, federal and state development projects began in the 1950s and 1960s. Congress passed the U.S. Housing Act in 1954 providing federal funds for urban renewal; Tucson was approved in 1965. The following year, Congress passed the U.S. Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act in which Tucson received a $3.1 million Model Cities Grant for redevelopment. According to Gomez-Novy and Polyzoides, the “stated political objective of this avowed process of urban renewal was radical economic and cultural betterment, a noble motive.” But the consequences—unintended or not—for the poor, racially and ethnically marginalized, and small-business owners were devastating. In Tucson, new construction, high-rise buildings, and freeways rejuvenated downtown, but this meant “the obliteration of one of the oldest
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residential districts” in the city. Urban renewal displaced Mexican American and African American families who, because of residential segregation, had difficulties finding places to live in other parts of the city.

Residential and school segregation was common practice in Tucson during the mid-twentieth century. From 1945 to 1947, Harry T. Getty studied the ethnic and racial relationships among Tucson residents. Through interviews and observations, Getty determined that ethnic minorities—Mexican Americans, African Americans, and Native Americans—were subjected to economic, residential, and educational discrimination from Anglo Tucsonans. In regards to occupations, Getty found that Mexican Americans were often bypassed for office-jobs due “to their accent in speaking English.” Also notable, Getty found that Mexican Americans were denied certain service and local government jobs such as fire fighters and foremen. These findings correspond with Thomas Sheridan’s claim that many defense industries brought to Arizona during WWII did not hire African Americans and Mexican Americans. Mapping out residential areas, Getty also found that the Southern Pacific Rail Road line divided the city. To the northeast lived Anglo and affluent populations. To the southwest—including downtown—
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lived Mexican Americans and African Americans. Although restrictive covenants barred African Americans and Chinese Americans from living in Anglo neighborhoods, these limitations did not legally extend to Mexican Americans. Regardless, most Mexican Americans lived in segregated barrios. This pattern extended to school segregation during the same period.

Getty found that school zones in Tucson resembled segregated residential areas. According to his study from 1945 to 1947, Safford Junior High, and Carrillo, Drachman, and El Rio Elementary schools all had a student population of over 90% Mexican American. Other elementary schools located in southwest Tucson—Davis, Borton, Menlo Park, Ochoa, Pascua, and Mission View—had student populations of over 50% Mexican American. Likewise, during the 1945–46 school year, only 3% of all Tucson schools had teachers of Mexican descent. Under Arizona law, African American students were segregated into their own schools. In a separate study, Sheridan argues that not only did Tucson practice segregation, but its school system was designed to denigrate “the cultural background of the Mexican children themselves.” For instance, Spanish was often prohibited unless used in bilingual education classes that emphasized English. Furthermore, classes were geared toward culturally Americanizing Mexican students; a practice that was not unique to Tucson, but fit with
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the Progressive education reform movement that sought to acculturate “the nation’s huge immigrant population.”\textsuperscript{58} From this evidence, it is clear that Tucson was a segregated city during the mid-twentieth century. Understanding this societal division is important when considering the ethnic implications of Tucson’s SRO program in the early 1960s.

Despite racial and ethnic oppression in Tucson, Mexican American communities thrived and resisted. For instance, Mexican Americans protested school districts to end inequitable practices and to begin a Chicano Studies programs in the 1960s. Furthermore, students from the University of Arizona and area high schools publicly demonstrated against bans on bilingual education, placing Spanish speaking students into remedial classes, and denying Mexican American courses.\textsuperscript{59} A vocal mouthpiece in the Tucson Chicano Movement was the \emph{El Coraje}, an independent student-run magazine encouraging Mexican American youth to action. For example, the paper promoted a demonstration in which the Chicano Movement would “be telling this town that we will no longer allow school systems to destroy our children, because they are Mexican.”\textsuperscript{60} This publication and the activism that arose in Tucson during the 1960s was a response to economic, residential, and educational discrimination that Mexican Americans had endured for decades.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 219.

\textsuperscript{59} MacDonald, \textit{Latino Education in the United States}, 118.

\textsuperscript{60} \emph{El Coraje}, “Dia De La Raza Unioa Throughout the Southwest,” \emph{El Coraje} (Tucson, AZ), March 1969.
Tucson’s mid-century expansion and central deterioration, like many other U.S. cities, coincided with an increasing crime rate, especially among juveniles. Much of this growth can be attributed to the nation’s rising population, advances in law enforcement, and the continued racialization of criminal activity in the United States throughout the twentieth century. In the 1960s, the consensus among many parents, schools, and politicians, was that delinquency resulted from postwar economic boom, new forms of entertainment, and poor family structure. Furthermore, efforts to decrease juvenile delinquency began in the late 1800s and persisted into the mid-twentieth century ushering in reform schools, children’s bureaus, and the juvenile court system. Tucsonans followed a similar path in both beliefs over the causes and remedies of delinquency. Eventually, an increasing rate of juvenile delinquency in the 1960s led to a new method of control: School Resource Officers.

Causes and Remedies: Tucson’s Juvenile Delinquency Problem, 1893-1963

Concerns over juvenile delinquency began before Tucson’s School Resource Officer program was first implemented in 1963. Before statehood in 1912, the Arizona Territorial Reform School opened in 1893. Built in Flagstaff, juvenile advocates argued that child offenders should not be housed in jails alongside adults. By 1903, a second reform school—focusing on industrial education—opened in Benson. The territorial Legislative Assembly enacted the first Arizona juvenile court in 1907. Supported by juvenile advocates, the Arizona Federation of Women’s Clubs “aroused the various women’s groups of the territory to urge their legislators to enact a juvenile court law” to
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handle offenders younger than eighteen.\textsuperscript{62} With a separate court to handle juvenile cases, Arizona founded a series of institutions specially designed to reform youthful offenders.

As Arizona’s population grew, so did the incidence of juvenile delinquency. No longer able to accommodate the state’s needs, the Flagstaff and Benson schools were closed and the Fort Grant Industrial School for Boys opened in 1912. The school remained as the state’s sole institution for delinquent and “socially disoriented boys” until 1973 when it was converted into an adult male prison.\textsuperscript{63} The industrial school’s stated objective was “to train, re-educate, and rehabilitate delinquently inclined boys” and “enable them to return to home life as constructive members of their community.”\textsuperscript{64} In 1927, the Randolph School for Girls was established but closed in 1938 due to health and sanitary concerns. The Covenant of the Good Shepherd assumed responsibility over delinquent girls that same year. Located in Phoenix, the school was able to “accommodate 175 girls” by 1964.\textsuperscript{65} Efforts to understand and decrease juvenile delinquency was not unique to Arizona, but part of a larger phenomenon that spread across the United States from the late 1800s to mid-1900s. Despite the use of these reform schools, delinquency continued to rise.


\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 26.

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., 45.
In Tucson, early to mid-twentieth century perceptions of juvenile delinquency aligned with national standards. Juvenile, much like the term adolescent, was a social construct used to categorize child development. From a legal perspective, progressive reformers in the late 1800s used the term to separate child offenders from their adult counterparts. From this distinction came reform schools, juvenile courts, youth probation officers, and juvenile detention centers designed to manage criminals under eighteen years of age. In Tucson, like other parts of the nation, the most common types of juvenile crimes were truancy, loitering, vandalism, theft, larceny and assault. In 1922, Pat L. Higgins, Pima County’s Chief Probation Officer reported to the Arizona Daily Star that “truancy and thieving are besetting sins of Pima county’s delinquent youth.” In 1943, the Tucson Daily Citizen reported that child vagrancy had increased by 25% from the previous decade. As a result, local officials and businesses collaborated to provide Tucson’s children with organized sports and playgrounds. The supporting argument held that “unless these boys and girls have some place to play, they will use the streets and they will get into trouble.” For some Tucsonans, idle hands were the Devil’s playthings. Despite efforts to prevent delinquency, in the 1940s, youth crime rates continued to rise into the 1950s. Tucson police reported that juvenile delinquency, by 1950, had taken a turn toward more serious offenses including automobile theft.
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burglary, and border crossing. The increase in delinquency prompted local studies on the trend.

In 1955 a study conducted by Dale E. Williams at the University of Arizona tracked juvenile delinquency rates in Tucson. Comparing annual reports from the Pima County Juvenile Court, Williams finds that from 1947 to 1954, complaints—made to Tucson police—of delinquency increased from 1,658 to 2,593. When divided by race and ethnicity, Williams found that 11.9% of Anglo-American juveniles in Tucson committed 1,224 (47%) delinquent acts. By comparison, 43.7% of Mexican American juveniles in Tucson committed 1,191 (46%) delinquent acts. From these numbers, it appears that although Anglo-American juveniles were committing more crimes overall, Mexican American juveniles were being accused at a disproportionately higher rate.

Williams’ study attributes this discrepancy to the higher proportion of Mexican Americans living in Tucson slums. Although poverty was a factor, Williams failed to recognize potential ethnic bias that hindered educational and occupational opportunities for Mexican Americans in Tucson. Furthermore, Williams dismissed the possibility of ethnic bias among Tucson’s law enforcement agencies.

Mexican Americans had experienced discrimination that limited opportunities in Tucson since the 1880s. Although the Mexican population had been the majority, greater wealth was concentrated among the Anglo population. This discrepancy
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becomes more evident once the railroad became the main source of trade and transportation in the city. White businesses and workers flourished as Mexican businesses and workers floundered from discriminatory practices. Into the twentieth century, the Anglo population eventually surpassed the Mexican population. Discrimination continued into the mid-twentieth century expanding to war industries and housing. Mexican Americans were largely denied access to higher paying positions during WWII. Residential segregation relegated Mexican Americans and African Americans to confined neighborhoods away from Tucson’s economic development. As Tucson expanded both in population and wealth, Mexican Americans were generally left out which accounts for lacking opportunities and higher poverty levels. Although Williams’s study provides insight into juvenile crime rates and a link to poverty, he does not account for why such poverty existed among Mexican American populations in Tucson.

In 1955, the Hughes Tucson Management Club held its annual scholarship competition “to provide some worthy graduating high school student in Pima County with a scholarship…to help finance a college education at the University of Arizona or one of the other state colleges.”73 The contest required students to write an essay on “the principal causes of juvenile delinquency in your community” and “suggestions for eliminating these causes.”74 Compiling the responses, the Hughes Tucson Management Club presented a report to Arizona Governor Ernest W. McFarland in June of 1955.
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Although distilled from the original essays, the report provides valuable insight into how some of Tucson’s high school students understood juvenile delinquency.

Twenty-one students from area schools submitted essays for the scholarship. According to the report, student responses were relatively similar arguing that home-life and schooling were the causes of and remedies to delinquency.\textsuperscript{75} Acknowledging that there was no perfect home situation, students argued that “idleness, lack of love and security, frustration, and low moral standards” in the home caused delinquency.\textsuperscript{76} To remedy these problems, students recommended “proper education of parents” including marriage and family courses offered in high schools and college, city-employed marriage counselors as an available tax-supported service, and stricter marriage laws and requirements.\textsuperscript{77}

Aside from home-life, students felt that poor school conditions including overcrowding, low teacher pay, and educator “indifference...toward undue absence, cheating, lack of interest, or dishonesty” contributed to delinquency.\textsuperscript{78} Essays also argued that schools appeared generally unsympathetic toward low- and average-achieving students, as more attention was given to college-prep students. To remedy these problems, students recommended increased pay and higher qualifications for

\textsuperscript{75} Elouise M. Bell, \textit{Youth Speaks on Juvenile Delinquency: A Report}, (Tucson: Hughes Tucson Management Club, 1955): 1, box 134, Governor’s Office Subject Files, 1951-1955, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, Archives and Records Management. Unfortunately, there is no demographic information provided to know how the essay’s may have reflected a diverse or homogeneous perspective.
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teachers, more extracurricular activities, and more attention paid to “others besides top
students.” Some students also pointed to lacking employment opportunities for teen-
agers, mental health concerns, and potential negative influence from comic books and
television.

The report concluded with a direct quote from one of the essays: “give the teen-
agers a place to have fun, to dance or swim, or take part in organized sports. Given
them responsibility and respect, give them the facts they need to know about themselves to make the adjustments that go along with adolescence, and in return you'll get enthusiastic, informed youngsters that will welcome future citizens of which to be proud.” From this report, students seemed to have comparable views as adults regarding the causes of delinquency. Specifically, family instability was a common theme. Similarly, schools were often viewed as remedies for correcting delinquency. Although the survey did not discuss influences in youth culture—movies, music, and comic books—as contributing factors to delinquency, there is a connection to what historian James Gilbert explains “as proof that the traditional transmission of values from institutions of social order through parents to children had been seriously weakened.” Gilbert argues that parents largely blamed mass media directed at youth for increasing delinquency. From this essay contest, students did not mention youth culture, but did highlight the breakdown between parent and child. Despite whatever influences may have led children to breaking the law, poor parenting skills were often
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highlighted as a central cause. For example, a *Tucson Daily Citizen* article on increasing divorce rates argued that “marriage failure” was the “breeding grounds for juvenile delinquency.” The breakdown in family and its perceived link to increased delinquency often supported a shift in parental responsibility to the schools. By partnering with schools, Tucson police not only aimed to reduce delinquency by implementing SRO programs in the 1960s, but also assumed this parental responsibility for discipline.

The same year teen-agers in Tucson were considering the causes and cures to juvenile delinquency, the U.S. Legislative Branch was investigating the federal government’s role in combating youth crime. Garnering little support in Congress, the Delinquent Children’s Act of 1955 ultimately failed, but investigations into delinquency continued. In July, the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency published a report indicating potential causes of delinquency across the country. Similar to the Tucson essay contestants, the committee argued that schools were the “first line of defense against juvenile delinquency.” Specifically, providing proper counseling services, decreasing the dropout rate, and reverse overcrowding would help prevent delinquent activities. By November, the subcommittee acknowledged that youth crime was continuing to climb reporting that approximately 1.3 million “children came to the attention of the police in 1954” and that nearly 500,000 were “brought to the attention of
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the juvenile court.” 84 This was a ten percent increase from 1953 and a fifty-eight percent increase from 1948. 85 The subcommittee determined that increased delinquency was a national problem and that federal funding could aid local and state agencies in reversing this increase. During the 1960s, it would be federal grants that helped to expand school-police partnerships in Tucson and beyond.

By signing the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act into law on September 22, 1961, President John F. Kennedy and Congress determined that juvenile delinquency had become a national concern that diminished the “strength and vitality of the people of our Nation.” 86 Under this law, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) was authorized to distribute grants for local and state level projects that implemented and studied techniques to prevent juvenile delinquency. 87 By placing HEW in charge, Congress and the President acknowledged the centrality of public education in combating juvenile delinquency. It was under this act that school-police partnerships were able to flourish in the 1960s.

Mirroring federal concerns over delinquency, governors from around the United States expressed their interests in combating this growing national problem. During the Fifty-Third Annual Governor’s Conference in 1961, a Committee of Juvenile Delinquency was charged with a fact-finding mission regarding delinquency prevention.
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Two years later, the committee argued that the “delinquent is often the product of a broken home, or a home in which English is not spoken, or a home so desperately poor that the youth ultimately grows discouraged and drops out of school.” Although poverty and a dysfunctional home life aligned with other perceptions on the causes of delinquency, the committee also associated language as a source. This reveals a potential bias against immigrant and ethnic minority populations suggesting that delinquency was not a domestic problem, but originated elsewhere. Given that Hispanics were the largest population in the United States that represented English as a Second Language (ESL) persons and non-English speakers, the committee’s belief reflects what MacDonald refers to as Hispanophobia: a “long-standing negative attitude towards...Spanish-speaking populations.” This attitude was evident in many school systems with a sizeable Hispanic population. For instance, school administrators would segregate Spanish-speaking students into separate, sometimes remedial, classes from their Anglo counterparts. Furthermore, intelligence tests were often given to determine a student’s ability. Commonly given in English, Spanish-speaking students often performed poorly classifying them as mentally inferior and justifying segregation. MacDonald argues that during the mid-twentieth century these practices often limited
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Mexican Americans’ educational opportunities: “approximately one-half of Mexican Americans over the age of 25 had not completed eighth grade and less than 6 percent had some college education.”92 Although the committee did not mention police collaboration with schools, improving education was recommended as the primary method in preventing delinquency.

In February of 1963, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education published a report on juvenile delinquency for Arizona. Its findings derived from a survey conducted the previous year. Out of 95 questionnaires given to personnel working-correctional officers, court officials, detention centers and juvenile institutions-with juvenile offenders in Arizona, 53 were returned. In the early 1960s, Arizona was one of the fastest growing states by population that also had a high transient population from migrant workers. The survey found that juvenile delinquency was increasing statewide. Specifically, respondents indicated that a “large number” of Mexican American migrant “youngsters [had] become neglected, dependent, and/or delinquent.”93 Common problems among delinquents in Arizona included alcoholism, drug use, and glue-sniffing according to the survey.94 In Tucson, glue-sniffing was viewed “as one of the nation’s most insidious problems among teen-age delinquents.”95

92 MacDonald, Latino Education in the United States, 216.
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The act was often associated with other forms of delinquency arguing that the glue sniffer’s reasoning abilities were hindered leading to criminal activity. Other forms of delinquency were associated with crimes committed by persons under eighteen years of age. The report also indicated that school dropouts were a group more inclined to delinquency.

By the early 1960s it was evident that juvenile delinquency had become a national concern. This was also true for Tucson, Arizona. Although reform schools and the juvenile court system had come to Arizona at the turn of the century, these methods did little to control the apparent growth in youth crime. Because of this, Tucson experimented with a new program: The School Resource Officer.


Looking for a way to reverse youth crime by 1962, Tucson Police Chief Bernard Garmire proposed an experimental program that he claimed would not only prevent juvenile delinquency, but also improve the image of Tucson’s law enforcement. Proposing this idea to the Tucson District One School Board, Garmire stated that “a similar program is under way at Flint, Mich.” and was “also being tried out in Chicago and several California communities.”

Flint, in 1958, had become the first city to implement a school-police partnership that permanently placed officers in public schools. Jointly funded by the Flint School Board and the Charles S. Mott Foundation, the Police School Liaison (PSL) program was instituted at Bryant Community Junior High School to prevent juvenile delinquency. In 1962, Garmire gave Detective Kendall
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Bedient a report on Flint’s PSL and “asked him to see if it would work” in Tucson.97 Together, Garmire and Bedient developed Tucson’s School Resource Officer (SRO) program and proposed it to the School Board.

Gaining approval from the school board in December, the SRO program was piloted at Mansfeld Junior High School including its five elementary feeder schools starting January 14, 1963. Detective Bedient—a Michigan State University graduate and juvenile officer—was Tucson’s first SRO. Under the program, he was provided office space at Mansfeld Junior High and considered part of the faculty despite being completely funded by the Tucson Police Department. Working full-time with administrators, teachers, students, and parents, it was hoped that the SRO would “become well acquainted with many students and to instill in them the basic ideals of law abiding citizenship.”98 Furthermore, the SRO’s role was to refer students at risk for delinquency to community agencies in an effort to help them before problems escalated involving the Juvenile Court system.

Mansfeld Junior High School was chosen as the SRO test site for its representative population. According to Garmire and Bedient, Mansfeld “did not have any greater problems” than other schools.99 In fact, Mansfeld was “ranked fourth lowest


in referrals to Pima County Juvenile” out of the fifteen area junior high schools.100

Furthermore, Bedient stated that Mansfeld was chosen after determining that the
“social, economic and ethnic makeup was compared to Tucson as a whole” indicating
that the school’s population was representative of Tucson’s demographic
composition.101 According to the 1960 Census, Tucson’s population was 212,892. Of
that total, 203,614 (95.6%) were white, 7,030 (3.3%) were African American, and 2,248
(1.01%) were indicated as “other.”102 Of that total, approximately 35,722 (17%) had
Spanish surnames.103 When compared to the Mansfeld area population, the school
served a total population of 37,532. Furthermore, approximately 5,373 (14%) were
persons with Spanish surnames.104 From these data, it is determined that Mansfeld’s
population was demographically representative of Tucson.

In this pilot program, the SRO had four specific purposes: educative,
preventative, investigative, and rehabilitative. In his initial weeks, Bedient gave 55-
minute presentations to each individual homeroom class to introduce himself and the
program to teachers and students. As part of the educative purpose, these

Department,1965): 1, folder 9, box 1, Ernest and Margaret Tilford Collection: 1946-1977, Arizona
Historical Society, Tucson Library and Archives.

101 Ibid.


103 Ibid., 13. Although this number does not account for the total Mexican American population in
Tucson at the time, this is the most completed estimate. For instance, a person may be of Mexican
descent, but not have a Spanish surname.
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presentations regarding general safety, police duties, and the law were also conducted per request of teachers. According to Bedient, the educational aspect of the program was an “attempt to form an identification of the policeman as a true friend and to promote a better understanding of the law.”\textsuperscript{105} By being present in the school and classrooms, it appears that the educative purpose was designed to build a rapport with students by presenting the police officer as a friend. Furthermore, because the officer had a permanent office space within the school, the SRO was viewed as a fulltime faculty member and served an educative role.

Aside from building a rapport with students, the SRO’s central duties included preventing, investigating, and rehabilitating incidents of juvenile delinquency. According to Bedient, delinquency prevention included “observing areas where students are ‘prone to congregate’” and patrol area neighborhoods at night looking for “children who are out later than is appropriate.”\textsuperscript{106} Officers were also responsible for making contacts with area businesses to keep tabs on “minor violations and improper demeanor on the part of the students.”\textsuperscript{107} In cases involving Mansfeld, Bedient was responsible for interviewing and searching students. If criminal activity was identified, the pupil was directed to the Pima County Juvenile Court. In less serious offenses or if adolescents presented pre-delinquent behavior—truancy, problems at home, or trouble with teachers and administrators—the SRO referred them to community organizations, medical
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services, or “spiritual counseling from various religious agencies.” Each of these
tasks that fell within the SRO’s parameters were used to combat juvenile delinquency in
Tucson schools.

These responsibilities were largely developed by Garmire and Bedient modeled
after the Flint PSL program. Other than approval from the District One School Board
and Superintendent Robert Morrow, there seems to have been little involvement from
educators. The Mansfeld Principal had to agree to allow the SRO to enter, but
otherwise, no guidelines were established in the program’s initial years. This would later
become a contentious point as some Tucson residents began to question the SRO’s
effectiveness and procedures. More so, it seems that school principals were responsible
for setting individual guidelines within their own schools, but no districtwide parameters
were set until 1966.

For many Tucsonans, the first-year results were enough to not only continue the
SRO program, but to expand it to other schools. A September 1963 editorial in the
Tucson Daily Citizen argued that “malicious mischief and petty thievery on the part of
youngsters is the reason why” the SRO program needed to expand. Local
businessman Abe Giteck told the Tucson Daily Citizen that there had “been a marked
improvement” and he “had very little difficulty with the students” since the program
began. Although school administrators were “initially skeptical” of police presence in
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schools, they deemed the SRO program a success in its first full year. The SRO program was also praised for preserving student safety from potential criminals and child molesters. For instance, student information had led authorities to arrest a man for “exposing himself to students.” Police records indicated that student referrals to Juvenile Court decreased for Mansfeld from 74 in 1962 to 55 in 1963: a nearly 25% reduction. According to Garmire, this decrease signified that “youngsters who were not referred were talked to and worked with at the very inception of a delinquency pattern and their tendency toward delinquency was corrected before it got started.” Although there was a significant drop in juvenile referrals in the first year, it is difficult to know if the SRO program was solely responsible. Despite inconclusive evidence, many local citizens and school administrators praised the program and called for its expansion.

By May of 1964, Garmire announced that the SRO program would continue at Mansfeld Junior High and be extended to three more schools by the beginning of the following school year. In August, Detective Joe Rodriguez was assigned to Safford Junior High, and Detective Larry Brooks was assigned to Spring Junior High. By October, Detective Robert Sinclair was assigned to Amphitheater Junior High. For the
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1964-65 school year, approximately 12,000 students were being served by Tucson’s SRO program.\textsuperscript{116} With this expansion came more praise. For instance, Amphitheater District Superintendent wrote to Garmire expressing admiration for SRO Sinclair stating that “his services have represented an outstanding contribution in the handling of delinquency.”\textsuperscript{117} Similarly, Robert D. Morrow—District No. One Superintendent—wrote that “as these boys and girls progress through school and take their places in society, they will be better citizens because of this program.”\textsuperscript{118} Moreover, the 1964/65 school year ended with 50 total referrals to juvenile court: five fewer than the year before. With such positive approval from school officials and data that the SRO program was effective, more principals requested police assistance in preventing delinquency.\textsuperscript{119} By the following school year, two more SROs were added at Naylor Junior High and Utterback Junior High.

From 1964 to 1966, reporter Bill Kimmey of the \textit{Tucson Daily Citizen} wrote several articles praising the SRO program. One story depicted an SRO as a hero who found a first-grader who had run away from school. In the same article, Kimmey interviewed SRO Robert Sinclair who stated that there were parents “who don’t make a sufficient effort to know where their kids are” and that it was the SRO who made it their


business to visit “where young people hang out” and ‘talk to those who are out on the street.” In another article, Kimmey stated that “hundreds of youngsters have been given new respect for policemen because of SROs.” By the end of the 1965/66 school year, seven Tucson junior high schools housed a full-time SRO. Despite this expansion, continued praise, and figures indicating positive results, some local citizens began questioning the underlying dangers of placing police in schools. For example, Spring Junior High Principal Morgan Maxwell realized the program’s shortcomings and ultimately removed the SRO from the school. According to Maxwell, Spring Junior High was “a community inhabited mostly by minority ethnic groups who have experienced job discrimination, exploitation, and what many feel as unfair treatment by the police.”

Initially, Maxwell had welcomed the SRO with open arms and commended the program after its first year at Spring. However, the officer was removed by 1966. According to Chief Garmire and Superintendent Morrow, the SRO was withdrawn due to “personality conflicts” with the principal. According to Maxwell, this claim was false. The SRO had been removed from Spring Junior High, Maxwell argued, because the officer “wouldn’t go along with the guidelines I set up.” Based on this report, it appears that the SRO
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came into conflict with individual school regulations, possibly overstepped administrative authority, and potentially marginalized minority youth. One of the concerns that some Tucsonans later shared was the conflict between police and school authority.

From early 1966 to 1968, parents, community members, organizations, and reporters challenged the SRO program stating that it was potentially violating student civil liberties and overstepping a boundary between police responsibility and school authority. Many parents and school officials called for the SRO’s continuation and expansion even without any significant study of the program. “Although...no assessment of its effectiveness is yet possible,” stated Mrs. B. L. Clark in an Arizona PTA Bulletin from 1966, “it illustrates one positive approach that recognizes the immediacy of the problem.”125 Clark’s statement reveals a point of contention for SRO critics. There was much praise for the program in its first few years, and some statistical data showed positive results. But there had not been a thorough study conducted to see if the program was effective in decreasing delinquency, improved police rapport and image with juveniles, or perhaps had any harmful effects on students. Despite lacking evidence and no public discussion or debate before the school board, the SRO program had expanded to seven schools by 1966 and was intended to be “a future model for the entire country” according to Garmire.126

By late 1965 it was evident that the city could not afford on its own to add more SROs for the following school year. To continue the program, Garmire and Tucson


Mayor Lew Davis sought out federal aid. Later that year, City Manager Mark Keane suggested that the 1965 Law Enforcement Assistance Act (LEAA) may provide funding to support further expansion of Tucson’s SRO. Under LEAA, local and state law enforcement agencies could apply for federal grants to “stimulate the testing and demonstration of new approaches and procedure in crime prevention and control, law enforcement, and criminal justice.” LEAA grants were distributed by Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (OLEA) under the United States Department of Justice.

Expressing interest, Davis said that “he would like to see an officer assigned to each of the 15 junior high schools and eight high schools in the city.” In early 1966, citizens, PTA members, and local leaders wrote Tucson Senator Carl T. Hayden seeking his assistance in securing funds through LEAA grants. Father Charles Rourke, a Catholic Priest at St. Augustine Cathedral in Tucson, wrote Hayden about the “wonderful program” and to beg his “assistance in helping” support Tucson’s youth. Although it appeared that the SRO received overwhelming support from many Tucsonans, opposition was growing in response to the program’s expansion.
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In February of 1966, the Southern Chapter of the Arizona Civil Liberties (ACLU) met to discuss concerns about Tucson’s SRO. During the meeting, the ACLU debated the potentially negative impact the SRO had on students and schools. Specifically, members found the police officer’s role as a counselor to be problematic. SROs did not have the same training or credentials as school counselors. Furthermore, there was a potential conflict of interest. Which role—police or counselor—would the SRO prioritize when presented with confidential information regarding a student? Where a traditional counselor may protect sensitive material, a police officer would not be held to the same standard and could use said data against the student. Furthermore, by acknowledging SROs as counselors, then the traditional school counselor’s role would be diminished. The ACLU also questioned if the police were violating students’ civil rights and due process through unsupervised interrogations, potential harassment, and surveillance. Ultimately, the meeting concluded with an agreement among ACLU members that further study into the SRO program was needed before it could expand to more schools.

In March of 1966, Ernest H. Tilford, an active ACLU board member and former juvenile parole officer, published the ACLU’s concerns in the *Tucson League for the Public Schools Newsletter*. Tilford furthered the opposition revealing that the SRO program had operated without formal written guidelines since its inception. Tilford also implied that this extension of authority resembled a police state in which private
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citizens were under constant surveillance and could be questioned without Constitutional protections. Tilford’s accusation was not outlandish given previous actions committed by Tucson’s police force under Garmire.

Chief Garmire and the Tucson Police Department had a history of harassment, overstepping authority, and even denying citizens’ rights. For instance, the Tucson Daily Citizen ran a story in 1959 about local police perception stating “that most policeman are uncivil, and regard the public as only a necessary nuisance.”134 In April of 1964, an editorial drew concerns about Garmire’s formation of “a so-called intelligence squad, whose members attend public meetings in plain clothes” and “watch for those persons who express dangerous thoughts.”135 When questioned about this squad, Garmire claimed that his officers were for precautionary measures and served a security role at public meetings. The editorial questioned Garmire’s reasoning stating that there did not appear to be a need for such a squad in Tucson. The article concluded that “this development conforms with Chief Garmire’s inclination of empire building - always adding new officers into an ever-expanding bureaucracy.”136 Later that year, the Congress of Racial Equality held a peaceful demonstration at Tucson’s City Hall. During the event, Tucson police photographed demonstrators. The ACLU stated that these actions were “completely uncalled-for in a free society” and that this incidence of police
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spying and harassment was “offensive and obnoxious to civil liberties.”\textsuperscript{137} Taken in context with Tucson police practices, the SRO program appears to be a continuation in expanding police authority. From 1966 to 1968 the ACLU, with support from local citizens, continued to oppose the SRO program calling for specific guidelines and even pursuing a lawsuit.

Throughout April of 1966, several articles and letters to the editor, reflected the growing conflict surrounding the SRO controversy. At a Tucson Press Club Forum in April, Reverend John C. Fowler–President of the ACLU Southern Chapter–and Mrs. B. McDonald–concerned citizen and mother–spoke out against the SRO program. Echoing previous ACLU concerns, Fowler and McDonald argued that “the SRO remedy for juvenile programs was short-sighted” and that school officials should handle student problems themselves.\textsuperscript{138} When challenged about what rights children have by the president of the Montezuma Council PTA, Fowler responded that “a child has rights the same as adults” and added that students not introduced to their rights will “make damn poor civil liberties-conscious adults.”\textsuperscript{139} In an April 19th letter to the editor, one citizen argued that questioning the SRO program was legitimate and found it troubling that police officers did not understand why the program was being criticized at the Press Club Forum.\textsuperscript{140} Another article stated that very little information about the SRO program
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had been made public and encouraged readers to learn more before choosing sides. This statement also reflected ACLU concerns that the program was implemented without public discussion. It argued that if taxes were being used to support this program and school children were to be subjected to police surveillance, then more information should have been made available to the public from the beginning. One former teacher stated that “if I were still teaching I believe I’d turn in my certificate before allowing detectives to usurp the duties and responsibilities for which I had been educated.” Further concerns arose as time went on. For instance, citizens questioned if the SRO displaced parental and school responsibilities in handling behavior problems. Some opponents argued that the program encouraged lazy parenting. Others questioned the police department’s legal right to be in the schools. Some parents and counselors argued that police were not properly educated to handle child behavioral problems. The ACLU questioned the legality of police interrogating children without a parent or legal counsel present and accessibility to confidential documents.

Despite these various concerns, many Tucsonans continued to support the SRO program. One resident argued that “the SRO program provides the healthy, normal contact between the officer and students.” One concerned parent stated that “if these
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men are responsible for saving only one child from a molester, or putting one potential juvenile delinquent on the right path, then the whole program is worthwhile.”¹⁴⁵ Even principals joined in the public debate. Principal William Corcoran of Safford Junior High argued that “the SRO program helps students as much as the district counseling program.”¹⁴⁶ Principal Anna Lawrence from Carrillo Elementary School stated that the program was “working smoothly” and that she was “thankful for it.”¹⁴⁷ It is evident that Tucson’s residents were divided on the SRO issue.

At a May 6, 1966 Community Forum about the SRO program, more than 200 people attended to hear opposing views. Clinical Psychologist Dr. Roland Tharp from Arizona State University spoke in opposition. Tharp argued that the program was “too easy a solution” and that by implementing this program the community was dodging “the responsibility of school and parent to prevent juvenile delinquency.”¹⁴⁸ Tharp further proposed that the logic behind the SRO could be extended to the household: if children were being policed based on behavior, then parents could be policed for the same infractions.

During the meeting, attendees discussed parental and educator concerns about the SRO’s dual role as police and counselor. When asked, an SRO present at the meeting denied that his role was to counsel students. This presents a misunderstanding


¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

between police, schools, and citizens. From various perspectives, one of the stated police functions was a counseling role: a duty that had been expressed by school administrators and the police themselves. However, at this meeting, the SRO claimed that he was not responsible for counseling. This misinterpretation highlights the important need for specific guidelines dictating the program: a measure that the ACLU had been demanding before the program was to accept funds from the federal government and expand to more schools.

The ACLU and other opponents increasingly targeted the SRO’s authority to interrogate students without legal or parental council. In an interview, Mansfeld’s SRO Kendall Bedient stated that “no guidelines had been set as a precedent and that he often found it ‘easier to find out what actually occurred’ from the child when the parent was not present.” 149 An official letter from the ACLU to the District One’s school board president, criticized Tucson schools for irresponsibly approving the SRO program “without first establishing uniform guidelines which would safeguard the rights of parents and children.” 150 By May of 1966, after pressure from concerned citizens and groups, the school board issued twelve guidelines that defined and regulated the SRO program. However, opponents argued that the “guidelines [created] a situation in which officers may freely question any child” without a parent or school official present. 151 This concern specifically addressed guideline nine in which “interviews by the resource

149 Alice MacDonald, “Background of SRO Program,” 2.


officer with students are to be arranged with the principal, who decides if the interview is to be conducted in his presence, in the presence of his designated representative, or by the school resource officer alone.\textsuperscript{152} Essentially, this meant that the principal could determine whether students were to be interviewed by the SRO alone or with an adult. For opponents, this guideline verified a central concern that student rights could be violated. Another concern centered on SRO access to confidential information which was granted by guideline seven stating that "records of a more confidential nature may be shared with him by the principal."\textsuperscript{153} Disappointed with the guidelines, the ACLU turned its attention to the federal level appealing to Arizona Congressman Morris Udall and the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (OLEA).

Given that Garmire had applied for LEAA grants to fund SRO expansion, the ACLU decided that the federal government could influence changes to the guidelines. In a letter to Udall, Tilford expressed his concerns about the guidelines stating that “rights are absent if an officer wishes to question a child.”\textsuperscript{154} Udall responded to Tilford explaining that this concern was not a federal matter, but should be resolved by the community.\textsuperscript{155} Turning to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the ACLU contacted Kenneth Carpenter from the federal Children’s Bureau. Restating the ACLU’s concerns over children’s rights, Carpenter agreed that police presence in schools
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should not replace the valuable efforts of counselors and social workers.\textsuperscript{156} Gaining traction, the ACLU also contacted Courtney Evans, Acting Director of OLEA, the office responsible for issuing grants under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. Acknowledging that opposition against the SRO was growing, Evans decided to visit Tucson to observe the program personally and speak with opponents.\textsuperscript{157} Agreeing with the ACLU’s concerns, Evans made two stipulations upon awarding grant money to Tucson. The OLEA stipulated that the Tucson SRO had to conduct a study of the program to assess its effectiveness. Furthermore, OLEA stipulated “procedures calling for advance notification to parents, advice of the voluntary nature of such interviews, and the presence of parents or school representatives in all interviews held are contemplated as part of the approved project plan.”\textsuperscript{158} On July 20, 1966, the Tucson SRO program was awarded $67,377 “applicable to first-year activities in a two-year project.”\textsuperscript{159} LEAA was enacted in 1965 to fund new techniques designed to prevent juvenile delinquency. Like other projects in Minneapolis, Flint, Atlanta, and Cincinnati, Tucson’s SRO was one of a group of programs that increased police presence in public schools. Although the ACLU was unable to prevent the SRO from expanding or dissolving, this small victory did set guidelines to ensure that student rights would be secured.
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Tucson’s SRO program was part of a larger educational phenomenon developing during the mid-twentieth century. Beginning in 1958, Flint, Michigan, implemented its school-police partnership in hopes to quell rising juvenile delinquency. Tucson’s SRO was an expansion on Flint’s program. Local police and school administrators believed that an innovative approach was needed to prevent delinquency. Arguably, Flint and Tucson fit into a longer history in which progressive reformers attempted to manage increasing populations in urban areas. Crime, especially, juvenile delinquency, was viewed as a social ill that was detrimental to national values and democratic citizenship. In this same progressive vein, mid-twentieth century law and education reformers partnered to once again manage a perceived national and local crisis. For supporters in Tucson, the SRO program was the best method in preventing youth crime. For opponents, questions about legality, student rights, and school and parental responsibility arose. The ACLU argued that law enforcement was overstepping its legal bounds attempting to create a police-state. Educators and counselors were concerned over the SRO’s credentials and ability to teach and counsel children effectively. Although supporters praised the SRO, it appeared that the very program designed to protect democracy, was diminishing it. This appeared to be the case for Mexican American and African American populations in Tucson.

**Ethnic and Legal Implications of “Tucson’s Dangerous Alliance”**

In July of 1966, seven days before the LEAA grant was awarded, *The Christian Century* ran a scathing editorial about Tucson’s SRO program. Editor Kyle Haselden described the program to readers specifying the duties and responsibilities each officer had within Tucson’s junior high and elementary schools. Haselden provided examples from supporters and arguments from oppositional voices. The program was designed to
detect and prevent juvenile delinquency, but was also subject to potential abuses by police authorities.¹⁶⁰ The ACLU, local parents and educators were legitimately concerned that students were being subjected to unsupervised and indiscriminate interrogations, that adolescents were used as police informants, that law officers were usurping administrative and counseling authority, and that law enforcement officers were misusing “the educational process for police purposes.”¹⁶¹ Criticizing the SRO program, Haselden argued that expanding police authority was detrimental to “the internal fiber of a democratic society” and that Tucson’s “well-intentioned people put their…children under police surveillance to purchase a better understanding of law enforcement and to prevent juvenile delinquency.”¹⁶² In these ways, Haselden agreed with the ACLU’s stance against Tucson’s SRO. Despite opposition, the program continued to expand.

In January of 1967, a lawsuit was brought against Tucson’s District No. One by Elizabeth B. Navarez and Thomas N. Bahti—parents of students within the district. Supported by the ACLU, the plaintiffs argued that the program constituted “an unlawful delegation of the rights, duties and responsibilities” by Tucson police and that the program violated the Arizona state Constitution.¹⁶³ Representing the plaintiffs, attorney William Messing argued that police intrusion into school affairs violated Article 11 of
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Arizona’s Constitution. The case was brought before Superior Court, but was dismissed on a technicality—the plaintiff’s children were not found to be in direct harm since they did not attend a school with an SRO.

Into 1969 and 1970, the ACLU continued its efforts to derail Tucson’s SRO with little success. By 1969, SROs were in ten schools and the school board discussed expanding the program into area high schools. By 1971, District No. 1 began talks to place SROs in “Tucson High, which has been the scene of numerous problems causing some teachers there to depict it as a ‘blackboard jungle.” For the ACLU, opposition centered on student rights, but never mentioned racial or ethnic implications. In fact, the only mention of race came from Minister Wilbur Johnson in a July, 1966 article. The former pastor of Pueblo Gardens Methodist Church discussed with Newsweek reporter Karl Fleming that a double standard existed in Tucson for black and white citizens. Referring to delinquency charges, Johnson argued that “for some, it’s considered to be a natural process of maturation. But another fellow does it and he’s a criminal.” Johnson explained that to African Americans, police are a threatening force and that children are “taught...that a policeman is sort of Jekyll and Hyde—a wearer of the hood
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at night and wearer of a tin badge by day.” Johnson’s statements spoke to a larger concern that the ACLU and other SRO opponents generally ignored: that minority populations were treated differently by police than their Anglo counterparts. Given that Tilford and many other ACLU members were white, their privileged status arguably did not allow them to see the effect that Tucson’s SRO had on minority populations.

Although little is mentioned about Mexican American and African American populations regarding police presence in schools in Tucson, closer analysis of the areas where the program began and spread to reveal an underlying story. Mansfeld Junior High School, argued Garmire, represented Tucson’s diverse population. Although this may have been true, Mansfeld was not typical. Most Tucson school zones resembled their segregated neighborhoods. According to Getty’s 1945-1947 study, most Mexican Americans and African Americans lived in southwest and central Tucson. This segregation largely remained the same into the 1960s. By 1966, five junior high schools—Mansfeld, Naylor, Safford, Spring, and Utterback—in District No. One had a police presence. Each of these schools were located in southwest and central Tucson: areas heavily populated by Mexican Americans and African Americans. Like Flint, Michigan, areas with proportionately high minority students and low-income earners were the first urban schools to experience a police presence.

Tucson’s SRO emphasized policing duties acting more like a neighborhood patrolman and detective responding to problems that fell under police jurisdiction.170

169 Ibid.

The program’s primary goal was to implement preventative measures in reducing juvenile crime while promoting a positive image of law enforcement.\footnote{Ibid., 329.} The partnership, although borrowing from Flint, established a new variation of the school-police partnership emphasizing greater autonomy of the police acting within the school setting. Tucson and other cities were the trailblazers in a trend that expanded throughout the latter half of the twentieth century. Although the SRO’s mission was to deter juvenile delinquency, it did so in ways that created a carceral-like environment that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.
Beginning in 1965, the University of Cincinnati, city police, and local schools partnered to develop a curriculum to teach junior high school students about law and law enforcement. Earlier that year, a University of Cincinnati graduate student Robert Portune conducted a study to measure the attitudes of adolescents toward police. In the analysis, Portune discovered that as children aged, they tended to have a less favorable attitude toward law enforcement concluding this was due to misconceptions perpetuated by lacking education. Following the study, Portune directed the Cincinnati Police-Attitude Project. The project’s primary objective was to reduce juvenile delinquency by changing students’ attitudes toward police. In the decades leading to this project, juvenile delinquency and youth crime had reportedly increased in Cincinnati. In response, educators and police believed that by teaching students about law and exposing them to positive police images, juveniles would be socialized into responsible democratic citizens. Therefore, the increased police presence in Cincinnati public schools correlated to juvenile delinquency rates during the 1960s.

As the Police-Attitude Project was underway, Cincinnati witnessed racial unrest between black and white citizens. Like other cities, Cincinnati’s African American population experienced racial discrimination through economic limitations, housing restrictions, and school segregation. During the 1960s, civil rights groups and black Cincinnatians increased pressure on city officials to desegregate public schools. Most black resistance was exercised through legal action and peaceful protests, but a small number of activists resorted to violence responding to white opposition. Local news and
police often emphasized violence and arrests while downplaying peaceful action. By the
time Portune’s team implemented the junior high curricula in 1967, racial tensions
further elevated.

By 1967, the project team finalized three six-week curriculums for the seventh,
eighth, and ninth grades. Complete with daily lessons, teaching materials, projects, and
evaluations, the prescribed curriculum experiment began in April. Of the six Cincinnati
schools testing the program, four were predominantly African American, and two were
desegregated with a majority white population. Portune’s 1965 study found that African
American children scored the lowest regarding favorable attitudes toward police when
compared to other races. Although whites were responsible for more juvenile crime,
black adolescents were arrested at a proportionally higher rate. This resulted in police
and educators typically viewing delinquency rate as a black juvenile problem.

By late 1967, project coordinators, teachers, and police deemed the curriculum a
success. Simultaneously, racial tensions heightened. Late that year, violence erupted in
several area high schools. Thus, parents and teachers petitioned the local school board
to increase security measures. In response, the district board implemented School
Resource Officer programs in predominantly black high schools. Chapter 5 will account
for how Cincinnati’s Police Attitude Project came into existence, the purposes and
values behind the program, and its racial and social implications. To do this, I will first
explore the city’s growth from the nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century.
Providing an historical backdrop to Cincinnati’s development will help contextualize the
social and racial dynamics in which school-police programs emerged. Next, this Chapter
5 will discuss Cincinnati’s growing concerns with juvenile delinquency during the
twentieth century and the solutions that officials devised to manage and deter this problem. Last, Chapter 5 will focus on police presence in Cincinnati’s public schools emphasizing the establishment of, challenges to, and expansion of the Police Attitude Project. Ultimately, Cincinnati’s increased police presence in schools continued to marginalize minority students. Although this program had a different approach compared to earlier school-police partnerships in Flint and Tucson, the project did share a common goal to deter juvenile delinquency and was rooted in antecedent school reform movements designed to socialize urban youth into productive, law-abiding, democratic citizens.

“The Most Northern Southern City”: Cincinnati’s Economic Growth and Racial Politics in the 19th and 20th Centuries

Located on Ohio’s southwestern border, Cincinnati grew from a riverfront outpost to an urban and industrial trade center by the early twentieth century. Because of its proximity to the South and therefore influenced by southern regionalism and politics, Cincinnati was often referred to as “the most northern southern city and the most southern northern city in the country.”¹ Given that Cincinnati sits along the Ohio River and borders Kentucky, the city often served as a haven or waypoint for African Americans escaping human bondage.² Despite ending slavery in 1802, Ohio maintained restrictive laws barring free blacks from fully enjoying political and civil freedoms. African Americans were permitted to reside in the state, but were excluded from political
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participation and were required to register with local officials prior to settlement.\(^3\) Oppressive restrictions, however, did not deter African Americans from settling Cincinnati during the Antebellum period.

Cincinnati witnessed immense growth in the decades prior to the Civil War. Economic success and expansion affectionately earned Cincinnati the nickname Queen City. First appearing in a May 1819 article written by Edward B. Cooke, Cincinnati was “justly styled the fair Queen of the West: distinguished for order, enterprise, public spirit, and liberality, she stands the wonder of an admiring world.”\(^4\) Advancements in steamboat technology, the city’s centralized location, the influx of European immigrants, and migration of southern African Americans provided the perfect climate for Cincinnati’s growth in the early nineteenth century. By 1860, Cincinnati became the fifth highest populated city in the United States, the largest in the mid-western region, and the fourth largest manufacturing city in the nation.\(^5\)

During this growth, racial politics and division became firmly entrenched in Ohio and Cincinnati society. By 1825, the Ohio General Assembly passed the state’s first common school law establishing an educational board. Although African American Ohioans supported public education through taxation, “they were universally excluded from the state’s new school system.”\(^6\) According to historian David A. Gerber, public
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education for African Americans was first considered in 1829, but support was repealed in 1831 due to white opposition.⁷ Therefore, many of Ohio’s black children did not receive a formal education in the antebellum period, and those who did attended private schools self-financed by local African Americans, industrial philanthropists, and white missionaries.⁸ Gerber’s account places racial division—the color line—front and center in Ohio’s development during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁹ To fully understand the scope of Cincinnati’s urban development, race must be centralized in the narrative.

From 1820 to 1860, Cincinnati’s black population grew from approximately 700 to 3,700. With this influx came white violent resistance. White laborers and merchants were concerned over job competition which ultimately erupted into violence in August 1829. Historian Nikki Marie Taylor contends that aside from wage disputes, white fears centered on miscegenation and moral corruption from residing among African Americans.¹⁰ In 1836, a pro-slavery white militia in Cincinnati vandalized a local abolitionist newspaper, the Philanthropist, for encouraging an anti-slavery movement.¹¹ During the riot, a white mob attacked black homes and businesses destroying
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⁹ “Color line” was first published in 1978 by Thomas Philpott in The Slum and the Ghetto: Neighborhood Deterioration and Middle-Class Reform, Chicago, 1880-1930, as a metaphor to explain economic and residential barriers placed on people of color.


¹¹ The Liberator, James G. Birney to William M. Chase, January 22, 1836, printed in The Liberator, February 6, 1836.
property. In September 1841, violence broke out again as 700 whites reportedly gathered “with the avowed purpose of attacking the negro houses, and driving that class of people from the city.” Despite these violent acts, black Cincinnatians responded through organized resistance and “grew increasingly confident about asserting their right to be in the city.” African Americans stood their ground protecting their homes, businesses, and lives from white rioters.

Although African Americans faced violence and discrimination, historian Henry Louis Taylor states that prior to the Civil War, Cincinnati was not residentially segregated. True, black Ohioans were relegated to the lowest paying jobs, restricted from political involvement, and had limited educational opportunities compared to whites. However, Taylor argues that the “black ghetto-slum” did not formally take shape until the 1920s. Prior to this, blacks typically lived among whites in Cincinnati’s Lower Basin—the southern-most area of Cincinnati located along the Ohio River. During and immediately after the Civil War, African Americans fleeing the war-torn South, sought out opportunity in northern industrial cities. During the war, Ohio’s black population grew to 62,213. Many black refugees entering Cincinnati settled in the already overcrowded Lower Basin. Migration brought continued violence and resistance from whites as “wild

---

12 Taylor, Frontiers of Freedom, 112.


14 Taylor, Frontiers of Freedom, 106.

15 Henry Taylor, Jr., “City Building, Public Policy, the Rise of the Industrial City, and Black Ghetto-Slum Formation in Cincinnati,” 158.

16 Gerber, Black Ohio and the Color Line, 26.
rumors [accusing blacks] of rape, pillage, and mayhem spread from county to county.”¹⁷ Democrats, through newspapers, reinforced fears and prejudice and even called for barring further black migrants from entering the state even demanding the removal of longtime black Ohio residents.¹⁸ Despite resistance, African American migrants settled in Cincinnati and challenged the city’s racial discrimination.

The Civil Rights Act of 1866 along with the passage of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments following the Civil War chipped away at Ohio’s racial discrimination. With the opportunity to challenge racism legally, African Americans actively pursued cases to equalize education. For instance, in the State of Ohio ex rel. Lewis v. Board of Education of Cincinnati, Hensley Lewis—an African American man—sued the Hamilton County school district in 1876 after his children were denied enrollment to a nearby white school.¹⁹ Instead, the Lewis children had to walk four miles to the nearest school for black children.²⁰ The case was ultimately dismissed maintaining segregated public schools in Cincinnati. Despite this loss, challenges to Ohio’s school segregation laws continued and legal segregation was eventually overturned with the passage of the Brown-Arnett Bill in February of 1887. Stating that segregation promoted a second-class education and denial of full rights and opportunities, this legislation argued that desegregation would move toward providing full legal citizenship for all Ohioans regardless of race. Upon passage, black Ohioans
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celebrated the victory that “completely wipe[d] out all the ‘black laws’ on the statute books.”

Although overturing *de jure* discrimination was certainly a step forward to racial equality, reactions from black and white Ohioans were mixed.

For Gerber, southern Ohio towns and cities, like Cincinnati, were often unaccommodating to race relations. White business owners denied service to black patrons and some social welfare facilities such as orphanages remained racially segregated. In Cincinnati, black parents were apprehensive to send their children to integrated schools. Although educational funding and resources may have been more equal under the Brown-Arnett Bill, black parents and teachers were concerned that their children would be harassed and discriminated against within integrated schools and therefore not receive a quality education. Instead of closing all black schools, Cincinnati retained them as “voluntary branch schools, open to children of both races.”

However, the voluntary schools remained one-hundred percent African American and by 1888, only 130 black students attended the newly desegregated schools. By the 1890s, the black population increased in the integrated schools, but approximately half of all African American students still attended the voluntary schools.
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Evidence of discrimination also appeared in employment. Regardless of Cincinnati’s continued economic expansion and trade during the late 1800s and early 1900s, most black men and women were relegated to low-paying menial labor jobs with little chance for advancement.27 According to the 1890 Census, approximately forty percent of black work was in domestic and service industry jobs as compared to only 9% of whites.28 Higher paying factory jobs and skilled labor positions were often difficult for African Americans to attain, as these jobs were typically reserved for white union members.29 Despite economic and educational limitations, many African Americans continued migrating to Cincinnati into the early 1900s.

African Americans continued fleeing the South due to restricted economic, political, and social opportunities from Jim Crow imposed laws.30 Historian Beverly A. Bunch-Lyons argues that Cincinnati, due to white resistance and similarities shared with the South, was “contested terrain” to migrating African Americans in the first half of the twentieth century.31 Regardless, Cincinnati’s black population increased from 14,482 (4.4%) in 1900 to 48,000 (10.4%) in 1930.32 Migrants sought a better life through increased educational opportunities and economic gains. Much of this growth came


28 Ibid.


31 Ibid, 4.

32 Ibid., 112.
during World War I as opportunities in war industries attracted black laborers. Bunch-Lyons argues that black women were particularly motivated by educational opportunities usually limited or denied to them and their children in the South. Although schools largely remained segregated by the early 1900s and black teachers were denied from teaching in integrated schools, a strong black educational system thrived in Cincinnati. Black parents and educators believed that integrated schools were unable to provide an adequate education for or address the needs of their children. Although some black Cincinnatians argued that segregation would regress from improving race relations, institutions like the Harriet Beecher Stowe School and the Frederick Douglass School offered black students a quality education provided by black teachers that was “a source of racial pride and community concern” for social, political, and economic self-uplift. These schools were widely popular among African American parents. For instance, the Stowe school grew in student enrollment from 650 in 1915 to 2,800 by 1925. 

With black migrants continuing to settle Cincinnati in the early 1900s, Taylor argues that the city became increasingly segregated. Because racial discrimination often relegated African Americans to the bottom rung of the socio-economic ladder, increasing residential costs combined with racial prejudice led “zoning laws, building codes, city planning, and subdivision regulations…to the formation of a black ghetto-
slum in Cincinnati.”^36 With better paying industrial jobs and developing infrastructure, white workers began leaving the city’s Lower Basin moving into the surrounding hilltop neighborhoods by the early 1900s. White flight in Cincinnati opened housing, although typically poor quality, for the increasing black population. Moving into the 1920s, Taylor argues that this demographic shift created the segregated slum in which much of Cincinnati’s black population resided.^38 As more black migrants settled in the Basin area, residential and housing reform movements began as what historian Robert B. Fairbanks argues was concern by city officials “with ordering and regulating what was perceived as the chaos of the slums.”^39 In doing so, affordable housing was eliminated, leaving few options for low-income black families.^40

According to historian William W. Griffin, approximately 78% of Cincinnati’s black population was situated in seven wards by the 1920s.^41 Despite residential segregation in Cincinnati, Griffin argues that a black concentrated population created what sociologists St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Clayton termed in the 1940s as “Black Metropolises.”^42 Where historians have regularly used ghetto as a term to emphasize
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the plight of segregation in cities, the black metropolis reflects the agency in community
development, business-building, and educational advancement achieved by African
Americans within an oppressive society. Within the metropolis many black
establishments—churches, social welfare agencies, financial institutions, schools, and
business—thrived as they catered exclusively to the surrounding black community.43
With such growth and measured successes, Cincinnati’s black population began
expanding beyond the Lower Basin into adjacent communities between 1920 and 1940.
The West End, Avondale, Walnut Hills, Eden Park, and Mt. Adams were predominantly
African American residential and commercial areas.44 This growth continued into the
1940s as World War II industries further attracted black migrants to Cincinnati.

Between 1940 and 1970, Cincinnati’s black population grew from 55,593 to
156,075.45 Industrial jobs during WWII brought many migrants into the city. White
Cincinnatians continued moving to newly developed neighborhoods as black residents
continued to largely remain in the city’s center and adjacent area of Avondale and
Walnut Hills. By 1960, argues historian Charles F. Casey-Leininger, Avondale and
Walnut Hills were firmly segregated black neighborhoods due to migration, urban
redevelopment that cleared Lower Basin homes, white flight, and residential


discrimination in newly developed areas.\textsuperscript{46} As in many urban areas in the United States, Cincinnati’s residential zones often resembled school districts in the mid-twentieth century. By the 1950s, black teachers still had difficulties entering integrated schools and were paid considerably less than their white counterparts.\textsuperscript{47} For African Americans, attitudes about segregation remained mixed, but many black parents and educators supported this system so long that all schools were equally funded. However, this was not the case. Cincinnati’s school board was accused by local black leaders and the NAACP for perpetuating a separate and unequal system in the 1963 case \textit{Tina Deal et al. v. the Cincinnati Board of Education}. In 1965, District Federal Judge John W. Peck sided with the school board upholding \textit{de facto} segregation in Cincinnati schools.\textsuperscript{48} The NAACP appealed the case without success. Despite setbacks in reversing school segregation, local and national organizations continued applying pressures into the late 1960s and beyond.

From the nineteenth to the twentieth century, Cincinnati’s population growth and economic gains were intertwined with, and often guided by, racial politics. Discrimination was evident through residential and educational segregation, limitations placed on employment opportunities, and barriers implemented on political participation. Coinciding with this growth was the increasing concern over crime and juvenile delinquency. This concern often reflected national perceptions that juveniles were
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rejecting adult authority and plagued by social ills often associated with mass culture, war, and industrialized urban growth. As tensions flared over race relations in Cincinnati during the mid-twentieth century, white Cincinnatians often associated delinquency with racial unrest, civil rights actions, and the Black Power Movement. As juvenile delinquency gained more attention into the twentieth century, Cincinnati officials in government, police, and education implemented strategies to combat the problem. Ultimately, this attention led to school-police partnerships, a phenomenon that began in the late 1950s and spread throughout major cities during the late twentieth century.

“Social Dynamite” in Cincinnati: Responses to Juvenile Delinquency in the Queen City, 1900-1960

“The existence in the slums of our large cities of thousands of youth between sixteen and twenty-one who are both out of schools and out of work,” stated James B. Conant, “is an explosive situation…it is social dynamite.” As Harvard University’s former president and an education scholar, this statement directly addressed the disproportionately high rate of urban youth, specifically African American, who faced limited opportunities, racial discrimination, and deteriorating economic and educational conditions in American cities. These conditions, Conant stated, contributed to increasing rates of delinquent activity. Improving economic conditions and addressing racial inequality were necessary in defusing tensions and reducing the juvenile problem. To do this, Conant recommended improving urban public education and increasing federal involvement. Schools should reflect the community’s economic opportunities to prepare


youth for industrial and urban employment.\textsuperscript{51} In support, federal intervention could alleviate hiring restrictions by addressing racial discrimination among employers and unions.\textsuperscript{52}

Conant’s attention to opportunity and discrimination was only one of several arguments used to explain and solve the juvenile delinquency problem many U.S. cities were experiencing during the twentieth century. Educators and civic leaders often viewed the public school as a solution. Preparing students for economic success in a modern world while addressing severe inequalities was a viable solution. Other approaches to solve delinquency came in the form of school-police partnerships starting in the 1950s. Beginning in Flint, Michigan and spreading across the country, most partnerships resembled the School Resource Officer (SRO) model. SROs were placed in schools to monitor and counsel students. By 1965, Cincinnati schools began their own variation of these programs. Breaking from the SRO model, a joint project between educators and police developed a school curriculum aimed at teaching students about law enforcement. Although this approach differed from other programs, Cincinnati’s action aligned with the school-police partnership phenomenon beginning in the mid-twentieth century. This movement responded to juvenile delinquency rates during that period, but did so in ways that continued to marginalize minority and low-income youth.

Cincinnati’s delinquency rate paralleled other urban centers. Overall, crime in cities increased throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century especially among persons under the age of 18. Cincinnati officials blamed this rise in delinquency on

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 112.
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poverty, deteriorating living conditions, overcrowding, limited opportunities, the Great Depression, WWII, mass culture, and the breakdown of the family. While increasing population and wealth came to Cincinnati during the early 1900s, so too did societal challenges. Specifically, law enforcement, community, and school officials were concerned with trends in juvenile delinquency and youth-related crimes. By 1910, Cincinnati’s population reached 363,591, an 11.6% increase from 1900. As Cincinnati grew, so too did instances of crime and delinquency. For example, the Juvenile Court of Hamilton County witnessed a “long time upward trend” in complaints received from 1927 to 1939. The 1930 Census indicated that Cincinnati’s Basin was the chief source of this trend. The Basin—heavily populated by low-income workers, African Americans, and recent immigrants—suffered from overcrowding due to increasing populations and residential segregation.

A 1940 study conducted by the Cincinnati Community Chest—a philanthropic and social welfare organization—argued that overcrowding in the Basin possibly “contributed to the increase in delinquency” and that this rate was higher among African American juveniles as compared to whites. To understand the cause, the report suggested that an increase in police officers and the “diligence in arresting juvenile offenders” during the late 1930s may have correlated to the juvenile arrest rate, but evidence was found
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to be inconclusive.\textsuperscript{56} In Cincinnati, the first significant increase in delinquency came at the outset of the Great Depression. Only 4\% of total crime in 1929 was committed by persons under 18. By 1939, this number increased to 14\%.\textsuperscript{57} The report concluded that a growing population or changing police practices did not directly cause a surge in delinquency. However, a rise in juvenile cases occurred “because of general adverse economic and social conditions combined at times with grossly inadequate relief during the depression period.”\textsuperscript{58} Linking poverty to crime was not a nuanced hypothesis. Nineteenth century benevolent child savers had argued that poverty often led urban youth toward a life of vice and delinquency. \textsuperscript{59} Despite this connection, the Community Chest did not address race in its report.

Like other cities, residential segregation and economic discrimination against African Americans was common practice in Cincinnati. Before the Depression, black Cincinnatians were typically relegated to lower paying jobs and denied access to labor unions.\textsuperscript{60} Economic gains made before the 1930s were quickly rolled back during the Depression, as African Americans were frequently the first employees fired and often bypassed for white workers in menial labor jobs traditionally reserved for blacks.\textsuperscript{61} Discrimination and segregation often led to a cycle of poverty, as opportunities were

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 14.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 20
\item \textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 20-21.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Bunch-Lyons, \textit{Contested Terrain}, 119.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
limited. If delinquency was linked to poverty and poor living conditions as suggested by the Community Chest report, then underlying racial oppression was arguably the cause.

Looking further at delinquency rates, the Cincinnatus Association—a community social welfare organization—published a study in 1942. The study notes that since 1927, “the number of juveniles arrested and charged with delinquent acts has roughly doubled and the delinquency in the slum area has considerably more than doubled.”62 By 1940, approximately 63% of delinquency cases were from the Basin area.63 Diverging from the Community Chest study, the Cincinnatus Association argued that overcrowding, substandard housing, and “the depression with its resultant breakdown in family life and family responsibility” caused delinquency.64 Furthermore, the study argued that juvenile courts, corrections, or social services alone could not reduce delinquency. These agencies were merely treating delinquency’s symptoms. Cincinnati would need to improve health and living conditions in its poorest areas—the Basin—to help foster opportunities that would then reduce crime among adolescents. Once these conditions improved, the “social and moral well-being of children” would not be jeopardized.65

Efforts were made to address the Basin’s deteriorating conditions during the 1930s and 1940s. In 1933, the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA) submitted a proposal to the Public Works Administration requesting funds to redevelop six city blocks. In 1937, after Congress passed the Housing Act that year, the CMHA

---

63 Ibid.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid., 12.
was granted funds for three separate redevelopment projects. However, historian
Robert Fairbanks argues that Cincinnati redevelopment overwhelmingly benefited white
populations and did not “address the problem of insufficient shelter for the city’s
neediest.”66 There was little effort to replenish affordable residential options once poor
and substandard housing had been eliminated.67 This action placed further limitations
on Cincinnati’s poor, immigrant, and African American populations.

Juvenile crime flourished during the 1940s. In total, Cincinnati crime rates had
decreased during World War II. However, a 1940 report compiled by the Cincinnati
Police Bureau of Records showed that although juveniles—people under 18 years of
age—“comprised less than 20% of the city’s inhabitants,” they were responsible for
disproportionately high rates of certain crimes when compared with adults.68 For police
and city officials, this increase was indicative of a “youth problem.”69 For example, there
were 1,328 total arrests for larceny in 1939. Juveniles accounted for 535 (40.3%) of
these arrests. Likewise, there were 181 arrests made for auto theft the same year.
Juveniles accounted for 88 (48.6%) of these arrests. Furthermore, there were 619
burglary arrests with 376 (60.7%) committed by juveniles.70
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The report also accounted for sex and race when compiling juvenile crime records. Of the 2,423 juvenile arrests in 1939, 2,122 (87.6%) were committed by males and 301 (12.4%) were committed by females.\textsuperscript{71} White boys comprised 43.3% of Cincinnati’s total youth population, but 1,211 (50.4%) were arrested for juvenile crimes in 1939. White girls comprised 43.7% of the total youth population with 206 (8.5%) being arrested that year. African American girls comprised 6.7% of the total youth population, and 95 (3.9%) arrests. Although white boys made up a larger overall percentage of arrests, the report stated that the youth crime problem was “undoubtedly the colored boy” who although only made up 6% of the total youth population, accounted for 37.2% of juvenile arrests.\textsuperscript{72} These statistics give insight into how local officials and agencies responded to the youth problem.

Recognizing that the juvenile justice system was ineffective in deterring youth crime, efforts were refocused on preventative programs by the late 1930s. Cincinnati’s West End–part of the Basin–adopted the Boy’s Club to provide males with a supervised space and activities–art, music, games, sports–to occupy leisure time. By providing this service to underprivileged boys, the program “hoped to win over some from the delinquent side of the ledger to the side of good citizenship.”\textsuperscript{73} Moving to the mid-twentieth century, approaching delinquency transitioned from punitive to preventative with the idea that modeling good behavior and providing supervised leisure time was
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the answer to solving the youth problem. Many programs often targeted boys giving less attention to female offenders.

Police records indicate that local concern about delinquency was not solely based on a perceived crisis, but supported by statistical evidence. Despite overall crime decreasing, juvenile arrests had increased. Although this report identifies arrest rates and highlights programs directed at males, it does not offer understanding or insight into why African American youth accounted for a disproportionately high arrest rate. From 1939 to 1941, juvenile arrests decreased from 15.1% to 10.1%.\(^4\) Cincinnati Police Chief Eugene Weatherly attributed this decline to the success of the Boy’s Club Movement. Even though prevention became an accepted approach to delinquency, police and officials did not address inequality, which only perpetuated the perceived youth problem among African American boys.

During the first half of the twentieth century black Cincinnatians confronted the problems—poverty, discrimination, substandard housing, and crime—that plagued their communities. Historian Andrea Tuttle Kornbluh highlights James Hathaway Robinson’s organizing accomplishments to address these problems by encouraging civic engagement in the larger metropolitan community.\(^5\) Educated at Fisk, Yale, and Columbia, Robinson was a sociologist and activist who began working for the Cincinnati Council of Social Agencies in 1917. Robinson surveyed black residents to understand living conditions in Cincinnati’s Basin area. Discovering that residential segregation had


relegated black Cincinnatians to the poorest conditions, Robinson organized the Negro Civic Welfare Committee (NCWC) to help develop and manage programs addressing community needs and working toward racial harmony. Robinson believed that discrimination and unrest between blacks and whites resulted from ignorance between the two groups. Robinson and the NCWC held the Annual Negro Music Festivals during the 1930s and 1940s as an organized effort to promote black culture to all Cincinnatians. Through education, Robinson saw a path to peace and equality that would also resolve black Cincinnatians’ most pressing difficulties.\(^{76}\) Despite these efforts, problems persisted into the post-World War II era.

Cincinnati experienced a mass population influx during World War II and the immediate postwar years. Increased opportunities from war industries, an expanding economy, and fleeing the Jim Crow South brought many African American workers to the Queen City. As the population grew in this period, white flight to Cincinnati’s expanding suburbs opened residential options previously closed to African Americans. The West End remained heavily populated by new migrants, but in the postwar era Walnut Hills and South Avondale became known as the “second black ghetto;” a term reflecting white Cincinnati’s continued racial prejudice.\(^{77}\) This population growth was not unique to Cincinnati. Many industrialized cities in the Midwest and Northeast experienced a similar influx. With growth came increased racial tension. For instance, race riots erupted in Detroit during July of 1943. Wanting to quell any potential violence,
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many cities “rushed to form race relations or intergroup relations committees.”

Cincinnati’s response was the Mayor’s Friendly Relations Committee (MFRC) formed in 1943.

Supported by Cincinnati politicians and black civic leaders, the MFRC operated under a pluralistic vision “aimed to promote tolerance for cultural group diversity” by targeting discrimination as potential causes of injustice and violence. Cincinnati Mayor James G. Stewart met with black leaders in July shortly after the Detroit race riots. Local NAACP members—Harold Snell, Sadie Samuels, and William Lovelace—recommended that Mayor Stewart meet with various community organizations, business owners, educators, and churches to gain perspective about the effects of discrimination on black Cincinnatians. Although the mayor’s response was slow, a meeting was eventually held in October 1943. During the meeting, speakers highlighted America’s fight in WWII for democracy and how this contradicted the injustice that people of color experienced in their own country. By November, the City Council approved the MFRC.

Partnering with the Urban League, Jewish Community Relations Committee, NAACP, the Conference of Christians and Jews, and local businesses, the MFRC investigated the racial discrimination that limited opportunities in education, housing, and business for black Cincinnatians that many perceived as the underlying causes of poverty and crime. Although preventing delinquency was not the MFRC’s primary
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objective, attempts to alleviate social tension and work towards equality indirectly addressed youth crime. For instance, the MFRC worked with the local Parent Teacher Association to ease racial and religious tensions. Following a December 1946 conference series for Cincinnati teachers conducted by the Bureau for Intercultural Education, the MFRC urged area PTA groups to cooperate with teachers to train students “in the path of greater unity in community relations” and help solve “school and neighborhood situations.”\textsuperscript{82} The MFRC also promoted courses on race relations for police officers after investigations into police brutality had been issued in 1947. In July of that year, Safety Director Oris E. Hamilton investigated Detective Fred Ruck for allegedly beating Alfred R. Cooper on two occasions without provocation. A similar investigation had been opened in June of 1947 accusing two officers of assaulting Haney Bradley.\textsuperscript{83} Furthermore, The MFRC worked to ensure access to recreation facilities—swimming pools and playgrounds—for all children regardless of race or religion, and discussed human relations with preservice teachers at the University of Cincinnati.\textsuperscript{84}

Although local government and various organizations promoted cooperation and unity among Cincinnati’s citizens, juvenile delinquency during the 1950s did not seem to ease. In 1949, the Hamilton County Juvenile Court processed approximately 3,679

\textsuperscript{82} Mary D. Bradstreet, “PTA Cooperation Is Sought By Friendly Relations Group,” \textit{The Cincinnati Enquirer} (Cincinnati, OH), December 8, 1946.

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{The Cincinnati Enquirer} “Inquiry Ordered By Hamilton,” \textit{The Cincinnati Enquirer} (Cincinnati, OH), July 18, 1947.

individual juvenile delinquency complaints. By 1950, there were 21,411 total arrests with 1,777 (8.3%) being juveniles. By 1958, total arrests increased to 24,222 with 3,429 (14.1%) being juveniles.\textsuperscript{85} In Cincinnati, the Juvenile Court system typically handled delinquency and crime. The Boys and Girls Department was responsible for offenders between the ages of 12 and 18. Any child offenders under age 12 were directed to the Children’s Registry. Assisted by social organizations—The Boy’s Club, YMCA, and Police Department sponsored athletic clubs—juvenile offenders were “handled as a social problem rather than in a strictly legal sense.”\textsuperscript{86} In cases where children were removed from the home, the court system placed delinquent offenders in the Juvenile Detention Home. Approximately 2,000 residents were “supervised and studied” by psychologists each year.\textsuperscript{87} According to the Hamilton County Juvenile Court system, delinquency resulted from “hasty marriages, military service and movement of people from rural to industrial areas.”\textsuperscript{88} To address family problems, the Juvenile Court System provided services to help “estranged couples regarding care and support of children.”\textsuperscript{89} While Cincinnati officials and organizations made efforts to address the juvenile problem, the court system was designed to treat the symptoms of delinquency instead of addressing the causes.
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During the spring of 1954, the Cincinnati City Council was “brought to its attention the matter of an apparently increasing problem of unacceptable and illegal behavior among a certain portion of the young people of the city.” By May of that year, the City Council proposed that the mayor select a five-member committee charged with investigating Cincinnati’s juvenile crime problem. The bi-racial, all-male committee comprised of two principals, a business man and Big Brother supporter, a PTA officer, and a reverend was assembled by June. Working with a diverse group of professional and community consultants—sociologists, child psychologists, law enforcement, health and welfare agencies, and church groups—the committee believed that “juvenile delinquency in the greater Cincinnati area is essentially a problem to be solved by the government services financed by Hamilton County.” In the committee’s view, delinquency was a public concern and therefore a public responsibility to solve.

By December of 1955, the Citizens Committee of Juvenile Delinquency released a report from its first year. The report acknowledged that juvenile delinquency and crime was a problem for only a small portion of youth in Cincinnati, but that this group was increasing. The report pointed to the complex societal problems that challenged adolescents. Echoing previous studies, the committee argued that changing family life, underprivilege, overcrowding, altering cultural norms, and international conflict caused delinquency. The committee also claimed that a juvenile's environmental experiences contributed to delinquency. For instance, mimicking parents or the adults in their
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immediate proximity caused children to view delinquency as acceptable even if the copied behavior was “out of step with the expectations of the larger society.” The committee also acknowledged that youth rebellion against injustice—racial discrimination, for example—could be construed as delinquency and recognized that activism was “in part, the product of society’s failure.” This constituted a brief admission that resistance to an unjust society was not entirely the fault of the juvenile.

The committee defined delinquency “as a disease is isolated in the scientist’s test tube and then provide a means of diagnosing those who were susceptible or had contracted it that we might hope for a sure and speedy cure.” Legally, the Revised Code of the State of Ohio defined delinquency as persons under the age of eighteen who violated the law, disobeyed adult authority, was habitually disobedient, was truant from school, endangered self or others, and attempted to marry without consent. Agreeing with Ohio’s official statement, the committee also recognized that delinquency varied by location. For instance, “a child who feeds pigeons” in one city may be a delinquent, while in another city “might get an award from the S.P.C.A.” Variations, per the report, may result from a police department’s available resources and priority devoted to delinquency. Because delinquency was typically tracked by law enforcement or Juvenile Court records, statistics only reflected those juveniles who were caught and may not be an accurate representation.
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The committee recommended community actions—some already in existence—to defend against the delinquency problem. First, the committee believed that a stable environment—including the home, church, school, recreation—was essential in fostering nondelinquent behavior and that “the attitude of parents toward their children is of primary importance in the origin of problems of children.”98 Second, schools were responsible for supporting parental efforts to “nurture the child’s personality growth or even sometimes of supplying the nourishment lacking in the home.”99 Per the committee, the school was responsible for developing children into good citizens through not only training students for a future occupation, but to teach self-governance, and “imbue them with a sense of values based on patterns other than the satisfaction of instincts.”100 To promote these values, the committee suggested that schools should be responsible for detecting early indications of delinquency among students. The third recommendation acknowledged law enforcement’s role in deterring delinquency. The Youth Aid Bureau processed juvenile complaints. The Juvenile Court was responsible for a juvenile’s criminal status. Correctional institutes, such as training schools and the Hamilton Welfare Department, would “retrain dependent, neglected and delinquent boys and girls committed…by the Juvenile Court so that they will be able to overcome their poor start in life and grow into normal, self-respecting men and women.”101 From this report it is apparent that the committee placed the responsibility of addressing
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delinquency on the family, community, school and law enforcement. This was not a new idea by the 1950s. Progressive era reformers contended that schools, community organizations, and law enforcement were central to solving delinquency. This trajectory led to a more defined and purposeful relationship between police and schools.

The Juvenile Committee shared common views of delinquency with other law enforcement agencies at the time. In the 1950s, law enforcement publications highlighted the seriousness of juvenile delinquency in the United States. One example, Raymond E. Clift’s *A Guide to Modern Police Thinking*, argued that the juvenile’s “emotional and environmental” condition “in conflict with one another, and with society” was often cited as the source of delinquency.¹⁰² Specifically, police and court officers presumed that a poor family life and a broken home were typically the primary causes. Law enforcement often argued that divorce rates, lacking structure and discipline mixed with absent love and attention created an unstable environment in which youth were more susceptible to delinquent behavior.¹⁰³ Furthermore, many adults believed that popular culture portraying crime, sex, and violence motivated youth rebellion.¹⁰⁴ Lastly, police believed that the ever-present threat of war, “especially the kind that threatens to obliterate civilization,” encouraged “a philosophy of ‘eat, drink, and be merry’ among…young people.”¹⁰⁵ It is evident that societal pressures caused delinquency


¹⁰³ Ibid., 222.


among America’s youth and police viewed themselves as agents in solving this problem.

Clift argued that a decrease in the use of foot patrolmen had broken close ties between police and the community and was a potential cause for increased delinquency. The patrolman could “get to know all the boys on his beat and become a hero in their eyes.”\textsuperscript{106} The car patrolman became more common in cities throughout the mid-1900s replacing the foot patrolman and limiting direct contact with kids and the community. Although arguing that a positive relationship between law enforcement and juveniles was important, Clift acknowledged that police should not “be misled into a belief that there is a panacea for our delinquency ills.”\textsuperscript{107} In other words, police were essential in solving the delinquency problem, but not the lone solution. Ultimately, Clift emphasized the necessity to identify delinquent tendencies among children early: arguing that “the conduct of a child in the early years of school may be a significant harbinger as to what his future will be like.”\textsuperscript{108} By the mid-1900s child behavior in schools increasingly became the focal point for police intervention. In Cincinnati, this was made evident by the Hamilton County Services for Delinquent Children that encouraged identifying delinquent children early through partnerships among law enforcement, juvenile courts, and schools.\textsuperscript{109}
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Between 1960 and 1965, Cincinnati’s juvenile arrest rate increased from 12.6% to 15.7% of the total persons arrested. This percentage had gradually increased in comparison to the total arrest rate from the early 1900s to the 1960s. For Cincinnati, this trend signified a juvenile problem that was associated with industrial and urban growth during the twentieth century. Law enforcement and city officials often cited overcrowding, poverty, broken homes, cultural shift, and war as the causes for this phenomenon. Regardless of whether this crisis was imagined or real, Cincinnati officials looked toward the juvenile court system and community organizations to deter delinquency during the early twentieth century.

Despite these efforts, little success was made in reversing the trend. By the early 1940s, more attention was given to racial discrimination by Cincinnati’s civic organizations. The Mayor’s Friendly Relations Committee (MFRC) acknowledged that economic and residential discrimination limited black opportunity, but no apparent connection was made to increasing numbers of African American children being arrested for juvenile crime. Into the 1950s and 1960s, police and educators increasingly viewed schools as potential agents in subsiding delinquency. Relying on schools for moral and behavioral training was not a new concept. The mid-19th century common schools and turn of the century Progressive schools had been among the first public institutions that addressed the perceived social ills emanating from urban development, immigration, and industrialization. However, prior to the 1950s, schools were typically not regarded as a solution to deterring youth crime specifically. This change came at a

time when solely relying on law enforcement to reverse delinquency was deemed insufficient. Since the late 1800s, police, juvenile courts, and youth detention centers collaborating with social workers had been the primary agents in combating delinquency. By the late 1950s and into the 1960s, this responsibility expanded to include public schools. By 1965, Cincinnati schools joined other cities like Flint and Tucson to deter delinquency actively through the Police-Juvenile Attitude Project.

Responding to Delinquency or Black Activism? Cincinnati’s Police-Juvenile Attitude Project, 1965-1968

“Does the Cincinnati school system,” asked a 1964 Better Schools editorial, “have a Constitutional obligation to balance the races in its schools?” The article was referencing Tina Deal et al. vs Cincinnati Board of Education filed November 6, 1963 charging that the board was operating racially segregated schools in Cincinnati violating the 1954 Brown decision ending legal segregation. In September 1963, two second grade and two third grade classes were bussed from Evanston Elementary School—predominantly black—to Oakley Elementary School, a white school. Per the school board, bussing was necessary to relieve overcrowding at Evanston. School overcrowding was a persistent problem as Cincinnati expanded in the 1960s. Local whites including the National Association for the Advancement of White People (NAAWP) openly opposed publicized bussing. The NAAWP had protested the school
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board since August before bussing was finalized.\textsuperscript{113} The Evanston children remained in racially segregated classes while attending Oakely. Upon learning of this, parents contacted the local NAACP to demand that their students be integrated. After the school board refused to comply with these demands, the NAACP filed suit in November.

In the lawsuit, plaintiffs argued that Cincinnati schools violated the 14\textsuperscript{th} Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause alleging “discrimination and segregation by defendants.”\textsuperscript{114} They sought “injunctive relief and declaration of rights with regard” to arbitrary school zones, teachers segregated by race, new school construction reflecting racial segregation, unequal facilities and overcrowding in black schools, and the right to attend integrated schools.\textsuperscript{115} The Cincinnati School Board maintained that schools were not legally segregated, but argued that “housing patterns determine the proportion of pupils of a given race or ethnic group in a school” and that it was “unwise” to “control artificially the proportion of children” in schools.\textsuperscript{116} School segregation had been outlawed in Ohio under the 1886 Public Accommodations Law. However, this law was largely unenforced and did not dictate how school districts were zoned. School districts in Cincinnati were based on residential patterns. Because of \textit{de facto} residential segregation, schools were racially imbalanced.

The same month that the NAACP filed suit against the Cincinnati Board of Education, a report on race relations was released by the MFRC. Although the report


\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 3.
did not reference the lawsuit directly, it stated that “1963 will be recorded in American history as the year of the great explosion in the demand for human rights and freedom.”

The report—a ten-month evaluation on local government’s response to civil rights—explained that this struggle was not spontaneous, but that unrest had been “visible for a long, long time.” The report stated that court decisions—particularly school desegregation cases—were “without a doubt the catalyst of today’s social revolution.”

The MFRC recommended that a Human Relations Commission be established in Cincinnati to maintain peace and oversee issues of discrimination in employment, housing, education, and public accommodations. One of the primary goals of this new agency was to address de facto segregation, learning gaps, and creating a more culturally inclusive curriculum in Cincinnati’s public schools.

By January of 1964, local black activists working with the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), drafted a letter to the Superintendent of Cincinnati Schools. Stating that racial discrimination existed in Cincinnati, CORE demanded that a biracial committee be appointed to the board of education to dismantle segregation. The superintendent refused sparking a schoolwide boycott sponsored by CORE and endorsed by the Cincinnati NAACP. On February 11, 1964, approximately 18,000 (35%)
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students participated in the boycott. By 1965, the United States District Court ruled in favor of the school board finding that any racial imbalance in Cincinnati was not intentional and therefore not violating the law.\textsuperscript{123}

The NAACP’s lawsuit and the subsequent boycott reflected racial tensions in Cincinnati during the 1960s. As African Americans vigorously fought against racial injustice, Cincinnati’s governing bodies were both actively maintaining segregation and pursuing methods to manage impending civil rights actions. The MFRC—eventually becoming the Human Relations Commission—was a multiracial agency seeking to quell violence and unrest, but had limited success.\textsuperscript{124} The Cincinnati School Board argued that it was not upholding legal discrimination, but also opposed actions to disrupt \textit{de facto} segregation at the time. These events provide the contextual background from which Cincinnati’s school-police partnership emerged in 1965.

In the spring of 1965 Robert Portune, then a doctoral student in the College of Education at the University of Cincinnati, completed his dissertation “An Analysis of the Attitudes of Junior High School Pupils toward Police Officers.” Portune surveyed 1,000 junior high students from Cincinnati schools to measure how adolescents perceived law and police officers. Likewise, Portune measured the attitudes of area police officers when questioned about adolescents. His findings indicated that “junior high students displayed an alarming ignorance of the function and mission of law enforcement in a
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democratic society” and that school curricula deprived students of this knowledge.\textsuperscript{125} The study further indicated that 9\textsuperscript{th} graders had “poorer attitudes toward police” than 7\textsuperscript{th} graders.\textsuperscript{126} Portune believed that contact between police and adolescents played a major factor in attitude development and that opinions of police varied with respect to age, grade, sex, race, school achievement, church attendance, and socioeconomic status. From surveying police, Portune found similar adverse reactions and concluded that a “mutual ignorance” existed among adolescents and law officers.\textsuperscript{127} To address this ignorance and foster positive attitudes from each group, Portune recommended that curricula be developed for both public junior high schools and police academies.

Portune contended that it was the school’s responsibility to foster good citizenship and that having a positive attitude toward law enforcement was an essential trait. Therefore, he argued that schools were responsible for teaching about law and police. Because Cincinnati schools did not teach about the police, the University of Cincinnati’s College of Education, directed by Portune, spearheaded a curriculum development project that provided lesson plans, teaching materials, and evaluations regarding law enforcement to Cincinnati public junior high schools. With the goal to improve relations between police and juveniles to reduce delinquency, Cincinnati schools working with local law enforcement collaborated with Portune to develop “curriculum materials for both junior high schools and the police academy to supply the
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knowledge that seemed to be lacking on both sides." For funding, the project team applied for a Law Enforcement Assistance Act (LEAA) grant. Enacted in 1965, LEAA was a federal program providing funds to local and state level law enforcement projects to spur innovative ideas in lowering U.S. crime rates. LEAA funded Tucson’s School Resource Officer program as well other school-police partnerships throughout the 1960s. By June, LEAA granted $62,678 to Cincinnati’s curriculum experiment. With funding, the project was underway at the University of Cincinnati.

On August 29, 1966, the National Conference on Early Adolescent Attitudes toward Police was held at the University of Cincinnati. Ten juvenile officers recommended by the International Association of Chiefs of Police and ten junior high curriculum developers recommended by the National Association of Secondary Principals attended the three-day event co-sponsored by the university and Cincinnati Police. Two of the officers—Lieutenant Kenneth Ice of Tucson and Lieutenant William Schonesen of Minneapolis—were recommended by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance because each was part of a school-police partnerships funded by LEAA. Teachers were matched with the cities that participating officers were from to promote programs in their home cities. Other participants included professionals from law enforcement, education, sociology and child psychology. Together, the forty conference attendees had a dual objective: to define “early adolescent attitudes toward police” and establish “basic criteria for curriculum units, materials, and methodology aimed at the formation of favorable attitudes toward law enforcement and the law enforcement
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officer.” This framework would be used to create curriculum experimented in select Cincinnati schools.

During the conference, scholars and law officers presented data to assist in developing the framework. Looking closer at these presenters and the information shared helps in understanding the specific concerns educators and police had regarding juvenile delinquency. During Portune’s presentation, he argued that attitudes varied by individual traits. For instance, younger students had a more favorable attitude toward police than older students, girls were more favorable than boys, white students more favorable than black students, higher achieving students more than lower achieving students, higher church attendance more favorable than lower church attendance, and higher socioeconomic status were more favorable compared to lower groups. Portune, however, did not offer explanations. For instance, there was no analysis of why African American students tended to have a less favorable attitude toward police. Given the racial tensions between black and white Cincinnatians perpetuated by discrimination, the police often represented the enforcement of white supremacy to African Americans. Combined with instances of police brutality and an unequal legal system, unfavorable attitudes toward police had extensive historical roots. Portune’s data did not occur in a vacuum and needed context that was absent from the conference reports.

Dr. Lester Guest, a Pennsylvania State University psychology professor, also addressed the conference. In his presentation, Guest made recommendations on how
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curricula could be implemented to change adolescent attitudes. Guest argued that curriculum should be designed to “teach attitudes, rather than have them develop incidentally.” To do this, teaching materials and lessons should be geared toward specific conclusions. For instance, changing attitudes required teachers to create “a favorable image” of police, “provide for experiences calculated to enhance change of attitude in the direction you wish,” and to guide “the individual to take a public stand in the desired direction, but not force the issue until” the teacher agrees with the desired outcome. Guest’s recommendations provided a guideline for indoctrination rather than teaching. The project’s end goal was to encourage favorable attitudes regarding police, but there appeared to be little room for students’ personal experiences—positive or negative—regarding police or room for open discussion exploring why students may have had an unfavorable attitude. Indoctrination is the act of teaching students to accept an idea, in this case an image of police, without question. Following Guest’s recommendations left little room for multiple perspectives, historical context, or constructive criticism regarding law enforcement.

Other presenters included Carey Pace, the President of the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals and Dr. Wendell Pierce, Superintendent of Cincinnati Schools. In his presentation entitled “The Nature of the Early Adolescent,” Pace argued that junior high school students should be the primary targets of attitude change because they were more susceptible to “abandoning the value systems imposed upon them by their parents and teachers, as complex forces within these youngsters compel
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them to become new personalities."\textsuperscript{134} Pace’s presentation reinforced Portune’s stance regarding junior high students. Pierce, providing local context, discussed the “changing nature of the metropolis and the implications of that change for the school and police agency.”\textsuperscript{135} Pierce highlighted the challenges that had strained relations between law enforcement and the larger society. Specifically, urban overcrowding, world conflicts, shifting morals and values, racial tension, and institutional failures needed to be considered when developing curriculum.\textsuperscript{136} Although Pierce encouraged the curriculum team to consider societal challenges, little insight was offered on how to accomplish this goal.

Pierce had been superintendent in 1963 when the NAACP filed suit against the Cincinnati School Board alleging racial segregation when black students were bussed to a white school due to overcrowding. Prior to students being transferred, Pierce “met twice with the Evanston Community Council and agreed in principle to the Negroes’ demand that the…pupils be distributed through Oakley classes.”\textsuperscript{137} However, the students remained segregated within their own classes. Pierce denied accusations about segregation and stated that “classroom assignments for the coming year had been completed…and it would be unfair to both teachers and students there to reshuffle them.”\textsuperscript{138} Pierce’s statement, however, did not address Cincinnati’s long history of racial
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segregation in both housing and public schooling nor the frustrations expressed by African American parents and students experiencing discrimination. For instance, Cincinnati’s school overcrowding problem most affected black students and teachers. Certainly, Pierce’s call for curriculum designers to consider context was necessary, but for Pierce to seemingly defend school segregation suggests that he was not asking the curriculum team to consider race relations from a perspective of the oppressed, but from the oppressor. This was another characteristic of indoctrination.

The conference ended with teachers and police officers creating a five-point framework to guide the curriculum project. Each point provided insight into the perspectives guiding the curriculum. The first four directly addressed knowledge about law enforcement and police image. The fifth explored teaching materials and devices necessary in “shaping favorable attitudes toward police.”139 The team recommended field trips to the police department, classroom visits from officers, and films and reading materials emphasizing a positive image of police work within a democratic society.

The first and third points inquired about what students should learn about law enforcement and explored students’ own personal responsibilities in upholding the law. Regarding the policeman as a person, the team believed that students “should know the policeman as a symbol” of law and that his or her role was “an active arm of society’s protection of itself.”140 Understanding the officer’s role, the framework also stipulated day-to-day tasks and responsibilities making “clear society’s need for law enforcement”
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emphasizing juvenile laws.\textsuperscript{141} Concerning student responsibility, good citizenship was equated with helping police. By supporting officers and upholding the law, students became active participants in their communities. For example, pupils were taught that cooperating with police investigations when necessary was a responsibility of law-abiding citizens.

The second and fourth points emphasized the police image. Should the officer be a friend, an “armed enforcer of the law,” or a combination of the two?\textsuperscript{142} Officers at the conference wanted an explicit image to be conveyed from the curriculum. A policeman was not a friend, and a clear “line of respect, dignity, and authority” must be established.\textsuperscript{143} Police also argued that although they should not be feared by children, officers should be introduced as a highly trained, “carefully selected individual, a representative of the law, entrusted with the task of maintaining law and order,” in a democratic society.\textsuperscript{144} To uphold this image, police were responsible for abiding by official codes of conduct and be knowledgeable about the population—emphasizing juveniles—they served.

Although this was an initial framework designed to guide curriculum development, it is evident that developers were strictly interested in molding student attitudes and not fostering critical thinking or inquiry. The curriculum did not ask students to explore their experiences or previous knowledge regarding police, but
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taught an ideal of what police should be. The curriculum team’s goal did not provide an authentic depiction of police within American society, but an artificial image based on the developers’ own favorable perspectives of law enforcement. The outline only included positive attributes reinforcing police as an authority figure to be respected and unquestioned. By the end of the conference, the guidelines were finalized and ready for development.

Beginning in September 1966, with cooperation from Cincinnati public schools, Archdiocese schools, and Hamilton County public schools, twelve veteran teachers were selected to develop seventh, eighth, and ninth grade curricula for the attitude project. Held at the University of Cincinnati, teachers enrolled in an education graduate course entitled “Curriculum Development Seminar: Law Enforcement Units in the Junior High School.” Dr. Robert Portune was listed as the course instructor, and teachers received three graduate credits for completing the seminar. Expanding on the conference framework, teachers developed three six-week units to be implemented in junior high social studies classes. Each curriculum utilized “a series of coordinated discovery activities such as games, role-playing, and community research” methods. Suggested instructional materials were paired with each unit and day-to-day lessons were outlined for teachers.

By April 1967, the curriculum program was implemented into six Cincinnati junior high schools for a two-week period and six other Hamilton County schools for the full six weeks. The curriculum was designed for six weeks, but Cincinnati teachers demanded
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a more concise program. Portune acknowledged that the condensed curriculum could alter the study's results, but proceeded regardless. In all, 537 students were part of the experimental group. The six Cincinnati junior high schools involved in the program included Cutter, Heinhold, Lyon, Withrow, Ach, and Sawyer.\footnote{147} Looking at the racial breakdown, it appears that the study targeted schools that were integrated or predominantly black. Four schools–Ach, Cutter, Heinhold, and Sawyer–were predominantly African American.\footnote{148}

Portune does not explicitly state why these Cincinnati schools were chosen for the study. There were several predominantly white junior high schools in Cincinnati. For instance, four junior high schools–Eastern Hills, Western Hills, Oyler, and Gamble–reported a less than 1% black population in 1966.\footnote{149} Portune did track for race in his initial juvenile attitude study: the basis for the larger project. In his dissertation, Portune had found that on average African Americans had a less favorable attitude toward police than white students. Portune also reported that students “in high socio-economic categories seem to have a more favorable attitude toward police than do students in lower socio-economic categories.”\footnote{150} Furthermore, police records from previous decades often framed rising delinquency rates not only as a juvenile problem, but as an African American problem. This perception among a mostly white government and
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police force provide some insight into why the Attitude Project targeted black and desegregated schools.

Police records indicated that African American juveniles, despite being a minority population, were arrested at a higher proportion compared to whites. However, comparing juvenile referral rates with arrest rates reveals a possible bias among Cincinnati law enforcement and juvenile justice. For 1966, there were 4,321 (46.4%) referrals and warnings for white males compared to 3,398 (36.5%) for black males. However, black males accounted for 41.9% of juvenile arrests compared to 40.8% of white males.  

There were significantly fewer warnings and referrals for black males, but a slightly higher arrest rate when compared to white males. Black male juveniles only accounted for 12.6% of the population, compared to 37.4% of white male juveniles in 1966.  

Given the placement of the attitude readjustment curriculum in predominantly black schools reveals how mostly white educators, police, and government officials interpreted the juvenile problem: one that was centered in black Cincinnati.

Although a team of teachers developed this curriculum, Portune guided the project and therefore one can presume that his ideological perspective shaped the final product. Because curricula are designed to have a desired outcome, they often reflect “a larger value matrix.”
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is arguably a form of acculturation shaping student perception. Additionally, it is necessary to consider the explicit, implicit, and null curricula that schools teach. The specific and public objectives, knowledge, and skills listed in a course syllabus or lesson plan encompass the explicit curriculum. However, the stated objectives are not the only lessons students absorb. For instance, time management, competition, obedience, and social interaction among peers are implicit lessons children learn within a school environment. Last, omitted ideas, perspectives, and knowledge compose the null curriculum. To analyze the purpose of, and values behind, the attitude-adjustment units, it is necessary to consider Portune’s ideological perspective in designing this curriculum.

The seventh-grade unit, entitled “The World of Rules,” introduced students to the concept of natural law and then “progresse[d], by discovery, to man-made rules in the home, at play, and in school.” From there, students applied this knowledge to the community and the policing agencies responsible for enforcing rules. For example, in week one, students were asked to create a list of rules followed in the home. Next, students were asked to identify who made the rules and why. Students then differentiated between man-made home rules and natural laws. Explicitly, this specific lesson taught students the importance of rules. Implicitly, students learned the
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consequences of disobeying rules. In a role-playing activity, students discussed the
dangers of riding a bicycle on a busy roadway and how a rule against such an activity
could prevent one from being injured. During the six-week unit, students expanded
their understanding of rules to the role of police officers in society. By the final week,
students engaged in a class-wide “project designed to reinforce and review the learning”
during the entire unit. Overall, the unit taught students the value of rules in varying
situations and that society needed rules and enforcers to function properly.

The eighth-grade unit, entitled “The World of Games,” allowed students to apply
their knowledge in the form of games. To show the value of rules in a society, students
would “play games without rules” or “unfair and inconsistent rules.” From there,
students were asked to draw parallels between rules and laws in which “game officials
are law enforcement officers.” For example, on the first day students played a game
with no official title or any rules. The teacher distributed various balls—tennis, ping pong,
volleyball, etc.—to students and announced that the game would end in ten minutes. The
teacher made clear that no questions could be asked during the game and that the
winner would receive a prize. The teacher started the timer and yelled “Go!” After ten
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minutes the teacher yelled “Stop” and proceeded to ask the students: “who won”? Acting on the students’ puzzlement, a discussion on improvements and if rules were essential for playing games followed. During the six-week unit, students engaged in various games followed by discussions on consistency, fairness, and the necessity of rules. By the final week, this concept was applied to laws focusing “attention on the police officer as the symbol of enforcement of rules in the Game of Life.” By discussing the role of police officers, students encountered “a favorable image of the police officer” to “cause students to relate positively to the police image.” Overall, the entire unit explicitly reinforced the need for effective laws and police officers for society to function safely and efficiently.

The ninth-grade unit, entitled “The World of Laws,” introduced students “to the idea of a lawless society” moving from the early development of law enforcement to modern practices. Students were asked to not only consider the history of law, but also how law enforcement existed within their own community. For example, on the first day, the teacher opened with a lecture about the necessity of law by providing examples of “short-lived, lawless uprising, of periods in which law was suspended and human beings ‘took the law into their own hands.’” Specifically, teachers were instructed to discuss the Gordon Riots in 1870 London, the 1919 Boston Police Strike, and the 1965
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Watts Riot in Los Angeles. In each instance, unrest and violence were emphasized as products of lawlessness.

During the unit, students discussed how laws and law enforcement helped maintain an ordered and safe society. Various law enforcement agencies were introduced to the students and comparisons were drawn between police and society with referees and sports. For instance, without a referee, players could break the rules without consequences. Likewise, citizens could break the law without police. By the final week, students became acquainted with the benefits—order, safety, structure—that law enforcement provided. From here the lesson focused on how citizens—including students—could contribute to law enforcement. During week six, students engaged in a class-wide project to develop a “Subtracts a Policeman” (SAP) program. The teacher explained that crime could flourish if there was a limited police force. If a patrolman must spend time and resources answering “calls that are the result of foolish actions on the part of youth,” then officers “are subtracted from more serious duties.” Therefore, students could contribute to law enforcement by not being a SAP. As part of the project, students designed a poster listing a SAP’s activities. For example, “A SAP breaks windows in the school building—and helps a robber escape somewhere in the city.” Students then made membership cards and discussed ideas for extending the program school-wide. The curriculum culminated with students applying their knowledge through
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practice. The students, themselves, became indirect agents of law enforcement through responsible citizenship and rejecting delinquent activity.

Explicitly, these curricula aimed to teach students the general principles and necessity of law within a democratic society. Police were depicted as carefully selected and highly trained enforcers of those laws. The student, as a good citizen, was responsible for upholding the law and, indirectly, assisting in law enforcement to protect America’s democracy. Lessons were prescribed with little room for deviation, but it is difficult to know how teachers taught within their individual classrooms. Behind closed doors, interactions between teachers and students remain elusive as limited resources exist. However, it is possible to explore the intent in creating these lessons and the implicit curriculum conveyed.

The curriculum project’s intended goal was to develop “materials for…junior high schools…to supply the knowledge that seemed to be lacking” about law and law enforcement. Ultimately, the goal was to foster among junior high students a favorable attitude toward police officers in efforts to reduce delinquency. Implicitly, students were taught obedience and unquestioned loyalty for law enforcement. Although discussion was part of the lessons, protocols were teacher-directed supplied by prescribed materials, questions, and activities. Opportunities to discuss personal experiences with law enforcement were largely omitted. Student voices, especially those that might tarnish the police image, were silenced. For instance, games were often utilized to teach students about the significance of law in society. Explicitly, students were taught that fair and consistent laws were necessary for the functioning of a free and democratic society. However, these lessons were taught in a vacuum omitting any racial, social, or
political context of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. African American unrest and negative attitudes toward Cincinnati police developed over decades of racial discrimination, segregation, and violence. Ignoring this context implicitly taught students that simply playing by the rules would keep them safe. Lessons were often taught about law as if they existed within an equal society. However, the United States was far from equal in the 1960s. Using the Watts Riot to exemplify a lawless society in teaching ninth graders about the importance of law is an example of the null curriculum. By omitting historical context, students are presented with an image of violent rioters indiscriminately and spontaneously disregarding law placing citizens in danger. However, riots, acts of protest, civil disobedience, and rebellion are displays of resistance against an oppressive society. In the case of Watts, racial tensions erupted into violence due to longstanding dissatisfaction with discrimination in employment, housing, education, and law enforcement. Given that open discussion, student experience, and historical context were omitted from these lessons, the Police-Attitude Curriculum conflicted with the realities of law and law enforcement in American society during the 1960s.

Once the twelve schools completed the experimental curriculum, students were evaluated to measure any change in attitude toward police. According to the study, students “showed conclusively that the experimental injection of the curriculum units in the regular social studies program had brought about significant favorable changes in
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the attitude." However, a closer look at the findings indicates a significantly different outcome based on race. Black students experienced “no significant differences in pre- and post-test means” and only a slightly favorable attitude change when the experimental group was compared to the control students. White students had a measurably significant change toward favorable attitudes. Given the historically tenuous relationship between police and black Cincinnatians, these results are not surprising and indicative of the longstanding problems of racial discrimination and segregation pervading Cincinnati. Despite mixed results, the project coordinators, police, and educators deemed the curriculum a success.

In July of 1966, the University of Cincinnati hosted the National Institute on Early Adolescent Attitudes toward Law Enforcement. At the conference, Portune and project leaders presented the curriculum experiment’s results to educational and police representatives from over fourteen states. Conference attendees were reportedly “enthusiastic” to learn about the experiment and “subsequently, pilot projects in many of the states represented…have been established.” As part of the study, a six-member committee composed of three educators and three police officers conducted an independent evaluation. The committee determined that the study was methodologically sound and that the curriculum fulfilled an existing need in educating students on law and law enforcement. The evaluators stated “the Cincinnati Police-Juvenile Attitude
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Project makes a real contribution toward a long range solution to the problem of the police image in a free, democratic society."\textsuperscript{177} With evidence of the project's advertised success, Cincinnati educators expanded the curriculum to area schools as one of many attempts to reverse juvenile delinquency. By the 1968 school year, approximately 2,000 junior high school students in Cincinnati experienced the attitude-adjustment curriculum.\textsuperscript{178}

\textbf{“Evolution of Disorder”: The Increasing Presence of Police in Cincinnati Schools during the 1960s}

“In an era where people seldom listen to the quiet ones,” opened a \textit{Cincinnati Enquirer} editorial on May 19, 1968, “it is often expedient to make a lot of noise and stir up the masses.”\textsuperscript{179} The article was referring to a series of events occurring in late spring in which approximately 33,000 secondary school students engaged in protest reacting to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s assassination on April 4, 1968. Although the article attributed the immediate juvenile disorder to King’s death, the author ignored the longer history of racial discrimination that informed the unrest.

Cincinnati’s history is a story of oppression and resistance. Although the city outlawed slavery by 1802, free blacks and people fleeing southern bondage faced violent opposition from white Cincinnatians. After the Civil War, the growing black population was denied an equal education until 1887. Despite the end to legal segregation in Ohio, Cincinnati schools remained segregated into the 1960s. Into the
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1900s, black Cincinnatians also faced economic limitations. Overwhelmingly, African Americans were typically relegated to low-paying jobs with little opportunity for advancement. During the 1930s, efforts to rejuvenate Cincinnati’s Basin—one of the few residential areas for African Americans—overwhelmingly benefited white low-income earners. Furthermore, African Americans were often accused of and arrested for crimes at a higher rate than their white counterparts. This was also true for black juveniles which was exemplified by school-police partnerships in predominantly black and integrated schools.

Despite a long history of oppression, African Americans were not passive victims. Withstanding opposition, African Americans—free and enslaved—risked capture, torture, and death fleeing to Cincinnati. Enduring limits to education, black Cincinnatians built and funded their own schools. Although many African Americans were relegated to low-paying jobs, the black metropolis thrived under the segregated society. The height of the Civil Rights Movement is another example of this resistance. Throughout the 1960s, black Cincinnatians fought school segregation. The story of oppression cannot be told without the story of resistance.

From 1965 to 1968, Cincinnati schools and police collaborated on the Cincinnati Police-Juvenile Attitude Project to socialize juveniles into having a favorable perspective of law enforcement. The project’s central aim was to reverse delinquency rates with an explicit focus on African American juveniles. Although project coordinators, educators, and police believed the program to be a success, there was little change among African American students regarding police image. This lack of change resulted from a longer history of discrimination against African Americans in Cincinnati.
During the curricula’s development and implementation, race relations continued to decay. In October of 1967, fights between black and white students “broke out in at least four…city schools.”

Reports indicated that the most violent attacks occurred at Hughes High School on October 11th. In total, twelve teachers and students were injured and six juveniles were arrested. Based on teacher and student accounts, a false fire alarm was pulled at 11:30 that morning. Approximately forty-minutes after the alarm, two female students were pushed in a crowd causing an exchange of words. Two teachers “found the two girls, crying, their books scattered on the floor.” Later that day, two other girls were “beaten when they refused to hand over their money to about 30 girls in a second-floor restroom.” Over the course of the day, more student fights broke out and police were called to monitor the school.

Reactions recorded in *The Cincinnati Enquirer* were mostly from white citizens. One parent told the paper, “the white people aren’t going to put up with this much longer.” Police Chief Jacob Schott told reporters that “marauding bands of Negroes roamed the halls, some of them carrying weapons.” The Chief also reported that upon his arrival he “saw a little white girl being stomped, kicked and beaten by a group
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of 20 Negroes.” Police blamed gangs and the Black Power Movement for the violence. From reports, the two were often conflated. One report claimed that a local black gang called the Aces was responsible for the violence at Hughes. Other reports argued that the civil rights groups CORE and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) were responsible and “attributed to youthful black power elements in the student body.” Reacting to the Hughes incident, teachers and administrators petitioned the school board for increased security measures. In a meeting with school superintendent Paul Miller and the school board, approximately 100 local teachers demanded the use of identification cards, security fences, locked doors, stricter dress codes, clearer establishment of school rules and authority, and use of police. Complying with teacher demands, the school board approved a $150,000 budget the following week to staff and outfit a “seven-man security patrol...in six public high schools.” The School Board also decided to implement a School Resource Officer Program in late October. The Board believed that a police presence would not only add security, but deter delinquency in schools.

*The Cincinnati Enquirer* failed to capture perspectives from African American residents regarding the violence in schools. However, the University of Cincinnati’s *News Record* ran an article on November 3, 1967, specifically seeking black voices.
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The article stated that “much of the racial unrest in the city is fostered by misunderstanding between the races, as exemplified by the recent coverage of the Hughes incident and related to misconceptions of the public in general.”¹⁸⁹ The article further reported on a Newman Center panel discussion on Racial Tension in Cincinnati earlier that week. During the discussion, Dr. Bruce Green—local NAACP chapter president—argued that “the Negro is not seeing any real push of the white community to correct the racial inequities.”¹⁹⁰ For Green, opposition by whites for black equality caused frustration among many African Americans resulting in violence for some.

By spring of 1968, racial tensions remained high. Reacting to Martin Luther King’s assassination in April, Cincinnati students began a series of boycotts and sit-ins resulting in school closures. From April 7th to the 16th, Cincinnati schools closed in remembrance of King, but also for a “cooling off period from disruptions and regular spring recess.”¹⁹¹ During the break, protests continued. On April 11th, the first Inter-City Council was held. The Council was a bi-racial student organization aimed at resolving racial tensions in schools by fostering cooperation between students and school faculty. It conducted a survey among students to voice complaints. Students pointed out the lack of black history in schools, poor school conditions, and objections to suspended black students. Throughout April and into May, protests continued. On April 24th, four black Withrow high school students were arrested. Believed to be agitators, the
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students were reassigned to other schools. In response, peaceful sit-ins were conducted at eight area high schools leading to the suspension of 1,306 students. On May 1st, 117 students were arrested during a protest. By May 2nd, the superintendent agreed to meet with students regarding complaints. The School Board refused student demands to improve school conditions, address issues of discrimination, or include a culturally inclusive curriculum leading to a system-wide boycott on May 6th in which 3,862 students were absent from school. During the boycott, eight Freedom Schools opened temporarily to accommodate protesting students. By May 15th, most suspensions were overturned and protests ended.192

By the end of the decade, a police presence had been firmly established within desegregated and predominantly African American Cincinnati public schools. In junior high schools, the Cincinnati Police-Juvenile Attitude Project implemented a curricular program to socialize students into having a favorable opinion of law enforcement officers. Although the program’s intention was to reduce delinquency by changing attitudes, little shift occurred among minority adolescents. The program did not account for deeper racial problems pervading Cincinnati’s populace. This is evident from the discrimination African Americans experienced from one generation to the next. In October 1967, Cincinnati schools and police implemented a School Resource Officer Program in seven desegregated high schools or schools that had proportionately high African American student body. The SROs’ primary responsibilities were to protect students and teachers from violence, prevent and investigate delinquency, and act as liaison between the community, police, and schools. Although Cincinnati’s school-police
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partnership intended to reduce delinquency, it did so in ways that diminished students’ rights and perpetuated the marginalization of minority and low-income youth.
In the 1950s and 1960s, urban public schools and local police worked together in efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency. Partnerships between these municipal bodies emerged in response to postwar domestic and international challenges to America’s social, economic, cultural and racial order: a caste system that took shape during the nation’s dawning years and persisted into the twentieth century. Benefiting from World War II, middle class America expanded in size, wealth, and influence directing social norms and cultural values. Simultaneously, Civil Rights Movements were intensifying as younger generations of oppressed people were coming of age in postwar America. Through legal and civil action, marginalized populations challenged long established *de jure* and *de facto* residential, economic, political, and educational barriers that protected white, Anglo middle class authority. Developing in urban public schools, municipal leaders, educators, and police from this dominant socio-cultural group implemented school-police partnerships. Although the purpose was to reduce juvenile delinquency, these programs challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.

Mid-twentieth century school-police partnerships existed in various forms, but often shared a similar mission. Flint’s Police School Liaisons, Tucson’s School Resource Officers, and Cincinnati’s Police-Attitude Project intended to prevent juvenile delinquency in their respective communities by teaching students about law and law enforcement, counseling at-risk students, surveilling potential deviant behavior, and promoting a positive police image. By increasing police presence, public schools reaffirmed themselves as agents in socializing urban youth into productive, law-abiding
republican citizens molded by white middle class values. This impulse harkened back to
common school and Progressive Era educational reformers who sought to socialize
mostly immigrant youth in a rapidly urbanizing and industrializing society. In the mid-
twentieth century, public schools were often civil rights battlegrounds where social and
racial turbulence erupted. School-police partnerships emerged in this climate reflecting
white middle class backlash to an increasingly pluralist society in which traditionally
marginalized populations were struggling to gain their democratic freedoms.

Municipal leaders, educators, and police seemingly intended to help the
populations they served through these partnerships. Reducing delinquency and crime
was, for supporters, a worthy cause. Even opponents were not entirely against their
intent. Regardless of social or racial background, many people believed that helping
students to become productive, upstanding citizens aligned with the values of a
democratic public education system. However, it is apparent that an increased police
presence challenged student rights across the socioeconomic and racial spectrum
through questionable, and sometimes unregulated, practices. Moreover, police
presence in public schools challenged educators’ authority as untrained officers often
assumed the role of disciplinarian, teacher, and counselor. Lastly, these partnerships
perpetuated the historic marginalization of people of color and low-income students.
Partnerships were often placed in either newly desegregated schools or those
predominantly populated by racial and ethnic minorities and poorer students.
Furthermore, activist organizations and community members claimed that police
programs often targeted black students. Despite conflicting views from educators,
parents, students, and stakeholders, police presence increased in urban schools throughout the mid- to late-twentieth century.

Through case studies, this dissertation explains how and why school-police partnerships emerged in Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati in the 1950s and 1960s. The overarching purpose is to understand the increasing presence of police in urban public schools: a phenomenon that began in the mid-twentieth century and remains a contentious point in America's contemporary school system. Chapter 6 will compare Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati. Although each city has a distinct history based on regional differences, highlighting their similarities helps to understand the contextual setting that was common among the first school-police partnerships. Additionally, Chapter 6 will examine juvenile delinquency as an urban problem that police, educators, and civic leaders attempted to resolve. Although partnerships varied in style and structure, each had the common goal to prevent delinquency among adolescents in public junior high schools. Lastly, Chapter 6 will identify the social and racial implications for students and educators. To an extent, each partnership was distinct. However, their shared origins, characteristics, and purposes reveal that Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati were representative of the increasing presence of police in urban public schools during the mid- to late-twentieth century.

**Urban Growth and Social Unrest: Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, 1860s-1960s**

The first American school-police partnership was implemented in Flint, Michigan during the 1958/59 school year in response to the city’s juvenile delinquency rates.¹
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Local police, civic leaders, and educators viewed delinquency as an urban byproduct that could be resolved through increased police presence in public schools. Delinquency was not a unique problem to Flint. Many cities throughout the twentieth century reported increased adolescent crime rates. Likewise, reformers in education, sociology, and law enforcement sought various methods to socialize children into productive, law-abiding citizens guided by White Anglo-Saxon Protestant middle class and affluent values. To determine that school-police partnerships began as an urban phenomenon, it is necessary to compare the contextual landscapes in which these programs emerged. Although geographically and demographically different, Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati share a common history of urban and industrial growth during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, American cities experienced periods of rapid economic growth and demographic shift. Advancements in technology allowed industries to expand in size and output. Innovation allowed transportation to flourish carrying goods and passengers throughout the United States. Supporting this economic expansion was a rapidly increasing population. During the nineteenth century, millions of immigrants seeking opportunities settled in America’s industrializing cities. Simultaneously, the United States expanded as migrants pushed the western frontier to its edge.
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Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati all expanded during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. For instance, Cincinnati’s centralized location and river access made the city an ideal area for industry and trade. In 1860, Cincinnati was the fourth largest manufacturing city in the nation.¹ Likewise, Tucson grew from a desert outpost to an urban oasis during the same period. Much of this development began in 1880 after the completed Southern Pacific Railroad established trade and transportation lines through Tucson.² For Flint, the mid-nineteenth century lumber town became the world’s second largest automobile manufacturing city under General Motors by the early 1900s. Flint’s population swelled from 13,000 in 1900 to nearly 156,000 by 1930.³ Although each city advanced at its own pace, the primary driver was economic development through industrial expansion, advancements in transportation, and population influx.

Societal problems and unrest including poverty, racial and ethnic tension, and crime were often urban byproducts. Stemming from white middle class backlash to an increasingly diverse urban population, economic and residential restrictions were often imposed on racial and ethnic minority groups. Black Cincinnatians endured, yet persisted through, violence and discrimination from whites even before the Civil War. Although Cincinnati ended slavery in 1802, restrictive laws often kept African Americans from exercising political or civil freedoms. In 1829, 1836, and 1841, violent white mobs targeted and destroyed black homes and businesses in efforts to rid Cincinnati of its


black population. After the Civil War, African Americans continued to experience discrimination through school segregation that mirrored racially separated residential areas. By the turn of the century, black men and women remained in the lowest-paying jobs with little to no opportunity for professional advancement.

Similarly, Flint’s black population experienced residential restrictions based on race and socioeconomic class that relegated African Americans to dilapidated housing in poor and industrialized wards. A 1934 study concluded that economic and residential discrimination contributed to high poverty and crime rates among Flint’s black population. As a result, African American students remained largely segregated into the mid-twentieth century. Likewise, many low-income white students often had access to fewer opportunities than their middle-class counterparts.

In Tucson, racial and ethnic discrimination became an increasing problem by the end of the 1800s. As more Anglo-Americans migrated to Tucson following the railroad’s completion, Mexican American political and economic power declined. All-white unions often opposed immigration and restricted Mexican Americans from high-paying railroad and mining jobs. Anglo-imposed restrictions created a cycle of poverty in
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Tucson in which Mexican Americans were typically relegated to poorer residential areas and segregated schools.

As American cities flourished in the nineteenth century, reformers turned to public education to manage and socialize an increasingly diverse population. Promoting republican, capitalist, and Protestant values, common schools sought to Americanize immigrant and urban youth to maintain a politically loyal, economically productive, and morally virtuous society. Spreading public education was met with opposition from religious sects, political and economic conservatives, and social elites north and south. However, education reformers and supporters persisted in their mission to provide a tax-supported education system that, in their minds, would preserve the republican, capitalist, and Protestant values in the face of a changing society.\(^\text{12}\)

By the turn of the century, Progressive Era education centralized authority, redesigned curricula, and developed pedagogical methods to address the needs of a shifting and growing population. Like common school reformers, the mission of Progressive education was to preserve white middle class values in a swiftly altering society. This purpose was solidified through centralizing public school administration: a systematic approach that shifted authority away from local parents and educators to an outside professionalizing middle class. Reformers also restructured public education’s curricular goals through age-grading, tracking, and adding new rungs onto the public school ladder. Furthermore, pedagogical researchers promoted child-centered learning and practical, real-world approaches to teaching. With new course offerings and
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advancements in teaching, reformers argued that students would be educated based on their individual needs and abilities to adapt to an ever-adjusting democratic society.\textsuperscript{13}

Despite having a democratic mission, common schools and Progressive schools were typically segregated and often reflected the economic conditions in which they operated. Schools with high marginalized populations were often underfunded, poorly resourced, and overcrowded compared to schools with a proportionately higher white middle class population. According to historian James Anderson, the disparities between black and white experiences and opportunities reflected a dual education system in the United States.\textsuperscript{14}

Public education in Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati developed along a similar trajectory as other urban school systems. As populations increased, cities constructed new and larger schools and expanded districts to accommodate a growing student population. Common schools developed in Cincinnati beginning in 1825 after Ohio’s General Assembly passed the state’s first school law.\textsuperscript{15} Tax supported schools were necessary to accommodate Cincinnati’s rising population. By 1829, public education was extended to African Americans, but was repealed by 1831 due to white
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opposition. Black Cincinnatians were without publicly funded schools until after the Civil War. This opposition reflected the racial discrimination that persisted in Cincinnati throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. By contrast, common schooling flourished among Cincinnati’s white communities. After the Civil War, African Americans legally challenged school segregation gaining ground in 1887. That year, the Brown-Arnett Bill overturned de jure segregation expanding public education to African Americans. Schools integrated in some areas, however, approximately half of Cincinnati’s African American population remained in racially segregated schools into the early twentieth century due to residential discrimination.

In Tucson, the earliest public schools emerged in 1867 once the city’s first school district materialized that year. As Tucson’s population increased during the mid- to late-nineteenth century, municipal leaders actively pursued school development by recruiting experienced teachers from around the country. Resembling Tucson’s social order during this period, public schools were generally accepting of both Mexican and Anglo students. At that time, local leadership and businesses were still largely controlled by Mexican Americans. As a result, Tucson’s public schools provided a bicultural and bilingual education. From 1880 to 1930 Tucson’s social order shifted as more Anglos
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migrated to the city.\textsuperscript{22} As the Anglo population increased, Mexican American wealth and power subsided. Anglo-owned businesses including the growing railroad and mining industries actively discriminated against Mexican Americans. Furthermore, residential discrimination limited where Mexican Americans could live. By the turn of the century, Tucson schools were largely segregated reflecting residential zones.\textsuperscript{23}

Prior to 1930, Flint’s population was largely transient fluctuating with the auto industry’s early decades.\textsuperscript{24} By 1910, Flint’s total population was 38,550.\textsuperscript{25} Of that number, 307 African Americans resided in the city. That year, approximately 4,700 students attended public school in Flint with forty-five being African American.\textsuperscript{26} Beginning in the 1930s, the Mott Foundation helped develop Flint’s public schools in efforts to uplift the community through philanthropy-supported education. Mott’s efforts gave way to the Community School Program that began during WWII and flourished in the postwar era.\textsuperscript{27}

By the outset of WWII, many American cities experienced another period of rapid growth. Factories expanded and retooled mobilizing for war. For instance, Flint’s
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automobile industry produced military vehicles and weapons during the war. This participation opened jobs typically reserved for white men to women and people of color. During the war, General Motors actively recruited southerners and many African Americans migrated eager to leave the oppressive Jim Crow South for better opportunities.

Like Flint, WWII economically benefited Tucson. The city’s climate and open land attracted the United States military looking for desert landscapes to prepare soldiers for warfare in Africa, testing military equipment, and training new pilots. By 1940, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base opened bringing approximately 3,000 servicemen to Tucson. Many Americans migrated to the city to accommodate the emerging military industrial complex. In 1930, Tucson’s population was 32,506. By 1960, the population reached 212,000.

Cincinnati also experienced rapid growth during WWII. Like Flint, Cincinnati’s industries retooled for war creating a labor need. Opportunities for higher paying jobs and education attracted many black men and women to Cincinnati. Between 1940 and 1970, Cincinnati’s black population increased from 55,593 to 156,075.

For Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, the shared experience of economic and industrial growth during
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WWII and into the postwar years created a population boom. Despite an increase in wealth and opportunity for many who migrated, each city experienced social and racial strife.

White backlash persisted as wartime industry attracted black laborers to Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati. Economic, residential, and educational restrictions remained constant during this period. Although war industries did extend greater opportunity to marginalized populations, black laborers in Flint were often kept in low-paying jobs. Once the war ended, African Americans were often fired from their positions opening jobs to returning white veterans. As more African Americans flocked to cities in the mid-twentieth century, many urban whites fled to new suburban developments maintaining a segregated society. African Americans often found it difficult to move to the suburbs with their white counterparts, as racist covenants denied black families from purchasing homes in white neighborhoods and economic restrictions often limited African American buying power for newly developed housing.\(^{33}\) In Cincinnati, black residents were often relegated to the Basin area and adjacent Avondale and Walnut Hills neighborhoods. Affluent and middle class whites resided on the city’s outskirts north and west of Cincinnati’s urban center.\(^{34}\)

Mexican Americans and African Americans had similar experiences in Tucson when compared to Flint and Cincinnati. Many Anglo-Americans flocked to Tucson
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during the wartime boom. To accommodate this surge, the city began developing outward. Anglo-Americans primarily settled these new suburbs, fleeing the city’s center.\textsuperscript{35} Although there were no formal laws barring Mexican Americans from the suburbs, many were unable to afford new housing due to economic restrictions. As white flight set in, black and brown citizens were often left behind in downtown Tucson’s dwindling economy and deteriorating housing.\textsuperscript{36} With residential and economic barriers in place, schools remained largely segregated in postwar Tucson separating Anglo, Mexican, and African American students.\textsuperscript{37}

In the years after the 1954 \textit{Brown} ruling, urban schools largely remained segregated through economic and residential discrimination. White backlash to integration created racial quotas, academies, magnet programs, and outright obstruction that maintained segregation in some areas.\textsuperscript{38} Public schooling in Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati followed this trend. Population increases in the postwar era caused urban public schools to expand. Flint’s population grew to over 163,000 by 1950.\textsuperscript{39} During a 1953 school workshop, Flint teachers expressed concerns about student enrollments and the potentially negative impacts of overcrowding, one being
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juvenile delinquency. From 1953 to 1957, Flint’s student population grew from nearly 28,000 to almost 36,000. Flint neighborhoods and schools remained segregated throughout much of the twentieth century. Like Flint, Tucson’s schools were largely segregated along racial and ethnic lines. African Americans remained legally segregated until 1954. However, restrictive residential practices and white flight maintained de facto segregation in public schools. These barriers also extended to Mexican Americans and other marginalized populations in Tucson's neighborhoods and schools. Similarly, black Cincinnatians endured racial discrimination in housing and public schooling. As Cincinnati’s black population increased in the postwar era, whites fled to newly developed suburbs. Because school zones often resembled residential areas, Cincinnati schools remained largely segregated after 1954. In the few schools that had desegregated, black teachers were denied employment. Moving into the 1960s, black Cincinnatians continued to challenge discrimination through legal action and protest.
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In Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, marginalized populations resisted discrimination and segregation. Migration to northern cities and seeking employment and educational opportunities was an act of resistance against southern white oppression. In Flint, the Urban League and NAACP were heavily involved with local civil rights action. Specifically, both organizations contributed to solving delinquency problems for urban youth in the 1950s. In 1967, Flint activists held a four-day sleep-in at the Michigan State Capitol to persuade Governor George Romney to support an open housing agenda to end residential discrimination against African Americans. The demonstration supported the proposed bill that would end restrictive residential covenants opening housing to African Americans in traditionally white neighborhoods. This action would also counter de facto school segregation that had persisted after the 1954 Brown decision.

In Tucson, Mexican Americans protested local school districts to end discriminatory practices and include Chicano Studies programs in the 1960s. Students at the University of Arizona as well as local high schools protested discriminatory practices that included a ban on bilingual education, placing Spanish speaking students into remedial classes, and denying Mexican American courses. A leading voice in the Chicano Tucson Movement was the El Coraje, an independent student-run publication calling Mexican American youth to action. For instance, a 1969 special edition of the

---


47 *Battle Creek Enquirer*, “Housing ‘Sleep-In’ Protest Called Off,” *Battle Creek Enquirer* (Battle Creek, MI), October 10, 1967.

48 MacDonald, *Latino Education in the United States*, 118.
paper advertised a march on May 9th in which the Chicano Movement would “be telling this town that we will no longer allow school systems to destroy our children, because they are Mexican.” This publication and the activism that emerged in Tucson during the late 1960s was in response to economic, residential, and educational discrimination that Mexican Americans had endured for decades.

In Cincinnati, African Americans engaged in peaceful demonstrations and court actions to fight school segregation and economic discrimination throughout the mid-twentieth century. For instance, the 1963 *Deal et al.* case argued that the Cincinnati School Board maintained segregation in area public schools. In this case, four elementary classes from a predominantly black school were bussed to a white school due to overcrowding. Instead of fully integrating the black students, the classes racially remained separate. Further examples of activism were also visible in a series of student protests occurring in 1967 and 1968. In October of 1967, violence erupted between black and white students in an area high school. Local newspapers blamed the unrest on the emerging Black Power Movement stating that activist groups like Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Congress of Racial Equality were inciting violence. Shortly after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr, approximately 33,000 high school students walked out of their classes in Cincinnati. Protesting
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discrimination in May of that year, nearly 4,000 students were involved in a school-wide boycott. During the boycott, Freedom Schools opened to accommodate the protesting students. These events exemplify the racially and socially volatile environment in which Cincinnati school-police partnerships developed.

Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati each have a history of discrimination against marginalized populations. This discrimination was met with resistance and civil rights action that created the context in which school-police partnerships emerged. In the wake of the 1954 Brown v. Board decision, opposition to desegregation manifested in many forms including private academies, school voucher programs, racial quotas, and outright obstruction by citizens and politicians to maintain a racially segregated society dominated by white supremacy. In this turbulent social climate, school-police partnerships were devised and implemented to combat delinquency—a societal problem that white middle class educators, police, and civic leaders often explicitly and implicitly identified marginalized youth as the primary culprits.

Industrial development during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries caused rapid growth in America’s cities. Although many Americans and immigrants benefited from expanding wealth and opportunity during nineteenth and twentieth centuries, cities also experienced a rise in social unrest. Despite varying in location and demographics, Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati shared in this common history. As migrants moved into each city, populations became culturally, racially, and ethnically diverse. In Flint and Cincinnati, the dominant social group—affluent and middle class white Protestants—reacted to this demographic shift by creating economic, residential,
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educational, and political barriers that marginalized immigrants, people of color, and the poor. For African Americans who fled the South for a better life in northern cities, Jim Crow migrated with them. In Tucson, migration and demographic shift resembled colonization. Until the early decades of the twentieth century, Mexican Americans were the dominant social group in Tucson. After 1880, industrial and transportation expansion created an influx of Anglo-Americans. By 1930, wealth and political power transferred to these new migrants allowing Anglos to become the dominant social group. During and after this shift, oppressive hiring practices, residential restrictions, and educational barriers marginalized Mexican Americans. Social unrest erupted as marginalized populations resisted oppression in various ways. In the longer history of freedom struggle, the mid-twentieth century is generally considered a high-point in civil rights action. It was within this climate of urban growth, and social unrest that the school-police partnership emerged.


During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, white middle class and affluent Americans—reacting to converging ideals, opposing social norms, and diverse populations—created an urban society in which American culture was defined by whiteness, Protestant values, republican virtues, and capitalist principles.\textsuperscript{54} This was evident from the economic, residential, and educational barriers that Anglo-Americans systematically placed on immigrants, people of color, and the poor. For these marginalized groups, the city brought opportunity layered within a social milieu of
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oppression and segregation. Moral corruption, youth crime, and delinquency were byproducts of urban growth. Municipal governments, law enforcement, welfare organizations, and schools have a long history of attempting to resolve these societal problems by socializing students into productive and loyal citizens.\(^{55}\) Intending to prevent juvenile delinquency, school-police partnerships followed this trajectory beginning in the mid-twentieth century. Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati provide insight into this phenomenon confirming that school-police partnerships developed in response to youth crime during a period of social and racial unrest in America’s cities.

Shaping child behavior and addressing youth crime were not new endeavors for schools or police. Nineteenth century common schools imparted Protestant-based morals to socialize urban immigrant youth into productive, loyal, and virtuous American citizens.\(^{56}\) Similarly, Progressive Era school reformers implemented bureaucratic policies to manage rapidly growing and diversifying urban student populations efficiently.\(^{57}\) Character education, a popular curricular reform in the early twentieth century, attempted to “preserve traditional values and ensure a place for moral training in…the public school.”\(^{58}\) Largely, Christian reformers promoted moral education to combat lax values and an increasingly secularized urban society. Outside of the classroom, moral education often manifested in extracurricular activities and clubs that

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 70.


\(^{57}\) David Tyack, *The One Best System*, 29.

encouraged “thrift, industry, honesty, and loyalty” promoting good citizenship. This path continued into the postwar era with the explicit mission to curb juvenile delinquency through an increased police presence in urban public schools.

Coinciding with public school efforts to socialize children, views on adolescents and delinquency altered throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For instance, nineteenth century child savers believed that urban youth needed protection from the dangers of an industrialized modern society. Child savers argued that competing cultures, overcrowding, poverty, and vice were environmental factors that corrupted juveniles. The child saving movement expanded to an institutional level throughout the nineteenth century as municipal governments appropriated the humanitarian cause establishing houses of refuge, reform schools, and eventually the juvenile court system. The juvenile system separated adolescent offenders from adults, but was also used as a tool to socialize immigrant children into productive American citizens. American nativists often blamed immigrants for urban poverty, crime, and social unrest. By codifying juvenile delinquency, municipal and state-level government intervened in problems traditionally handled informally by families, schools, and police. Once under jurisdiction, delinquent activity like truancy, sexual conduct, or idleness was not only a detriment to adolescent well-being, but also to America’s dominant cultural and social ideologies—Protestantism, capitalism, and republicanism.

59 Ibid., 51.


61 Mennel, *Thorns & Thistles*, 56.
Police attention to juvenile delinquency also predated school-police partnerships. For instance, turn of the century truancy officers worked with schools to enforce attendance laws. The New York Police Department began working with local agencies in 1918 to address youth crime. By 1930, this relationship evolved into the Crime Prevention Bureau specializing in juvenile justice. In the first half of the twentieth century, Children’s Bureaus emerged throughout America’s cities with the central mission to deter delinquency. For many programs, the intent was not punitive, but preventative by cooperating with schools and welfare agencies, providing counseling programs, and sponsoring recreational activities and clubs for adolescents.63 Efforts among municipal governments, welfare organizations, law enforcement, and schools in Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati mirrored this trend.

In Flint, educators, police, and civic leaders attributed delinquency to rapid population growth and poverty rates. One study found that delinquency typically occurred in residential wards predominantly settled by working-class laborers, African Americans, and new immigrants.64 These communities often consisted of dilapidated housing near industrialized areas. The earliest attempts to address delinquency in Flint came in the form of clubs, extracurricular activities, and community safe spaces sponsored by a local philanthropist, Charles Mott.65 The Mott Foundation funded


educational programs such as the Mott Boy’s Club beginning in 1929. By 1933, the program evolved into the Mott Camp for Boys, a summer program designed to occupy adolescents’ leisure time with outdoor education, sports, and structured activities that promoted physical fitness, character building, and civic responsibility. By the 1930s, local community groups collaborating with the Mott Foundation and law enforcement converted empty lots into supervised playgrounds that served over 6,500 children by 1935. By 1938, the Mott Foundation financed the Stepping Stone Program for Girls. The extracurricular program worked with local schools to provide spiritual and moral guidance for girls at risk for delinquent behavior.

In Tucson, juvenile delinquency in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries aligned with national standards differentiating between adult and adolescent offenders. Police, educators, and municipal leaders associated juvenile crime with truancy, loitering, vandalism, theft, and assault. Prior to WWII, the most common measures to combat delinquency were state-sponsored and funded reform schools throughout Arizona. Beginning in 1893 with the Arizona Territorial Reform School, a series of juvenile detention centers were built throughout the state. Arizona’s first juvenile court was established in 1907. Once processed through the court system, juveniles were typically sent for rehabilitation, retraining, and reeducating to become productive
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citizens. Juvenile advocacy groups, such as the Arizona Federation of Women’s Clubs, largely supported these programs.69

As in Flint and Tucson, reformers in Cincinnati often blamed poverty and deteriorating urban conditions for delinquency rates in the early twentieth century. Specifically, municipal leaders and police viewed areas populated by low-income earners, African Americans, and recent immigrants, as hotbeds of crime and delinquency. Between 1927 and 1939, the Hamilton County Juvenile Court reported a rise in delinquent complaints and juvenile arrests for Cincinnati.70 A 1940 study found that from 1929 to 1939, juvenile arrests increased from 4% to 14% of total crime committed in Cincinnati.71 The report concluded that social conditions and limited economic opportunities exacerbated by the Great Depression primarily caused this increase. Aside from the juvenile court system, Cincinnati relied on welfare organizations and clubs to reduce delinquency. During the 1930s, the Boys Club provided Cincinnati youth with supervised spaces to preoccupy leisure time and promote good citizenship.72
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Prior to WWII, reformers attributed delinquency to moral decay caused by rapid urban growth and industrial expansion. During and after the war, national concerns from educators, parents, and law enforcement about delinquency continued, but pointed to new causes. Limited economic opportunity and poor living conditions were still primary reasons. However, the war itself, youth culture, family breakdown and civil rights activism were now contributing factors. For instance, a 1944 *New York Times* article by J. Edgar Hoover citing statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation argued that “economic and emotional stress” brought on by WWII caused “the tendency toward neglect of youth and children” resulting in delinquency. With all efforts toward the war, children were left without a structured home life. The war created a generation of unsupervised, independent children that challenged social norms and parental authority.

In the postwar, Baby Boomers came of age in an era of youth culture that countered traditional middle class values. Cold War anxiety contributed to adult fears of a potential youth rebellion. Middle class parents and municipal officials blamed entertainment targeting youth for replacing white, middle class, Protestant social norms with mass-produced low-class culture. Furthermore, the height of civil rights action, student activism, and war protests during the mid-twentieth century escalated generational, social, and racial tensions. White, middle class Americans equated youth culture and civil rights action with delinquent behavior giving the perception of an
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increasing youth crime problem. Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati were not immune to these growing concerns.

In the postwar era, Flint residents became increasingly concerned about juvenile delinquency. In the 1950s, growing income and suburban sprawl provided the means and need for an expanding middle class to purchase automobiles. For Flint, this translated to a healthy economy, an increasing population, and a need to accommodate more students. As the student population increased from 27,732 in 1953 to 35,834 in 1957, so too did juvenile crime rates. Juvenile arrests increased from 1,081 in 1953 to 1,791 in 1957. Seeking out a new way to combat this local problem, Flint schools and police collaborated in 1958 implementing the Police School Liaison program.

In postwar Tucson, delinquency also continued to increase both in frequency and severity. By 1950, local police voiced concern that juvenile delinquency manifested in more serious offenses including automobile theft and burglary. A 1955 study indicated that from 1947 to 1954, delinquency complaints to police rose from 1,600 to over 2,500. The study argued that marginalized populations—specifically Mexican Americans—living in poverty and having limited opportunity was a primary cause for increasing rates. In 1963, a report from the Western Interstate Commission for Higher
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In postwar Cincinnati, previous efforts did not seem to prevent delinquency and youth crime. Police reports indicate that juvenile arrests increased from 8.3\% of total arrests in 1950 to 14.1\% of total arrests in 1958.\footnote{“Table 66, Juvenile Arrests compared with Total Arrests for the Last Ten Years, 1959-1950,” in Cincinnati Police, “1959 Annual Report of the Division of the Police,” (Police Statistics of Cincinnati, 1960).} A 1955 local report echoed previous findings that challenges to family life, poverty, limited opportunities, changing cultural norms, war, and overcrowding were the main reasons behind delinquency rates in Cincinnati.\footnote{Report of Citizens Committee of Juvenile Delinquency, (Cincinnati, Ohio December 1955): 19.} Between 1960 and 1965, Cincinnati’s delinquency rate continued to climb with the city’s population from 12.6\% to 15.7\% of total persons arrested.\footnote{“Table 66, Juvenile Arrests Compared with Total Arrests for the Last Ten Years, 1966-1957,” in Cincinnati Police, 1966 Annual Report of the Division of the Police, (Police Statistics of Cincinnati, 1961).} By 1965, Cincinnati schools collaborated with the University of Cincinnati and local police to develop and implement the Police-Juvenile Attitude Project: a curriculum program designed to change adolescent attitudes toward police in efforts to deter delinquent behavior.

Nationally, law enforcement agencies reported that juvenile delinquency was on a steady rise during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In response, a series of governmental and law enforcement reforms were implemented during the same period.
For instance, houses of refuge first appeared in New York City, Boston, and Philadelphia in the 1820s. Child savers pointed to increased immigration and urban poverty as the central causes of delinquency. Houses of refuge provided an organized method “to remove the children of the urban immigrant and lower classes” who were deemed incapable of providing an “adequate moral education” by municipal agencies and reformers. Extending from the child saver reform movement was the juvenile court system. The nation’s first juvenile court was established in Chicago in 1899. Considered as “one of the proudest achievements of progressive reformers,” juvenile courts developed throughout America’s cities in the early twentieth century. Following this trajectory, President Howard Taft enacted the U.S. Children’s Bureau in 1912 as the federal government’s first welfare agency dedicated to serving the nation’s youth. Acting partly as a databank for youth related statistics–birth and mortality rates, education attendance, and criminal activity–the Bureau oversaw the Juvenile Justice System. In the postwar era, further federal interest in juvenile delinquency came in the form of President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Crime. In 1965, the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice found that nationally, juvenile arrests had increased by 52% since 1960.
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In the postwar era, concerns over youth crime, negative images of police, and poor youth attitudes toward law enforcement persisted causing municipal leaders, police, and schools to act. Local law enforcement in conjunction with public school, private organizations, and community agencies began instituting a variety of school-police partnerships in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1958, Flint implemented the nation’s first partnership. In the following decade, other cities including Tucson and Cincinnati began their own programs contributing to a phenomenon that continued into the twenty-first century. Flint and Tucson each implemented a variation of the SRO program in which an officer became a faculty member working within area schools. SROs assumed the roles of teachers, counselors, and investigators to deter delinquency preemptively among school children.\textsuperscript{90} Curriculum-based programs, such as Cincinnati’s Police-Attitude Project, were strictly educational tools that taught students about the law and while promoting an ideal image of police officers. Although officers did not instruct students directly, they were involved in developing the curriculum.\textsuperscript{91} Despite differences in approach, each made juvenile delinquency prevention a primary goal.

Outside of Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, programs sprang up in cities such as Minneapolis, Miami, New York City, Boise, Los Angeles, Oakland, Seattle, Chicago, Baton Rouge, Atlanta and Anchorage. Many of these programs were structurally and ideologically rooted in Flint’s Police School Liaison. In 1962, Chief of Tucson Police Bernard Garmire stated that “a similar program is under way at Flint” when proposing


the SRO idea to the local school board. Likewise, a Tucson SRO was a contributing member to the Cincinnati Police-Attitude project in 1967. In April of 1967, the first national Police-School Liaison Workshop was held in Flint and attended by approximately 150 educators, judges, and police from around the country. By 1968, police interns enrolled in the Mott Institute for Police-School Liaison Officers to learn about the PSL program and to implement it in their home communities. These workshops and internships were designed and financed by the Mott Foundation with the intention to export the PSL program to cities throughout the country. It is evident that all roads led back to Flint.

In Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, school-police partnerships began as local initiatives. However, by 1965, federal support for these programs began when Congress enacted the Law Enforcement Assistance Act (LEAA) as part of President Johnson’s War on Crime. Under LEAA, local and state law enforcement agencies could apply for federal grants through the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance under the United States Department of Justice to fund innovative crime prevention plans. Both Tucson and Cincinnati took advantage of LEAA and received funds to pay for and expand their partnerships. This aid provided another contextual layer to this phenomenon. Although programs largely began from local concerns, federal involvement in the 1960s provided
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the necessary resources to increase police presence in urban public schools in the late twentieth century. Johnson’s War on Crime was a federal action aimed to reduce the nation’s crime rates by funding state and local law enforcement initiatives, but historians have argued that increased police presence and funding had detrimental outcomes for marginalized urban populations through claims of harassment, brutality, and the growth of mass incarceration.96

Prior to WWII, local organizations, law enforcement, and educators combated juvenile delinquency through various community programs. Despite these efforts, youth crime rates continued an upward trend. Many Americans pointed to the harmful effects of poverty and city-life as the primary causes of delinquency. In the postwar period, the nation’s adolescent population increased as Baby Boomers came of age in the 1950s and 1960s. A larger population equated to an increase in delinquent activity. Mass culture and activism contributed to fears of a youth rebellion challenging the traditional socio-cultural norms and values of the growing middle class. Exacerbated by Cold War anxiety and challenges to white supremacy, many Americans perceived civil rights actions as delinquent acts. Since the mid-1800s, white middle class Protestants viewed public schools as the harbinger of democratic citizenship. By the mid-twentieth century, law enforcement and municipal leaders turned to public schools to address juvenile delinquency. Despite this goal, it is apparent from Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati that school-police partnerships continued to marginalize minority and low-income students.

School-police partnerships emerged in urban areas during the mid-twentieth century in response to juvenile delinquency. Economic expansion during the nineteenth century and again during and after WWII not only increased urban populations, but caused a demographic shift as African Americans left the Jim Crow South seeking opportunities in northern industrial centers like Flint and Cincinnati. Similarly, southwestern cities like Tucson experienced a demographic shift as Anglo-Americans migrated west. As cities grew, societal problems like poverty, crime, and racial and ethnic tensions intensified.

After WWII, America’s role in international affairs and global conflict amplified. The Cold War shaped American culture and politics after 1945. The United States was the world’s leading exporter of democracy and capitalism despite contradictions in social and racial domestic relations. Simultaneously, civil rights activism in the 1950s and 1960s heightened as people of color resisted white supremacy to gain the full rights and privileges promised to all American citizens under the Constitution. Meanwhile, youth culture across racial and social lines challenged traditional white Protestant, middle class values as the Baby Boomer generation came of age. This is the social, cultural, and political climate in which school-police partnerships emerged. While considering these contextual factors, it is also necessary to understand the social, and racial implications of these partnerships.

**Diminishing Students’ Rights and Marginalizing Minority and Low-Income Students in Early School-Police Partnerships**

Shaping students’ cultural, social, and political values has been as much a part of public education as reading, writing, and arithmetic. This was visible in early common
schools, industrial schools, and Progressive era reforms. In each instance, middle class and affluent White Anglo-Saxon Protestants reformed public schools to address a society that challenged their cultural, social, and racial dominance. Continuing this trend in the mid-twentieth century, public schools collaborated with police to prevent juvenile delinquency: a societal problem that was often associated with students of color and the poor. In Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, reformers viewed juvenile delinquency as not only harmful to a child’s development, but a detriment to American society. Although programs gained support, conflicting beliefs and values concerning the roles of law enforcement and public education caused controversy. Each partnership began as a local enterprise organized by police, educators, and municipal leaders to address juvenile delinquency. Although this may have been the intent, these programs challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.

Students’ rights was a relatively new concept developing from the 1950s to the 1970s. During this period, adolescents challenged cultural, racial, and social standards that served to protect white middle class Protestant society for generations. These contests manifested in protests, boycotts, sit-ins, and legal actions calling for equitable educational standards and the freedoms of expression and speech within public schools. Students during the mid-twentieth century began to rebel against societal norms which drew attention from parents, educators, and police. Challenging adult
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authority was often associated with juvenile delinquency and cited as a reason for placing police in schools and changes made to juvenile justice.

Juvenile court systems had existed since 1899, but often acted more akin to a social welfare agency that helped wayward children rather than an adult courthouse judging citizens under the bar of justice. Throughout the first-half of the twentieth century, state juvenile courts gradually altered from their humanitarian beginnings to resemble the more hardened legal systems of today. However, historians have credited the Supreme Court’s ruling on In Re Gault in 1967 as the flashpoint “which redefine child’s legal identity and hammered the final nail in the coffin of the children’s courts.” In the case, fifteen-year-old Gerald Gault was arrested for making a prank phone call to a neighbor. Police questioned the teenager without legal counsel or parental consent. In fact, Gault’s parents were not even notified that their son had been taken into custody until they returned home after work that day. On June 15, 1964, unbeknownst to his parents, Gault was sentenced to the Arizona State Industrial School for six years. According to legal scholars and historians, Gault had no representation and was denied due process. By 1967, Gault’s sentence was overturned by the Supreme Court further codifying juvenile delinquency and crime in the United States.  

98 Feld, Bad Kids, 37; Platt, The Child Savers, 4; Mennel, Thorns & Thistles, 127; and Wolcott, Cops and Kids, 2.  
Although the *Gault* decision added further protections to juveniles in America’s courts, education historian Jennifer de Forest argues that some legal experts at the time of the decision were concerned about the unintended and negative consequences. For instance, New York Judge Justice Wise Polier argued that “while *Gault* raised the expectation of *fairness* it decreased the expectation that the State would *protect* a child in trouble,” meaning that children would now be “vulnerable to the all-too-common human impulse for retribution and punishment.”\(^{102}\) After *Gault*, children were arguably more susceptible to a formalized legal system and therefore could be punished for juvenile acts that were previously handled informally by police, parents, and schools.

Another example of how student rights took shape during this period was through legal challenges regarding freedom of expression. Historian Gael Graham highlights the *Karr v. Schmidt* case in which a high school student fought against restrictive dress codes that dictated male students’ hair length.\(^{103}\) Graham argues that student appearance and dress codes became prevalent in public schools after WWII stating that school administrators intended to “not only to manage the larger numbers of students jostling in the halls but to diminish class-based distinctions and to prevent middle-class students from adopting the sartorial styles of the rough kids from across the tracks.”\(^{104}\) By the 1950s and 1960s, appearance was often tied to juvenile delinquency. Parents
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and educators believed that “conformity in dress could contain student behavior.”105 The Karr case was eventually appealed to the Supreme Court, but thrown out. Refusing to cut his hair, Karr never returned to public school but did earn his diploma at home and attended college.

Other examples of student activism and a push for rights during the mid-twentieth century is visible through minority civil rights movements. Although civil rights activism before the 1960s was typically associated with organizations and individual adult leaders, by the late 1960s and early 1970s, students began actively participating and even leading demonstrations against discrimination and segregation. Historian Dionne Danns examines the agency of black high school students in Chicago during the 1960s.106 Demanding black history courses, more black teachers and administrators, school improvements, and increased involvement with parents and students in educational decisions, African American students organized and led a series of boycotts in 1968. Over the multi-day protest, approximately 50,000 students participated to attain their demands for an equitable education.107 Similar student-organized protests occurred in other cities during the period. For instance, Mexican American students challenged discrimination and segregation in public schools. The Chicano Movement sought equitable education, the inclusion of bi-lingual and Mexican American classes,
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and an increased presence of Mexican American educators. Although these movements intersect with racial and ethnic causes for civil rights, it is important to highlight that students were the change agents in these instances.

Students’ rights are part of the school-police partnership narrative. The overall concern from parents, educators, and civil liberties groups was that students would be subjected to increased surveillance, potential harassment, illegal searches, and interrogated by police without parental consent or legal counsel. Parents and educators voiced opposition to Flint’s PSL program stating that officers were being used to intimidate children and targeting students of color. In Tucson, parents and the local chapter of the ACLU drew attention to the lack of guidelines that dictated the local SRO program. Opponents argued that without official procedures, police had access to confidential student information and could interrogate students freely without regard for their legal protections. In Cincinnati, as student activism and a demand for equitable education increased, schools and city officials responded by increasing police presence in predominantly African American and desegregated schools. In each case, school-


police partnerships emerged in an era when students began regularly challenging cultural, racial, and social norms. A carceral-like environment that diminished students’ rights was created by formally placing police in urban public schools.

Flint’s PSL was largely funded by the Mott Foundation. The foundation’s mission was to uplift the Flint community through education.¹¹² For Mott, delinquency represented poor moral and democratic values and stifled economic development.¹¹³ For educators and stakeholders like Mott, a positive perception of police would not only prevent delinquency, but encourage students to become moral and productive citizens. This goal was apparent in many educational plans the Mott Foundation supported. For instance, the Mott Camp for Boys was a summer program designed to “develop character through co-operation, social responsibility, and ideals of democratic living.”¹¹⁴ The PSL was an extension of Mott’s vision to uplift Flint’s community by helping adolescents “to assume the responsibilities of citizenship.”¹¹⁵ For Mott, police, and educators, good citizenship aligned with republican, capitalist, and Protestant ideals guided by white, middle class and affluent values. These values and perspectives on race and class shaped school-police partnerships placing them in areas predominantly populated with African American and poor students.

Tucson’s school-police partnership was also designed to detect early signs of delinquent behavior, counsel students, and promote a positive image of law
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enforcement. By maintaining a full-time faculty position, Tucson’s SROs patrolled hallways, counseled youth, and spent time in classrooms teaching students about the law, safety, and functions and duties of police officers. According to program developers, SROs would “become well acquainted with many students and…instill in them the basic ideals of law abiding citizenship.” Stakeholders argued that positive experiences would build trust between adolescents and police ultimately reducing delinquency. For Tucson’s SRO, like other school-police partnerships, behavior that reflected white middle class values and obeying the law were synonymous with good American citizenship.

Cincinnati’s partnership differed from the PSL-SRO model. Instead of physically placing a police officer in the school, Cincinnati developed a curriculum program designed to prevent delinquency by teaching junior high school students about the law, promoting good citizenship, and presenting an ideal image of police. The project director, Robert Portune, argued that one of public education’s primary functions was to teach good citizenship and that obeying the law, respecting police authority, and assisting officers in upholding the law was a crucial part of that lesson. Developed by local educators and police, curriculum was implemented into junior high social studies courses. The partnership’s central goal was to prevent delinquency in efforts to maintain America’s republican virtues protected by police authority. Given the civil rights turmoil in which this program emerged and the placement of these programs in predominantly
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populated black schools, the larger societal end was to quell racial strife by policing marginalized students.

There are two problems with promoting an ideal image of police officers to adolescents. First, the image typically reflected the perspectives of partnership designers: white middle class professional educators and police officers. Second, the image contradicted the real experiences of marginalized youth. For people of color in the United States, law enforcement often represented the policing arm of white supremacy. In Flint and Cincinnati, African Americans were arrested and imprisoned at disproportionately higher rates than whites. For instance, comparing juvenile referral rates with arrest rates reveals a possible bias among Cincinnati law enforcement and juvenile justice. In 1966, there were 4,321 (46.4%) referrals and warnings for white males compared to 3,398 (36.5%) for black males. However, black males accounted for 41.9% of juvenile arrests compared to 40.8% of whites.\footnote{Table 67–Juvenile Arrests, Warnings and Referrals, By Color and Sex of Juveniles: 1966" in Cincinnati Police, 1966 Annual Report of the Division of the Police (Cincinnati: Police Statistics of Cincinnati, 1967).} There were significantly fewer warnings and referrals for black males, but a slightly higher arrest rate when compared to white males. Likewise, Mexican Americans in Tucson commonly served longer and harsher prison sentences compared to Anglos.\footnote{Oscar J. Martinez, “Hispanics in Arizona,” in Arizona at Seventy-Five: The Next Twenty-Five Years, eds. Beth Luey and Noel J. Stowe (Tucson: Arizona State University Press, 1987): 92.}

Additionally, each city had a history of police harassment and brutality against black and brown citizens, people in poverty, and social activists. For instance, the \textit{Tucson Daily Citizen} ran a story in 1959 about local police perceptions stating “that
most policemen are uncivil, and regard the public as only a necessary nuisance.”¹²⁰ In 1964, the Congress of Racial Equality held a peaceful demonstration at Tucson’s City Hall. During the event, Tucson police photographed demonstrators. The ACLU stated that these actions were “completely uncalled-for in a free society” and that this incident of police spying and harassment was “offensive and obnoxious to civil liberties.”¹²¹ Similarly, the Battle Creek Enquirer reported in 1951 that ten Flint police officers were penalized for assaulting three robbery suspects.¹²² In 1959, the NAACP accused Flint police of “the unprovoked manhandling and arrest of a Negro girl” arguing that the occurrence exemplified police prejudice against African Americans.¹²³ In Cincinnati, complaints of brutality prompted city officials to investigate local police in 1947.¹²⁴ In 1958, the NAACP called attention to “discrimination against Negroes by police” when a 14-year-old African American male was shot and killed by officers during a pursuit.¹²⁵ For people of color, law enforcement was often associated with prejudice, violence, and harassment and contradicted the ideal image that many school-police partnerships promoted.


¹²¹ Dale Hurliman to Executive Board, American Civil Liberties Union, June, 1964, folder 13, box 4, Arizona Civil Liberties Union Papers, University of Arizona Libraries, Special Collections.

¹²² The Battle Creek Enquirer, “Flint Police Officers Penalized for Brutality,” The Battle Creek Enquirer (Battle Creek, MI), May 23, 1951.

¹²³ The Battle Creek Enquirer, “Fight for Human Dignity Described at NAACP Rally,” The Battle Creek Enquirer (Battle Creek, MI), November 23, 1959.


Partnership developers in Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati believed that by promoting an ideal image of law enforcement, adolescents would trust police. This line of thinking argued that building a rapport and fostering positive experiences through education would ultimately help deter delinquency among students. However, this approach resembled indoctrination. Students were not provided with opportunities to discuss personal experiences—positive or negative—with law enforcement. Marginalized students were instructed by teachers and officers to replace their own personal realities and histories of police violence and racism with an artificial image created by the hegemony: White Anglo-Saxon Protestant middle class America.

In each city, vocal opposition from people of color and civil rights organizations give insight into the contradictions presented by the school-police partnerships. In Flint, teachers and local civil rights leaders argued that the PSL was targeting black students and that police presence was a form of intimidation. In Tucson, the local chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union attempted to remove the program citing instances of police harassment, illegal search and seizures, and interrogating students without a legal or parental presence. Furthermore, black Tucsonans voiced their distrust for police stating that a double standard existed between whites and people of color. Although there was no vocal opposition to the curriculum project in Cincinnati, black civil


rights groups called attention to unfair treatment, brutality, and harassment from police. Cincinnati law enforcement, meanwhile, often blamed civil rights activists for violence.129

Analyzing the time and place in which these partnerships emerged gives insight into the social and racial perspectives that informed educators, police, and stakeholders. In 1958, the nation’s first school-police partnership began in Flint four years after the Brown decision ended legal segregation in public schools. Race relations in postwar American cities were turbulent. The Civil Rights Movements from the 1950s to the 1970s were invigorated by a growing number of young activists.130 In Brown’s wake, municipal leaders in Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati made efforts to ease social and racial tension, subdue potential violence, and suppress civil rights actions. In each city, school zones were patterned after racially, ethnically, and economically segregated neighborhoods. While segregation was prevalent, the slow process of desegregation through redistricting and bussing began in some districts.

Educators, police, and municipal leaders associated juvenile delinquency with poverty, limited opportunity, a tenuous family life, activism and youth culture. In Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, school-police partnerships were largely implemented in racially segregated African American schools, ethnically segregated Mexican American schools, schools with a higher proportion of low-income students, and schools that were racially integrated. Therefore, black, brown, and poor students in urban schools were

---


more likely to experience a police presence than their white middle class and affluent counterparts. Although school-police partnerships were commonly promoted as a new method to prevent juvenile delinquency, the social and racial implications of these programs continued to marginalize students of color and the poor.

Although school-police partnerships began in the 1950s and 1960s, their origins are a part of a longer historical narrative. During the nineteenth century, reformers developed and used public education to socialize children into productive, law-abiding, culturally American citizens. The purpose was to homogenize a pluralist society under White Anglo-Saxon Protestant middle class and affluent ideals. By the mid-twentieth century, this trend continued as educators formed partnerships with local police to deter delinquency among adolescents. Once again, the school became an agent in socialization. Through designing and implementing these partnerships, police, educators, and municipal leaders believed that they could resolve an urban problem that not only challenged white, middle class values, but was also a detriment to a republican and capitalist society. In upholding these values, educators and police identified the delinquent as students of color and the poor. Under these partnerships, race and class became determining factors of acceptable behavior. At face-value, partnerships increased police presence in schools and introduced curriculum programs intended to prevent delinquent activity through education, counseling, and portraying an ideal image of law enforcement. Although programs had extensive support, conflicting beliefs and values concerning the roles of law enforcement and public education caused local controversy. Despite questionable evidence about the effectiveness of these partnerships, police presence in urban public schools spread throughout the twentieth
Flint’s Police School Liaison, Tucson’s School Resource Officer, and Cincinnati’s Police-Attitude Project each began as a local initiative led by police, educators, and municipal leaders to address juvenile delinquency—an urban problem that gained nationwide attention in the post-WWII era. Educators collaborated with municipal law enforcement to reduce juvenile delinquency, but did so in ways that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION: SCHOOL-POLICE PARTNERSHIPS THEN AND NOW: HOW HISTORICAL STUDY INFORMS CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION

School-police partnerships were products of social dominance, cultural hegemony, and white supremacy that emerged in American cities in the post-\textit{Brown} era. Through case studies, I attempt to understand why, how, when, and where these programs originated. Although police presence has extended to suburban and rural schools since the 1980s, partnerships began in the mid-twentieth century as an urban public education phenomenon. Flint’s Police School Liaison (PSL), Tucson’s School Resource Officer (SRO), and Cincinnati’s Police-Attitude Project each started as a local initiative spearheaded by police, educators, and municipal leaders to address juvenile delinquency. Although these programs garnered widespread support, opponents argued that in efforts to deter delinquency, students’ rights were often disregarded and continued to marginalize students of color and the poor.

Historians of education have indirectly addressed the juncture between public education and law enforcement. Accounts of the truancy officer are typically woven into narratives that focus on Progressive education reforms.\textsuperscript{1} The truant officer was the product of state compulsory laws beginning the late 1800s. For instance, historian William Issel argues that although the officer’s job was to enforce newly established attendance laws, local authorities ultimately determined the need for such a specified

According to historian Mosses Stambler, “local truant officers gave almost no attention to forcing the school attendance of those children who were gainfully employed” rendering the laws ineffective in some cities. Although the truancy officers, to varying degrees, worked with schools, they were not considered faculty members and had no apparent connection to discipline, teaching, or counseling matters. School-police partnerships in the 1950s and 1960s, however, differed substantially from truancy officers as they actively worked with students and educators to deter juvenile delinquency.

School-police partnerships represent important historical shifts in law enforcement and urban public schooling. The permanent presence of police within schools extended the watchful eye of law enforcement into a new space. Police jurisdiction over public schools did not change. However, partnerships increased surveillance within schools creating a carceral-like environment in which students and educators were more susceptible to harassment, search & seizure, an invasion of privacy and being questioned without legal counsel. Furthermore, the police role expanded to include administrative, teaching, and counseling duties. This change was problematic in two ways. Officers were assuming responsibilities for which they had no formal training potentially causing harm to the students they served, and it undermined the professionals educated, trusted, and employed for those positions. From their beginning, school-police partnerships have altered public school environments in

---


significant ways that, in the post-

*Brown* era, have continued to marginalize minority and poor students.

Recently, historian Judith Kafka wrote a critical history about carceral-like penalties within urban public schools. Kafka claims that zero tolerance policies resulted from the centralization of discipline in public schools that "disproportionately affects minority youth, while offering no real social benefit." For Kafka, zero tolerance policies have led to harsher punishments and elevated school discipline to legal matters handled by police and courts. Although our studies are complementary, Kafka’s work emphasizes changes in discipline and school policies. Because I weave together multiple historical threads to account for police presence in public schools, this dissertation contributes to and expands upon histories of urban education reform, child & youth, juvenile delinquency, and ethnicity and race in education.

School-police partnerships originated as an urban public education reform designed to deter juvenile delinquency by socializing students into productive, law-abiding citizens of good moral character directed by middle-class and affluent Anglo-American values. Although having a permanent police presence was new, this was not the first time public schools socialized students in this way. For instance, America’s urban centers experienced periods of demographic and economic growth throughout the 1800s. In response, common schools promoted republican, capitalist, and

---


5 Ibid., 5.

Protestant virtues to Americanize immigrant and urban youth to maintain a politically loyal, economically productive, and morally virtuous society.  

Education reformers during the same period designed school systems to socialize students by muting cultural differences and emphasizing white, Anglo-American, middle class and affluent values.

By the end of the nineteenth century, middle class and affluent Americans responded to a sustained influx of immigrants, thriving cities, and an expanding industrial society through political, economic, and social reforms to reaffirm capitalism and democracy believed to be tarnished by corporations and political machines. Urban education reformers envisioned public schools as the efficient mechanism to preserve an ordered and democratically loyal society. Progressives bureaucratized the school administrative structure by prioritizing a growing middle class body of professional schoolmen and elite businessmen to direct educational decision-making usurping localized authority. School reform was one way to manage social ills attributed to urban expansion. Additionally, reformers modernized curriculum and pedagogy to promote a

---
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moral and practical education that would prepare students to live productively in a rapidly changing urban society.\textsuperscript{11} This reform impulse preserved the public school’s position as an agent of social change.\textsuperscript{12}

Public schools have a long history of shaping students’ behaviors and values. It was this impulse based on middle class White Anglo-Saxon Protestant values that reformed public education positioning the school as an active agent in maintaining an ordered and moral society to resolve urban problems. My contribution to urban education reform extends this impulse into the mid-twentieth century by claiming that school-police partnerships followed a similar trajectory. I contend that these partnerships represented a new approach, but were rooted in nineteenth century school reforms and perceptions of acceptable adolescent behaviors and values. Not only does my account contribute to urban education reform, but also to closely related histories of child & youth and juvenile delinquency.

Adolescents and delinquency are socially constructed concepts that have shifted with nineteenth and twentieth century educational reforms. Reformers sought to protect children from the dangers and allure of cities.\textsuperscript{13} Overcrowding, poverty, vice, and a flood of new cultures and people challenged middle class, Anglo-American values leading benevolent child savers to develop institutional structures that would oversee and

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{12} Lawrence Cremin, \textit{The Transformation of the School}, 118.

\textsuperscript{13} Kaestle, \textit{Pillars of the Republic}, 70; Anthony L. Platt, \textit{The Child Savers}, 4; and Mennel, \textit{Thorns & Thistles}, 127.
\end{footnotesize}
socialize wayward children. Their perspectives on class, race, and ethnicity shaped reforms that perceived immigrant populations and people of color as the sources of poverty, crime, and social tension in America’s cities. From this movement emerged reform schools, houses of refuge, child welfare agencies, and the Juvenile Justice System. Public education reforms were directly tied to this socializing movement to mold adolescent behavior and morals.

By the mid-twentieth century, delinquency and youth crime rates caused alarm among parents, educators, police and municipal leaders. Historians have attributed wartime stress, Cold War anxiety, expanding youth culture and activism to challenging adult authority and traditional middle class values. Reaction from adults came in the form of community and organization-led programs designed to occupy youthful leisure time in constructive ways. This study contributes to the histories of children & youth and delinquency by highlighting that urban public schools were once again working to shape


students into productive, loyal, law abiding, democratic citizens. Public school reformers implemented school-police partnerships in reaction to mid-twentieth century social changes—desegregation, activism, and youth culture—that reformers branded as juvenile delinquency. Cast as a problem, reformers believed it could be resolved by increasing police presence in urban public schools.

My study also contributes to histories of ethnicity and race in education. As immigrants settled the United States, they carried with them their own languages, religions, and cultural values that nativists viewed as a challenge to the nation’s socio-cultural order. The United States during the nineteenth century was becoming a pluralist nation, and education reformers responded by socializing growing urban populations into good citizens reflecting republican, capitalist, and Protestant virtues. This impulse shaped common schools and turn of the century progressive education: a system that socially and culturally shaped generations of American children and were precursors to mid-twentieth century school-police partnerships. By acknowledging these antecedents, this dissertation argues that although formal school-police partnerships first emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, they aligned with a longer historical trajectory. Additionally, in attempting to socialize a rapidly changing and increasingly pluralistic society, reformers believed that juvenile delinquency challenged middle class and affluent, White Anglo-Saxon Protestant urban society.

The construction of race and American identity are closely entwined and indispensable to understanding educational reforms during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Historian Hilary J. Moss emphasizes race as part of the common school

17 Kaestle, Pillars of the Republic, 70.
narrative, arguing that American ideals and imagery often prized whiteness over people of color.\textsuperscript{18} Not only did nineteenth century public education attempt to homogenize an ethnically and culturally pluralistic society, but it also identified the ideal American as white.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, historian James Anderson contends that post-Civil War public education reflected America’s racial and social caste system in which two systems coexisted: one for citizenship and the other for the second-class.\textsuperscript{20} Despite minority successes to establish schools, defeat \textit{de jure} segregation, and protest economic and residential discrimination, white public school reformers endeavored to socialize students into explicit roles that replicated America’s racial and social order.

Anderson and Moss argue that education has operated as a dual system since African Americans first began seeking out paths to formal schooling. In the twentieth century, race and ethnicity continued to shape public education. From the 1950s to the 1970s, America’s cities were experiencing racial and ethnic tensions, as African American and Mexican American activists, faced by massive white resistance, struggled to secure their civil rights.\textsuperscript{21} Public education was often a battleground during this


tumultuous climate. Throughout the United States, Anglo-Americans took steps to slow or halt desegregation whenever possible.\textsuperscript{22} Civil Rights activism from African Americans and Mexican Americans persisted against economic, political, residential, and educational discrimination.

Building on histories of ethnicity and race in education, I argue that mid-twentieth century school-police partnerships attempted to prevent juvenile delinquency by socializing students into productive and law-abiding citizens, but did so in ways that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth. By the mid-twentieth century, juvenile delinquency was defined by its challenge to America’s dominant racial, social, and cultural groups. Analyzing the time and place


in which these partnerships emerged gives insight into the social and racial implications of these partnerships. As African Americans and Mexican Americans desegregated public schools beginning the 1950s and 1960s, so too did police. This action was not a coincidence, but a purposeful response from Anglo-Americans seeking to manage a period of social change within in public schools. In Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati, school-police partnerships were largely implemented in racially segregated African American schools, ethnically segregated Mexican American schools, schools with a higher proportion of low-income students, and schools that had been recently desegregated. Therefore, black, brown, and poor students in urban schools were more likely to experience a police presence than their Anglo middle class and affluent counterparts. Given that police presence in urban public schools materialized in the wake of Brown v Board, school-police partnerships originated as a middle class and affluent Anglo-American response to Civil Rights Movements invigorated by marginalized youth.

Industrial development and transportation advancement opened opportunities that attracted immigrants and rural migrants to cities like Flint, Tucson, and Cincinnati. Urban America became increasingly pluralistic as diverse cultures, classes, races, and ethnicities converged often resulting in poverty, crime, and social unrest. White middle class urban dwellers responded to demographic shifts by establishing economic, residential, political, and educational barriers that marginalized immigrants, people of color, and the poor.23 The partnerships that emerged in these cities represented new

methods in the mid-twentieth century to resolve urban concerns over juvenile delinquency. Police had collaborated with schools prior to the 1950s; two early examples included Juvenile Aid Bureaus and truancy officers. Early collaborations between schools and police enforced attendance laws, investigated youth crimes, and provided welfare and counseling services to juveniles. In these relationships, police operated independently from public schools.

Formal partnerships beginning in the 1950s either physically placed law enforcement officers within schools as faculty members or allowed police to co-develop school curricula and lessons. The PSL-SRO model provided police office space within schools, received funds from police and school budgets, and maintained a permanent presence as counselor, teacher, and law enforcer. Cincinnati’s Police-Attitude Project brought police and educators together to develop curricula and lessons implemented in junior high school social studies classrooms. Although they were not permanent faculty members under the Cincinnati partnership, police perspectives shaped what students learned regarding law and law enforcement. Additionally, the curriculum promoted an ideal image of law enforcement that was constructed by police officers working with educators. Despite differences, each program aimed to deter juvenile delinquency through an increased police presence in public schools. From the beginning, however, school-police partnerships approached delinquency at the expense of minority and low-income students.

For scholars in education, sociology, and criminology, understanding the origins of school-police partnerships can contribute to their overall perspective of the contemporary debates and problems that arise from the increasing presence of police in
public schools.\textsuperscript{24} For instance, education reformers sought to reduce delinquency by implementing school-police partnerships. However, these programs implicitly targeted marginalized youth and diminished student protections under the law. These problems echo the consensus among contemporary scholars that have claimed that police presence in schools is detrimental to a positive and equitable public educational experience. In considering the past, historians of education are confined to their present context. For this reason, history is a process in which understanding and knowledge of the past can shift in response to “concerns and issues of the present prompt[ing] historians to reform and rephrase questions about the past and to think in new ways about old problems.”\textsuperscript{25} This is not to say that historical insight can solve contemporary problems, but it can add depth to discussion and inform specific questions that non-historical perspectives may not consider.

During the latter half of the twentieth century, urban public schools experienced an increase in police presence. Varying in form, school-police partnerships manifested as security forces, school resource officers (SROs), and curriculum programs throughout the United States. By 2014, there were approximately 43,770 police officers in public schools.\textsuperscript{26} That equated to 43\% of all public schools in the United States and

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} Wayne J. Urban and Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr., \textit{American education: A history} (5\textsuperscript{th} ed.). (New York: Routledge, 2014), ix.
\item \textsuperscript{26} “Total Number of Public Schools, and the Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Security Personnel Present at School At least Once a Week, by Type of Personnel and School Characteristics:
\end{itemize}
45% of all public schools in urban areas.\textsuperscript{27} There was also a correlation between race and number of police. Schools with a higher proportion of white students compared to students of color have had a lower police presence. Schools that are more racially and ethnically mixed, tend to have had a higher percentage of police officers. As the proportion of white students within a school decreases, the number of police has tended to increase.\textsuperscript{28} These percentages have had an upward trend since the 1950s and continue to grow as more public schools partner with local law enforcement.

Functions of school-police partnerships vary. Since the 1990s, state-level policymakers and local school boards have taken aggressive measures against violence, weapons, and illegal drugs in schools leading to swift and harsher punishments for violators.\textsuperscript{29} In this capacity, the partnership’s main purpose resides in the security and safety of students and educators. Police-conducted patrols, random drug sweeps, locker checks, and metal detectors have become commonplace in many urban public schools. For instance, the Los Angeles School Police Department (LASPD) operates within the L.A. County School District primarily serving as a security force by patrolling school grounds and surrounding areas, ensuring safety for students and


\textsuperscript{28} “Total Number of Public Schools, and the Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Security Personnel Present at School At least Once a Week, by Type of Personnel and School Characteristics: School Year 2013-14,” 11.

\textsuperscript{29} Kathleen Nolan, Police in the Hallways, 30.
faculty moving on and off campuses, and investigating school- and student-related crimes.\textsuperscript{30} Although the LASPD does offer extracurricular, rapport-building programs, its central purpose is law enforcement differentiating them from traditional SRO and curriculum-based programs.

The SRO’s responsibilities extend beyond security. Although their role can differ by school, district, and state, SROs generally act as a liaison between schools and police working with students to detect delinquent behavior. In this position, SROs counsel students, investigate school or student related crimes, or conduct educational programs and assemblies. For example, the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO), founded in 1991, defines the SRO’s role as “teacher, informal counselor, and law enforcement.”\textsuperscript{31} Although NASRO claims that it developed this “triad,” SROs have used this approach since their origins in 1950s and 1960s.\textsuperscript{32} Other partner variations include curricular and extracurricular programs designed to teach students about law, safety, drug abuse and police duties. Depending on the program, police may or may not be directly involved in teaching the curriculum. Perhaps the most notable curriculum used in schools since the 1980s is Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.). In this program, police teach “kids the skills they need to avoid involvement in drugs, gangs, and violence.”\textsuperscript{33} In this approach, police assume the role of

\begin{flushleft}
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\end{flushleft}
educator and do not serve as a counselor or investigator while on school grounds. Irrespective of practice, the central purpose of these modern-day programs is to promote safety, build rapport with students through positive experiences, and deter juvenile crime and delinquency. Because educators, parents, municipal leaders, and law enforcement have largely viewed school-police partnerships as a success, programs have expanded since the late 1950s.

Attitudes surrounding school-police partnerships are mixed. Supporting arguments highlight the added safety an armed police officer brings to schools, reduction in juvenile crime, and the positive experiences fostered between students and law officers. In 1997, a principal from Redlands High School in San Bernardino, California, stated that its SRO “genuinely and absolutely cares about the students here” and has “gained the respect of teachers and school officials.” Commenting on building a rapport between students and police, a principal at Buechel Metropolitan High School in Louisville, Kentucky, stated in 1999 that its SRO was “breaking down barriers and, hopefully, if these students see other officers, it won’t be as enemies anymore.” Concerned about school violence in 2000, supporters from Camden School district in New Jersey argued that “placing an officer in local schools will prevent most problems


35 Stacy Spaulding DeLay, “Officers have Excellent Reputation,” The San Bernardino County Sun (San Bernardino, CA), September 4, 1997.

from occurring.” A principal at Johnston Middle School in Des Moines, Iowa, said in 2007 that “an officer in the building is not just about making it safer, but also giving the school and officer the ability to work with resources better,” adding that SROs “worked as a team with school personnel.” It is evident that educators and parents view school-police partnerships favorably across the nation. However, opponents caution that increased police presence in public schools may cause more harm than good.

Scholars in sociology, criminology, and education have argued that added security and police diminish civil rights, circumvent due process, increase the frequency and severity of punishments, target students of color and the poor, do not always foster positive relationships among juveniles, undermine the professional responsibilities of educators and counselors, and are largely ineffective in reducing delinquent activity.

For example, in White Plains, New York, parents and the local American Civil Liberties Union branch protested in 1999, that “searching students, their lockers and belongings” on grounds of illegal search and seizure tactics violated students’ rights and privacy. In Clinton, Connecticut, parents and teachers criticized Morgan High School’s SRO and
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zero-tolerance policy in 2008 after a student was arrested because his science project resembled a “Taser-like weapon.” After an incident in 2016 at Central High School in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in which an SRO pinned a student to the ground for trespassing, school officials, teachers, and students criticized the officer’s actions. One member of a local social justice group stated: “So many of the kids have bad experiences with the police.” In 2017, an SRO at Meadow Woods Middle School in Orlando, Florida, used pepper spray to end a lunch-room fist-fight injuring eight students and causing alarm among parents and faculty. That same year, an SRO hand-cuffed and arrested a ten-year-old autistic student in Okeechobee, Florida, for disrupting class and kicking and punching. These examples legitimize the concerns among scholars that school-police partnerships may be detrimental to public schools and the students they serve.

The debate over school-police partnerships is not new. Since the first programs emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, civil rights organizations, parents, educators, and students have criticized permanently placing police in schools. For example, in 1966, opponents of Tucson’s SRO program argued that a police presence in schools was unchecked and left students susceptible to questioning and searches that violated their
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civil rights. Furthermore, the director of the Flint Urban League argued in 1972 that Flint’s police program was used to intimidate black students. Conversely, many parents, educators, police and students have praised these programs for their efforts to deter juvenile delinquency and provide security for schools. Reacting to public criticism of Tucson, Arizona’s SRO program in 1966, an editorial argued that a critique of the SRO “is nothing more than an adult form of rebellion against police authority.” Moreover, a Palm Springs resident argued in 1969 that the “purpose of the School Resource Officer [was] to augment a child’s education rather than act as a classroom disciplinarian.” Additionally, in Lincoln, Nebraska, “parents and schools and the children themselves have been extremely favorable” of the local SRO program in 1972.

Despite conflicting views, police presence in public schools has expanded nationwide. Today, safety and security are often cited as the primary reasons for implementing these partnerships. Protecting students and teachers is vital. Parents want the peace of mind knowing that their children will be safe from violence and will return home to them after school. The problem is that police are trained to detect and


investigate crime. They are the government agents who enforce local, state, and federal laws. Police are not teachers, administrators, or counselors. They do not have backgrounds or degrees in education, child development, special education, or behavioral management. By assuming the educator’s roles, officers undermine the professionals who are educated and trusted to cultivate America’s children. Moreover, placing police in schools has had a detrimental effect by diminishing students’ rights and continuing to marginalize students of color and the poor through zero-tolerance punishments, the school-to-prison pipeline, and mass incarceration.\textsuperscript{50}

In the mid-twentieth century, marginalized populations fought to end American apartheid. During the same period, police began entering urban public schools. The publicized intention was to save students from delinquent behavior. Through education, counseling, and personal interactions between students and police, an ideal image of the law enforcement officer was promoted: a person who could be trusted in and out of school. This image countered the real experiences that many marginalized youths had with police during the 1950s and 1960s: one of brutality and harassment that enforced Jim Crow Era rules. Evidence suggests that the creation and implementation of school-police partnerships in urban public schools was a means to control and manage juvenile delinquency, but did so at the expense of marginalized youth. Given the increase in police presence in schools in the twenty-first century, it is unlikely that this trend will subside. Historically, school-police partnerships have compromised the professional

role that educators and councilors serve. Additionally, evidence suggests that from their outset partnerships have challenged students’ civil rights by creating an environment under constant police surveillance. Lastly, increased police presence in urban public schools has perpetuated a system that marginalizes students of color and the poor. Educators and law enforcement must therefore proceed with caution and allow teachers to teach, administrators to manage, and counselors to counsel.

Current debates over school police presence reverberate the concerns educators and parents had when these programs first emerged. The consensus among scholars that study modern-day school-police partnerships argues that these programs and the continued codification of school discipline are detrimental to students, education professionals, and the overall school environment. It is evident from this study, that the origins of this phenomenon correspond with these modern-day perceptions. School-police partnerships were designed and implemented by middle class, Anglo-Americans to deter delinquency, but did so in ways that challenged students’ rights and continued to marginalize minority and low-income urban youth.
LIST OF REFERENCES


American Civil Liberties Union. June, 1964. folder 13, box 4, Arizona Civil Liberties Union Papers, University of Arizona Libraries, Special Collections.


Bradstreet, Mary D. “PTA Cooperation Is Sought By Friendly Relations Group.” The Cincinnati Enquirer (Cincinnati, OH), December 8, 1946.


Cooke, Edward B. *Inquisitor and Cincinnati Enquirer Advertiser*. (Cincinnati, OH), May 4, 1819.

Community Chest of Cincinnati and Hamilton County. “Relief and Related Trends in Evictions, Dependent and Neglected Children and Juvenile Delinquency,
Cincinnati and Hamilton County, 1828-1940.” Cincinnati: The Cincinnati Community Chest, 1940.


DeLay, Stacy Spaulding. “Officers have Excellent Reputation.” The San Bernardino County Sun (San Bernardino, CA), September 4, 1997.


———. “Terror Probe Starts in Flint.” Detroit Free Press (Detroit, MI), May 26, 1936.


Doornbos, Caitlin. “Students Pepper-Sprayed by Resource Officer during Fight.” The Orlando Sentinel (Orlando, FL), March 16, 2017.


———. folder 27.3, Box 2, Charles S. Mott Collection, University of Michigan, Flint, Frances Wilson Thompson Library, Genesee Historical Collections Center.


The Battle Creek Enquirer. “Flint Police Officers Penalized for Brutality.” The Battle Creek Enquirer (Battle Creek, MI), May 23, 1951.

———. “Fight for Human Dignity Described at NAACP Rally.” The Battle Creek Enquirer (Battle Creek, MI), November 23, 1959.

———. “Housing ‘Sleep-In’ Protest Called Off.” The Battle Creek Enquirer (Battle Creek, MI), October 10, 1967.
The Chicago Tribune. “Cincinnati Tour is Unsurpassed in Middle West.” The Chicago Sunday Tribune, (Chicago, IL), May 27, 1917.


The Des Moines Register. “School Officials Weigh Hiring Police Officer.” The Des Moines Register (Des Moines, Iowa), February 6, 2007.


———. “Policemen from Varied Locales Discuss School Liaison Programs.” The Flint Journal (Flint, MI), September 26, 1968.

———. “Schools Expand Police Liaison Team.” The Flint Journal (Flint, MI), September 21, 1969.


Thomas, Bob. “SRO Program Hopes to extend into high schools.” The Arizona Republic (Phoenix, AZ), February 9, 1969.


BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Kenneth Noble earned his Ph.D. in curriculum & instruction with an emphasis in schools, society, and culture. He earned his B.A. in history and B.S. in social studies secondary education from Mississippi State University in May 2006. Kenneth continued his studies in secondary education at Mississippi State earning his M.S. in December 2007. Starting in the fall of 2008, Kenneth taught high school social studies in Georgetown, SC. In fall 2010, he returned to Mississippi State earning his M.A. in history concentrating on twentieth century America and education. In fall 2012, Kenneth began his studies at the University of Florida in the School of Teaching and Learning where he also teaches History of Education in the United States. His primary research interests include police presence in schools, urban education, race and class in education, students’ rights, and nineteenth and twentieth century education reform.