POLICE **EMPIRE** ERN CING **NEW YORK**

MATTHEW GUARIGLIA

POLICE & THE EMPIRE CITY



RACE & THE **ORIGINS** OF MODERN **POLICING NEW YORK**

DUKE

UNIVERSITY

POLICE & THE EMPIRE CITY

MATTHEW GUARIGLIA

DUKE

Duke University Press Durham and London 2023

UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 2023 Duke University Press. All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Project Editor: Ihsan Taylor
Designed by Aimee C. Harrison
Typeset in Garamond Premier Pro and Helvetica Neue Pro
by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Guariglia, Matthew, author.

Title: Police and the Empire City: race and the origins of modern policing in New York / Matthew Guariglia.

Description: Durham: Duke University Press, 2023. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023003684 (print)

LCCN 2023003685 (ebook)

ISBN 9781478025405 (paperback)

ISBN 9781478020622 (hardcover)

ISBN 9781478027546 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: New York (N.Y.). Police Department—History.

 $Police - New\ York\ (State) - New\ York - History.\ |\ Law\ enforcement -$

New York (State)—New York—History. | Racial profiling in law enforcement—New York (State)—New York—History. | Discrimination

in law enforcement—New York (State)—New York—History. | Police brutality—New York (State)—New York—History. | Police-community

relations—New York (State)—New York—History. | New York (N.Y.)— Ethnic relations—History. | BISAC: HISTORY / United States / General |

SOCIAL SCIENCE / Criminology

Classification: LCC HV8148.N5 G83 2023 (print) | LCC HV8148.N5

(ebook) | DDC 363.209747/1—dc23/eng/20230714 LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2023003684

LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2023003685

Cover art: Italians and police officers around a suspended bank in New York City, circa 1907–14. Photo by Bain News Service, N.Y.C. George Grantham Bain Collection (Library of Congress).



FOR MY FAMILY

DUKE

UNIVERSITY PRESS

1 IntroductionRace, Legibility& Policing inthe Unequal City

24 **1**

Becoming BlueNew York Police's
Earliest Encounters
with Race & Ethnicity,
1845–1871

44 2
Racial Hierarchies
of Crime & Policing
Bodies, Morals & Gender
in the NYPD, 1890–1897

71 3
Colonial Methods
Francis Vinton Greene's
Journey from Empire to
Policing the Empire City

DUKE

UNIVERSITY PRESS

CONTENTS

93 4

The Rise of Ethnic Policing

Warren Charles, Cornelius Willemse & the German Squad

107 5

Policing the

"Italian Problem"

Criminality, Racial Difference & the NYPD Italian Squad, 1903–1909

135 6

"They Needed Me as Much as I Needed Them"

Black Patrolmen & Resistance to Police Brutality,

1900-1913

153 7

"Police Are

Raw Materials"

Training Bodies in the World War I Era

176 8

Global Knowledge /

American Police

Information, International Collaboration & the

Rise of Technocratic "Color-Blind" Policing

199 Conclusion

Policing's Small Toolbox & the Afterlives

of Ethnic Policing

207 Acknowledgments

211 Notes

235 Bibliography

259 Index

DUKE

UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

Race, Legibility, and Policing in the Unequal City

In 1906, the editors of Joseph Pulitzer's popular newspaper the Evening World proposed a plan they thought would finally allow police to get a foothold in New York's Chinatown. The proposal was to tear down sections of the majority immigrant neighborhood and turn it into a wide-open park. The headline "Tear Down the Dens of Chinatown and Make a Park of New York's Darkest Spot," sought to depict not just the densely inhabited tenements of Lower Manhattan but also their residents as dark and impenetrable. "Sightseers go through the streets and look at the silent Chinamen and think they have seen Chinatown," the article said, "but the mysteries hid behind those walls, the crime-polluted back alleys and cellars, the dungeon dives, the secret life of the thugs and thieves, and feuds, the slavery—these are not seen." To the working-, middle-, and even upper-class white readers of the Evening World, Chinatown, like many immigrant neighborhoods in New York at the time, was a shadowy spot on the map. It was a place unknowable and illegible to respectable white Manhattanites, even those predisposed to searching for the lurid and titillating and (often staged) slumming and tourism expeditions. The paper's editors and its readers were led to believe that because much of this world existed beyond the reach and gaze of the majority white and Americanborn police department, it was a place in which crime could flourish and even spread to other neighborhoods and threaten white communities.¹

Officers and administrators of the New York City's police department, as well as the wider white public, were fed a steady diet of sensationalized



reporting about Chinese immigrants. This reporting often played up the foreignness of the inhabitants of Chinatown to the point of racist caricature—especially when it came to depicting Chinese people as having a predilection for all manner of vice, including the seduction or sexual coercion of young white women. Stories of police liberating young white women from these supposedly unfindable basement dens would have been familiar to newspaper readers at the time. These stories slotted perfectly into the contemporary moral panic gripping politicians, police administrators, and the upper crust of New York society: fear that sexually predatory immigrant and nonwhite men were seducing and exploiting white women. These men would allegedly use affection, drugs, or force to profit from coerced prostitution. The panic weaponized xenophobic fears of interracial socialization and sexual interaction to criminalize and arrest immigrants and nonwhite men, and even to deport some of them.²

The Evening World's proposal to turn spaces unknowable to police into a park reached beyond city planning—it was also an attempt to turn people who were supposedly so foreign as to be unknowable into something predictable and benign as well. "The criminals who infest the district," the editors wrote, "are forced to come together for mutual protection and concealment.... No one except those thoroughly afraid of them can understand their language." Consequently, because the only people who understood their language were also the same people who feared reprisals should they speak to law enforcement, "the police cannot get evidence of the conspiracy or of the murder when it is committed." The cultural gap between the alleged criminal and the police—the inability of police to gain cooperation from witnesses conspired to make detectives believe the people of Chinatown were as incomprehensible as the dense urban landscape itself. As one officer said, "I'd be willing to wager a fair sum that a hundred murders have been committed in Chinatown, by Chinamen, without a word about such crimes reaching the ears of police." To some extent, these crimes were fantasies created by an American-born public eager to read criminality, deviance, and violence onto any cultures that seemed foreign or different.3

Arrests in the Progressive Era, especially in immigrant and Black neighborhoods, were not a clear indicator of the existence of crime. After all, police often used immigrants' inability to wield civic power, attract attention from municipal services, or communicate effectively with the government to extort money from the newly arrived and arrest those who protested. But police per-

2 INTRODUCTION

ceived their failures to solve those crimes that did exist as a manifestation of the cultural, linguistic, and even geographical unknowability of immigrants and the spaces they inhabited.4

This plan's apparent origin in the pages of a newspaper rather than from the mouth of a police administrator or legislator is also significant. During this period, police, commissioners, reformers, politicians, and even newspaper reporters and editors—commentators as lowly as beat cops and as elevated as renowned international intellectuals—dedicated considerable ink and intellectual labor to attempt to solve the problem of how to police a rapidly diversifying city. Through writings and policy proposals, they attempted to transform nineteenth-century-style policing into a modern science ready to tackle New York's new and more multiracial century. They were the producers, recyclers, and legitimizers of the knowledge on which racial violence and exclusion were built and justified. Throughout this book, I refer to this cohort of people who created knowledge about policing, whether they were detectives, politicians, or university scientists, as "police intellectuals." While I take the time to explore the mental work of police intellectuals, these actors can also be categorized as what Micol Seigel has labeled "violence workers." Although most of the people who created knowledge about policing never personally pulled a trigger or swung a club, they helped to build, justify, and legitimize a system of policing and power relationships that caused violence, not just on physical bodies but also on "discursive, epistemic, symbolic, psychic, and economic," levels. Although some of these people may have had limited contact with one another, they were all engaged in the project of trying to understand how police could exert power across the racial landscape and develop ways to make it more dependable and inescapable.⁵

The 1906 proposals about how to make Chinatown—and by extension Chinese—crime more visible to police were not by any means the start of the conversation. In the early twentieth century, there was a general understanding among the people who thought about crime in the United States that policing did not work. It was not that the system itself was flawed; after all, politicians and social scientists could always point to European police institutions that supposedly showed great results in managing crime. No, many believed that it was the American population itself that made policing ineffective.



Police and the Empire City

Police and the Empire City shows how race shaped modern policing and how, in turn, modern policing helped to define and redefine racial boundaries in New York. From its founding, the police department in New York had to organize in ways that addressed racial and ethnic difference. This meant recruiting certain kinds of officers, aggressively policing specific neighborhoods, and building a body of knowledge about the relationship between race and crime. By doing so, police became an engine of racial management and race-making. Not only did police administrators get to decide who was worthy of recruitment to the force—and thus eligible for inclusion in the project of racial state-building—they also got to decide which races were law-abiding and assimilable to American society, and which races were innately criminal and worthy of exclusion and violence.

By building a department that administrators, politicians, and social scientists thought capable of addressing crime in a diverse city, they allowed their engagement with race, perceptions about racial difference, and racisms to leave a tangible imprint on the shape and operations of modern police. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the NYPD explicitly recruited immigrants and created squads of multilingual officers to patrol specific neighborhoods. Police who served as anthropologists and translators gathering knowledge and making communities more knowable to the state were eventually eclipsed by more technocratic and academic ways of knowing. Technologies and filing systems that are now central to the bureaucratic operations of departments were integrated as a means to identify even those people who could not communicate with officers. By the mid-1910s, officer training and education included not just a physical, legal, and forensic curriculum, but also courses to provide linguistic and cultural knowledge. All of these innovations emerged in the early twentieth century as ways that the department could uphold its commitment to racial management in the city.⁶

I have chosen to write about the period between the NYPD's founding in 1845 and the 1930s because it encompasses the moment when police transitioned from a more informal collection of pugilists clad in wool coats to what we can recognize today as a modern professionalized police department. The desire to understand and subordinate immigrant and nonwhite communities catalyzed the rise of a technocratic and surveillance-based policing designed to know, document, and identify as many urbanites as possible—and forged connections between police and the federal immigration administration that

4 INTRODUCTION

endure to this day. This period also saw an acceleration of police departments' antagonistic and militarized posture against marginalized civilians as more technologies, tactics, and ways of racializing crime and violence from America's imperial projects traveled home. Progressive Era police laid the groundwork for the globalized and collaborative system of policing and surveillance so characteristic of international relations to this day. Those interested in the United States' commitment to training police abroad during the Cold War, or the NYPD's thirteen international outposts opened after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, may find the earliest intellectual justifications of such connections not in 2001 or 1970, but in the State Department's 1910 plan to convene a World Police Congress to be held in Washington, DC, to establish international collaboration to combat Italian organized crime.⁷

The narrative in this book covers large demographic swings, the expansion of the US Empire, emancipation and Reconstruction, and the intellectual work and street-level experimentation by police as the fledgling institution navigated these turbulent changes. These national era-defining events sent waves of people, goods, and ideas to New York and forced the department to contend with their existence in the city. By experimenting with ways of exerting control over immigrant and Black communities—which the New York City Police Department believed to be hotbeds of crime—NYPD administrators and beat cops along with social scientists, politicians, racial scientists, early eugenicists, and a fearful, racist, and xenophobic white public all slowly and deliberately compiled the elements of the modern police department we still encounter.

This period also oversaw the nationalizing of local police problems. Feeling unable to control immigrant crime in New York and elsewhere, police intellectuals became outspoken advocates for using the federal levers of power to address their concerns. Federal immigration policy and deportations, culminating in the draconian immigration restrictions of 1921 and 1924, became vital tools to prevent immigration or remove immigrants from those demographics police believed were especially prone to criminality.

The intellectual history of policing New York City is also a global history. Excavating the history of how the NYPD adapted during the early twentieth century uncovers circuits of knowledge produced and exported to create racial boundaries and justify state violence around the world. These circuits do not exist purely because people proud to call themselves New Yorkers hailed from every corner of the globe, but also because its police department is itself a composite of pieces and tactics from around the world. Prominent figures



in policing, as well as a good number of officers, had come to the profession as a result of the expansion of the US Empire in the American West, the Pacific, and the Caribbean. Tactics and mentalities of understanding race, insurgency, surveillance, and anticolonialist resistance all found their way into the structure and procedures of the NYPD, both in the minds of soldiers and through the books and academic studies that imperialism produced. The US occupation of the Philippines and other occupied colonies were, to use a phrase Alfred McCoy has popularized, a "laboratory of police modernity." European imperialism as well left its imprint on policing in New York. The first decades of the twentieth century were defined, in part, by the ready and continuous connection between the United States and Europe. As civil servants crisscrossed the ocean, and as police began to form an international community of law enforcement thinkers and practitioners, American police departments became frequent recipients of policing tactics and technologies in use in Europe. Many of these European technologies, fingerprinting chief among them, had been developed in colonies brutally occupied by Great Britain or France. Once in New York, these tactics, whether or not they had been tested on colonial subjects, were put to use to make a multiracial and multiethnic city more controllable by police.8

The Failures of Policing in a Multiracial Nation

From 1913 to 1917, Raymond Fosdick, a former NYPD administrator turned researcher, traveled the United States and Europe, visiting police departments in hopes of finding a solution to what he called the "American Problem." He declared it the defining difficulty of policing in the United States. It was, in his estimation, "this complex problem of nationality that the police are called upon to grapple with. They must enforce the same laws among a score of races and maintain a standard of conduct in a population coming from radically different environments." Europe, he argued, had the benefit of homogeneity, in addition to more advanced police procedures. Police there came from the populace they were policing, which meant, Fosdick presumed, they understood the people. American police simply weren't equipped to control "disorder" among so many different types of people perceived to have an innate propensity for crime. He believed that to handle immigrant crime, it was the near impossible duty of the police to make law-abiding Americans out of foreign, backward, or innately criminal Italians, Chinese, or Russians. But before they could do that, police first had to understand who these immigrants were.⁹

6 INTRODUCTION

Even before the formal creation of the New York City Municipal Police Department in 1845, the police of the city—and before that its night watchmen—had been forced to contend with the city's multiracial and multiethnic residents. Irish, German, and Chinese immigrants, traders, and sailors from around the globe, formerly enslaved freedmen and women, descendants of original Dutch settlers—all of them lived, walked, ate, drank, socialized, and worked in the growing city, and all of them were subject to the growing power of the professionalizing urban police force.

The high number of Irish people employed as police may have helped to make the newly arrived seem a little less mysterious, but it did not offset decades of racialization, stereotyping, and discrimination by the city's Anglo-Dutch elite. Despite xenophobic stereotypes that the Irish had a propensity for violence and graft, Irish police were often useful and relied upon *for* their reputation as brawlers, not despite it. Likewise, the alderman of Tammany Hall—the Democratic Party's political committee that often used corrupt means to dominate city politics for a large portion of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—appointed a high number of Germans to the police force, which helped offset the language barriers that hindered many American-born officers as they patrolled German neighborhoods.¹⁰

The Municipal Police Department's early role in enforcing racial boundaries in the city also meant navigating various states of freedom and enslavement. Even in the urban North, where police departments can trace their direct origins more to London's metropolitan police than Southern slave patrols—the vestiges of slavery and the brutality of racial capitalism remained defining characteristics. Shortly after the 1845 founding of the NYPD, the federal government tasked police departments with enforcing the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act. Decades after New York had outlawed slavery, New York police officers were responsible for finding, capturing, and sending South self-emancipated African Americans who had risked their lives to make it to New York, hoping to find freedom. To say that all US police departments sprang from brutal slave patrols is not untrue—surveillance of Blackness in the North and South was a vital state and state-sanctioned function—but it also allows us to dismiss London-style policing as somehow more benign. It was not. Robert Peel, a founder of England's modern police system may have written in 1829 that police should maintain good public standing by "offering individual service and friendship to all members of society without regard to their race or social standing" but in the United States, early police were incapable of and uninterested in reconciling racial fairness with protecting the accumulation of capital. This was because Black people were themselves the capital being accumulated in the form of enslaved laborers. Even when the right of Black men to vote was affirmed by the Fifteenth Amendment to the US Constitution, plum police positions were not offered to members of New York's small Black community in exchange for their votes, as they were for other racial and ethnic groups in New York City.¹¹

By 1904, the American Problem had already resulted in a majority monolingual police force ill-equipped for policing a diverse city. The model for ethnic policing emerged from this ad hoc place of need, and an inability to understand immigrant communities. In 1904, the NYPD officially appointed its first Chinese American officer and organized a German Squad and an Italian Squad, all in an attempt to correct the linguistic and cultural blind spots of a predominantly monolingual police force. These centralized squads tasked with patrolling and investigating specific racial groups were not the invention of the NYPD. Between 1900 and the 1920s, many police commissioners, administrators, and even beat cops had been involved in upholding the US imperial project in the American West and overseas. "Native policing," as it is called in a colonialist context, traveled home with police commissioners like Gen. Francis Vinton Greene or former assistant secretary of the Navy William McAdoo and found a place in New York's immigrant neighborhoods.

This attempt at ethnic policing was short-lived. Mounting hostility toward immigrants and a growing legislative movement to expand immigration restrictions that already depressed Chinese immigration to the United States sowed distrust even inside the now multiethnic NYPD. Between the end of xenophobic police commissioner Theodore Bingham's tenure in 1909, the rise of racial nationalism around World War I, and the eventual immigration restrictions of 1921 and 1924, immigrant squads were phased out. Police intellectuals lost interest in recruiting officers specifically for their language and cultural knowledge.

By the time Fosdick wrote in 1917 about the problem of policing immigrants, police in New York City were trying to catalyze a massive transformation—if not in function of the police, then at least in form. Technological advances in forensic science; presumptive racial science; mounting xenophobia; and a Progressive Era revolution that transformed, professionalized, and standardized municipal governance all collided in an attempt to change policing. Reformers hoped to transform the police from corrupt pugilists sicced on political rivals and opponents of the racial and economic

status quo to a professionalized force that utilized legal, racial, and scientific know-how to solve and prevent crimes, maintain public health and safety, and build legal cases. Even under this aspirational regime police would still be called upon to enact state violence against those who represented a threat to "law and order." This included labor and civil rights activists, sex workers, people pursuing same-sex sexual and romantic relations, and racialized subjects whose assertion of the right to public space represented a threat to the white male monopoly on access to urban amenities. Standardizing police coverage over the entire city also meant finding ways for police to exert power over those people and spaces that, by virtue of their foreignness or distrust of police, had hindered police effectiveness and obscured the state's penetrating gaze.12

The problem of legibility—the idea that a government that understands the motivations, desires, and fears of its subjects can better govern them—is fundamental to Fosdick's formulation of the American Problem. As political scientist Hugh Heclo once wrote, the state must "puzzle before power." It must understand before it can subordinate. During the years of his investigation, millions of immigrants from around the world came to the United States in hopes of finding political and religious freedom and economic opportunity. During the high point of immigration in 1907, almost 1.3 million people arrived in urban and industrial centers in the United States. These people often spoke different languages from the government employees who registered their names and patrolled their streets.¹³

The American Problem was fundamentally an equation asking how the government might make immigrants more legible to police and, by subjecting them to more effective subordination, make them more reconcilable with life in white America.

On March 17, 1913, the same year Fosdick left for his tour of seventy-two police departments in the United States to find out how police could better patrol immigrant neighborhoods, Daniel Davis was shot six times by police on the corner of Lenox Avenue and 139th street in East Harlem. Davis, who was Black, had supposedly "molested" a white woman, Irene Leslie, as he walked by her on the street. Leslie summoned the police and the confrontation resulted in an officer shooting Davis to death. "The reports are confusing," the New York Age, the city's largest Black newspaper, reported. "What really happened will probably never be known."14

Although African Americans made up less than 2 percent of New York City's population in the years around the turn of the century, Black New



Yorkers like Davis were disproportionately represented in arrest records and anecdotes of police harassment and violence. The multiracial neighborhoods where the Black, immigrant, and native-born working classes cohabitated were among the most ferociously policed—both by uniformed officers and by white people looking to enforce the color line and forcibly distance themselves from those they perceived as below them on the racial hierarchy. Black women were often harassed and arrested on mere suspicion of being prostitutes simply because they were read by police as inherently deviant. Black men were equally labeled as biologically predisposed not just to crime but to other misdeeds as well because of assumptions about a lack of respectability stemming from sometimes precarious employment.¹⁵

Because of this supposed predisposition and the repetitive and time-flattening nature of state violence in Black communities, African Americans were often dismissed inside the police departments and in the writing of police intellectuals. While police were eager to recruit Italian or Chinese officers, administrators did not feel the need to appoint Black officers to act as translators. They saw Black criminality as a problem, to be sure, but not a problem in need of a solution—the solution to that problem was always violence. As Khalil Muhammad has written that in the wake of mounting panic about immigrant crime, the continued awareness of crime committed by Black Americans "would have sounded more familiar than alarmist." Any academic studies or attempts to find a solution or root cause of Black criminality were warped by notions of biological deviance and reified its permanence. ¹⁶

The death of Daniel Davis, and the deaths of so many other Black New Yorkers at the hands of police, was understood with a different mental calculus on the part of police administrators and social scientists than the problem of immigrant crime. The police, Fosdick wrote,

must be prepared to understand the criminal propensities of Sicilians and Poles, of Chinese and Russians. They must become expert in detecting crime characteristics as shown by twenty races.... To see the London "Bobby" at work, dealing with people of his race who understand him and whom he understands, is to learn a larger sympathy for his brother officer who walks the beat in New York, Chicago, or San Francisco.

But for Black men and women, there was almost always just "power" and never "puzzle." ¹⁷



Policing, Police, and Race-Making

The language of race in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was convoluted and situational. I often use "race" and "ethnicity" interchangeably. Ethnicity, as historian David Roediger argues, was a discursive creation of the mid-twentieth century that differentiated among types of white people after different immigrant groups had already been consolidated into a legally monolithic white race. Because in 1902 most New Yorkers would have understood the difference between Irish people and German people as being racial rather than ethnic, I endeavor to echo their language. However, there are moments when "ethnic" is useful because it connotes a process of racial formation that includes different European races and excludes groups like African Americans and Chinese New Yorkers. Therefore, I use "ethnic" to refer to white immigrants and their descendants who are still deemed a racialized other. I also use "Anglo-Irish" or sometimes "Anglo-German-Irish" to talk about these ethnic groups as a single consolidated unit of white New Yorkers who excluded new immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe.¹⁸

Police departments served another important function in the maintenance of racial boundaries and racial capitalism: the consolidation of the social and economic mobility associated with whiteness around European immigrants. Scholars of race have debated whether European immigrants were technically "white" upon their arrival to the United States regardless of the legal and scientific consensus that they were a different race from Anglo-Americans. Despite the perceptions of racial differences between Jewish, Italian, Irish, and German immigrants, this book agrees that the presumption of eventual assimilability into white American culture came with social and economic mobility—in essence, whiteness—denied to Asian and African-descended Caribbean immigrants, as well as native-born Black Americans.¹⁹

In addition to showing how ethnic police officers led their communities into whiteness by participating in the project of racial state-building, it is also essential to acknowledge the role of anti-Black racism in allowing the formation of a more consolidated whiteness. Scholars have argued that European immigrants were able to prove their whiteness by forcibly emphasizing the difference between themselves and African Americans. This often took the form of refusing to work alongside or perform similar labor as Black workers, fighting over public space by enforcing uncrossable racial boundaries, and constructing moral and medical taboos around interracial socializing. By differentiating themselves from Black Americans, newly arrived immigrants attempted to prove their assimilability into whiteness—and their ascension to careers in the police department offered one such avenue.²⁰

Immigrant men who served on the police force not only expedited the process of Americanizing their kin and neighbors but they also served as the vanguards of whiteness for their races. By taking on the shared obligation of policing their own communities and by contributing to the project of municipal governance, immigrant police officers were rewarded with social mobility often denied to their civilian peers. For instance, despite the intense racialization of Irish immigrants in the mid-nineteenth century, Irish officers who helped to beat back Irish rioters were both understood and visually depicted as more American and "whiter" than the countrymen they policed. Ethnic police were often among the first people in their racial categories to be treated with the deference usually reserved for white citizens.

But policing was not just about winning entrance onto the force: the key difference was *how* European immigrants were policed. For European immigrants in the United States, assimilation and whiteness became synonymous with the rights, privileges, and obligations of citizenship. *Police and the Empire City* argues that police viewed their presence in immigrant communities as an important engine of citizen-making. At all levels of the department, leaders and officers believed that the more communities of the newly arrived could be made hospitable to state control, the faster they would learn the legal and extralegal rules that dictated behavior in their adopted nation. In a sense, the NYPD's investment in policing a community often meant a vote of confidence in that community's assimilability. As New York City police commissioner William McAdoo said in 1906, police are doing "far more important work, so far as the future citizens are concerned, than probably any other officials in this land." In some neighborhoods police violence was inclusive, while in others it was intensely exclusive. ²¹

Immigrants, however, were not the only racial others trying to carve out lives for themselves in diversifying and industrializing urban centers. Black residents were also living, working, and navigating the rapidly expanding city. But white thinkers of Fosdick's generation did not question how police could better "understand" Black urbanites. Black pacification was a central tenant of American governance and had been for centuries. African American brutalization at the hands of police in the name of order and safety went unchallenged and was expected even while Fosdick and his cohort agonized over making police departments more effective with immigrants. In the early twentieth century, European immigrants were treated as yet another challenge created

as a byproduct of a modernizing society—a complication that could be solved by innovations in governance. Police treated Black New Yorkers, however, as a historical constant. Their perceived criminality was not a governance problem that police thought they could solve for good, but an immutable reality of American life.

When African American leaders sought to reduce police violence in Black neighborhoods, one of their most insistent requests was to desegregate the NYPD. Black officers, they claimed, would be more mindful of the needs of the neighborhood, less violent, and possess a better ability to discern the difference between troublemakers and respectable members of the community. Even though New York was behind Philadelphia, Chicago, and other cities in appointing Black patrolmen, advocates hoping for a Black NYPD officer often framed their request in comparison with the first generation of immigrant officers. After all, they argued, if the NYPD found it necessary to deploy Italians and Germans to their own neighborhoods, why shouldn't they do the same in majority Black neighborhoods? White administrators did not see any such need—but upon his appointment Samuel Battle, the NYPD's first Black patrolman, quickly felt the same way as many of the initial immigrant officers, that he was acting as a translator and anthropologist helping the department to decode and understand his community.²²

Black officers received access to some levers of social and economic mobility. Samuel Battle climbed the ranks to become an NYPD lieutenant, and later the New York City parole commissioner. But he also occupied complicated and fraught territory, by grappling with racism aimed at him by white officers and civilians while being expected to mete out racist violence on behalf of the police department. He could not bestow whiteness and belonging on himself or his community in the same way that white ethnic officers could, but he did help to enforce the color line in New York by serving the NYPD project of racial management.

Chinese immigrants inhabited a liminal space between European immigrants, who could eventually be assimilated into whiteness, and Black Americans who were forcibly and permanently excluded. Chinese immigrants were subject to entwined racialization and criminalization that was simultaneously similar to that faced by other immigrants but also different. While there were some aspects of Italian or Jewish culture that may have seemed familiar to American police, assumptions about Chinese culture shaded them to appear more alien—sometimes to the point of novelty. While some upwardly mobile immigrants dared not visit working-class multiracial neighborhoods for fear



of socially self-demoting, many upper-class New Yorkers enjoyed "slumming" in ethnic enclaves, especially Chinatown. The financial incentive to cater to amusement seekers meant Chinese business owners often exaggerated their foreignness in order to "manufacture" the performance of race expected by white customers. While this created economic possibilities and social mobility for Chinese New Yorkers, it also reinforced stereotypes that were the basis of public opinion and often policing.²³

Unlike European immigrants, the Chinese had already been the subject of punitive and xenophobic enforcement. The US government had enacted the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, which prohibited Chinese laborers without immediate family in the United States from immigrating, with a few notable exceptions. This already distinguished them, both racially and in a sense of national belonging and citizenship, from European immigrants who did not encounter substantial restrictions barring them from the United States until 1921. Decades before the Progressive Era politicians argued over whether restrictions on immigration from some regions of Europe might decrease urban crime and improve the health of the body politic, they had already made the determination on Chinese immigrants.²⁴

Xenophobic presumptions about criminality and economic adaptability warped the way that police intellectuals and other social scientists understood racial difference. In a society broken into "good" and "bad" minorities, goodness and badness were determined by who could *act* the most like white New Yorkers and thereby assimilate into their way of ordering society. Immigrants, especially nonwhite immigrants, had to overcome not just systemic repression and a lack of economic opportunity extended to white native-born Americans but also the preconceived notions about a group's ability to assimilate. They did this by developing language skills, changing styles of dress, and sometimes even converting to predominant religions.²⁵

The racial formation Chinese immigrants underwent on US soil did not occur in a vacuum but as part of a process of race-making that unfolded throughout the urban landscape. The growth of Chinese and Japanese immigrants in the United States both complicated and reinforced the Black/white color line. On the one hand, over the better part of a century, a mountain of case law was developed to determine where Asian immigrants belonged within a society built upon a racial dichotomy. Would they attend segregated schools or ride segregated public transit? In some ways, it forced legal, political, and cultural institutions to grapple with a group of people who were not Black but also not white. In other ways, however, it strengthened the ra-

cial divide as Asian Americans in New York achieved more economic power and opportunity by the 1940s, even as Japanese Americans on the West Coast were subject to imprisonment during World War II. Their economic and social mobility in New York, like the Irish or Italian immigrants before them, bolstered preconceived police and upper-class white notions about Blackness, just as they challenged notions about Asian-ness. Despite the state's understanding and enforcement of racial hierarchy, the intellectual work of policing was not always perceivable from the street level.²⁶

While the police department's forceful treatment of immigrants, Black people, and working-class New Yorkers of all stripes often looked similar on the ground, how police thought about each group and their ability to participate in American society reflected their slow accumulation of economic and political power in the city.

Building the Early Carceral State

Even though NYPD officers seemed to have treated pedestrians and residents differently depending on the community they were patrolling, we must understand these various modes in relation to one another. Authors and historians have produced thorough and illuminating bodies of literature exploring policing of Black Americans or in predominantly immigrant neighborhoods.²⁷ Other indispensable histories written in recent years have been dedicated to the policing of gender and sexuality.²⁸ Still more plumb the depths of the police department's place within electoral and party politics.²⁹ This books builds on that necessary and paradigm-shifting work by considering the varying functions of the department as happening in the context of others. I take up the call that historians must, as Kelly Lytle Hernández has written, "suture the split" that has cleaved the history of deportation and immigrant policing from the history of incarceration and brutalization of Black people. Suturing this split shows how the various shades of racialization and criminalization that affect immigrants and Black Americans in different ways belong to the same process of racial capitalist state-building and settler colonialism.³⁰

Administrators in the NYPD spoke about the necessity of recruiting Chinese-speaking officers as they simultaneously brutalized Black women for asserting their belonging in public life. Officers clubbed Yiddish strikers as they simultaneously built a departmental library that included scientific texts about the "Italian temperament." Police interaction with each of these communities deserves scholarly attention—especially in the case of those groups that



have been subjected to untold violence and trauma at the hands of the racial state. But behind each of these specific examples was a unified and hierarchical system of policing simultaneously informed by—and informing—scientific and political understanding of crime, violence, and national belonging in a patriarchal and white-dominated nation. As Ruth Wilson Gilmore reminds us, "People who enliven the agencies, policies, and institutions that we call the 'surveillance state,' are thinking about all of us all the time together. And yet, in many cases, we think of ourselves separately, in isolated struggles that at best join together as alliances rather than a unified movement." ³¹

Policing does not happen in a vacuum. It exists on a continuum in which the perceived necessity of policing in one neighborhood affects how police behave elsewhere. To understand how police learned to patrol communities differently at the beginning of the twentieth century is to begin to unravel how racial formation shaped the state and how the state shapes race. Racialization is a shared process, in which different groups share common stimuli, historically contingent social and economic factors, and are acted upon by a range of state and individual actors. "Whiteness and blackness, as well as other modern racial forms, emerge as subject positions, habits of perception, and modes of embodiment that develop from the ongoing risk management of settler and slave capitalism, and more generally racial capitalism," writes Nikhil Pal Singh. The ongoing and changing positionality of racial groups in regards to their relationship with policing, police, and criminality, dictates their racial and economic mobility. By incorporating Natalia Molina's notion of racial scripts, or the connections and mutual constructions of racial formation, we can begin to understand policing as a common factor that acts upon many groups in the same city in the same historical moment. "A racial scripts approach," she writes, "pulls the lens back so that we can see different racial projects operating at the same time, affecting different groups simultaneously."32

This book relies upon the methodological and political framework of the many Black, immigrant, queer, and activist scholars who have heeded the urgency of our moment and painstakingly built our growing literature on the carceral state. Although most of their scholarship and research has focused on uncovering the bipartisan, imperialist, and cultural roots of our current moment of mass incarceration, I am interested in widening the scope to show the slow buildup of carceral capacity. By carceral capacity I do not mean, as other scholars have, the enormous increase in the construction of cells or the frequent passage of statutes stemming from the war on crime, the war on drugs, and quality-of-life policing. I mean instead the growing capacity of the state

to exert power over a diverse multiracial and multiethnic populace. In the case of Chinatown, and by extension the Chinese community dispersed across the city, the expansion of carceral capacity meant exerting control over terra incognita, unknown and unmappable territory. It was not always a given that police could traverse dense immigrant neighborhoods to locate and apprehend a single person. In the late nineteenth century there were large swaths of ethnic and nonwhite New York believed to be unpoliceable. Over time, departments needed to build the capacity to identify, track, and apprehend even those people attempting to be illegible to the state. Before the state could imprison millions of people, it first had to build a punitive system capable of exerting control over large areas of the nation. 33

My contribution to our understanding of the late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century carceral state comes from excavating the relationship between policing, racial formation, the state's project of subjection and subordination—and the impact of this project on shaping our institutions. Specifically, I am interested in merging studies of global circuits of knowledge and imperial power with domestic race and ethnic formation and policing's role in the hardening of Black/white racial boundaries. By integrating my study of the entwined processes of racialization and criminalization in Black and immigrant communities with the shared knowledge of colonial race-making and governance, a clearer picture emerges of a global collaborative system of racial state violence. The police department did not appear one day, a fully functioning institution with a set of tactics and philosophies. It emerged slowly over time and carried a deep intergenerational institutional knowledge. Despite modern police intellectuals' assertion of "color blindness" in their procedures, these contemporary departments inherited and still use tools developed when the consideration of race was explicit and integral to policing.

For police intellectuals, the integration of tools like the criminal file and the filing cabinet meant people could be sorted by criminal history, by name, or even by skull circumference—whatever simplified the process of identifying a person. The retention of this information, combined with the NYPD's heavy investment in statisticians at the turn of the century, laid the foundation for a technocratic model of policing in which harassment of the same racialized communities was no longer justified by racial and biological characteristics but by data. It was the same racial profiling, now cloaked with the veneer of objectivity. Police make arrests, arrests generate statistics, and statistics then justify police presence in a neighborhood. This is part of the meaning of carceral capacity. Turning arrests into data points—like seeing a forest solely as feet of sellable lumber—allowed the police to think of the city on a much larger scale and more easily write off entire neighborhoods as requiring harassment and constant surveillance. In this approach, we see the origins of police gang databases and machine-learning predictive policing that rely on police statistics to inscribe people as inherently criminal in a way purported to be "color blind." ³⁴

Likewise, NYPD administrators in 1915 stocked the department's library with the work of criminal anthropologists who believed they could predict criminal behavior in people based on their race and upbringing. They laid the groundwork for current racialized attempts to deploy officers based on data-driven and predictive policing algorithms. These are just two of many examples. Studying the professionalization and solidification of policing in the Progressive Era holds many keys to understanding why the carceral state functions as it does. It opens the US police's shallow toolbox and shows the racial history of many tools that purport now to be "color blind." 35

Chapters and Organization

This book is split into eight chapters that trace the evolution of the NYPD more or less chronologically. It is difficult to write a book that considers policing as not simply directed against one community or another but applied both simultaneously and unequally on various groups. While individual chapters trace different threads—Black activism against police brutality, panic over Italian crime, the development of new technologies and methodologies of policing—many occupy the same chronological territory. The NYPD relied heavily on German-speaking officers in 1904 even as administrators attempted to develop new ways of policing that no longer required immigrant or first-generation personal knowledge. It is not my intention to create a clean narrative of change over time, but rather show that competing visions of policing existed simultaneously, sometimes in contention with one another and sometimes in harmony.

What follows is an attempt to balance this commotion with a readable narrative that engages the major hegemonic trends in policing—from Anglo-Irish dominated patrol to ethnic policing, followed by the rise of technocratic and standardized policing.

Chapter 1 explores how the police department in New York City, from the time of its founding in 1845, was immediately enmeshed in the project of racial management and an active engine of race- and citizen-making. Politicians attempting to exchange police appointments for votes all but ensured an ethnically diverse police force from its very inception. Critics of Irish and German immigration to the United States voiced their concerns that these early immigrant police were biologically susceptible to graft and brutality in ways the Anglo-American officers were not. These often violent debates about good policing, embodied traits, and ethnicity usually spilled out of the halls of government and into the streets. One way that immigrant police officers felt they could Americanize—and by the same token consolidate their "whiteness"—was in their participation in racial state-building. Reinscribing racist notions of inherent Black criminality, enforcing anti-Black policies like the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, and even putting down Irish-involved urban disorder all allowed immigrant police officers a way to prove their belonging and differentiate themselves as being racially different from Black New Yorkers and less Americanized immigrants.

After several late nineteenth-century reform movements attempted to break up Irish influence within the department, chapter 2 argues that the evolving understanding of race, civilization, and the role of police in society changed to accommodate some immigrants. Serving from 1895 to 1897, police commissioner and future US president Theodore Roosevelt argued that the supposed natural fighting ability of Irish men made them invaluable to a style of policing predicated solely on pacifying urban unrest by force. Their embodied traits, which had once supposedly made them a liability to the force, now made them essential. Irish and German police had found their racial and national inclusion at the expense of Black New Yorkers, nonwhite immigrants, and newly arrived foreigners.

Chapter 3 traces the career of Gen. Francis Vinton Greene as he furthered the US imperial project in the Philippines and Cuba, returning to become the NYPD's police commissioner in 1903. This chapter argues that ethnic squads, which police administrators developed in 1904 to deploy multilingual immigrant officers into their own communities, were a direct transplant from the US Empire. A tactic already common in European empires, "native policing" became essential in the Philippines as the US colonial government grappled with how to subdue such a diverse archipelago. Back in New York, the years between 1898 and 1904 saw an unprecedented uptick in the arrival of European immigrants, turning it into one of the most diverse cities in the world. During Greene's tenure as commissioner, he confronted police problems that looked like those he had faced as a colonial administrator. Chapter 4 explores the afterlives of Greene's career and the problem posed by diverse, multilingual populations that became acute during the 1904 *Slocum* disaster. When the ferryboat carrying over one thousand German New Yorkers caught fire in the East River, NYPD Inspector Max Schmittberger organized over one hundred German-speaking officers into a "German Squad" to deal with the investigation and manage the angry grieving families.

Chapter 5 traces the rise and fall of the NYPD's "Italian Squad" between 1904 and 1909. Starting with six Italian-speaking officers and growing until the group had over one hundred members, the Italian Squad represented the high-water mark of ethnic policing in New York. Learning to police Italians in the United States became a national agenda as police intellectuals around the country dedicated a multitude of resources to the dilemma of organized crime and political radicalism associated with Southern Italians and Sicilians. The NYPD's Italian Squad was the largest of these endeavors and often served as a model for other cities. Although there were several practical reasons for the group's dissolution in 1909, including the assassination of the squad's leader, Joseph Petrosino, I argue that Police Commissioner Theodore Bingham's increasing skepticism toward immigrant officers made the NYPD inhospitable to ethnic policing.

Chapter 6 explores how police practices in Black communities diverged from those employed in immigrant neighborhoods. Starting in the wake of the riot of 1900, in which police and white pedestrians unleashed a multiday reign of terror on a Black neighborhood, community members intensified their calls for police reform. Activists like Rev. Reverdy Ransom made the appointment of Black police officers a central demand in those years because they believed it would curb police brutality as well as make Black neighborhoods safer. After ten years of escalating calls in the Black press, Samuel Battle became the first African American NYPD officer in 1911. Although his status as a "Black first" has put Battle in the pantheon of civil rights notables, it has also meant that popular historical narratives about his appointment tend to ignore the complex multiracial context in which he lived. This chapter demonstrates how Black activists understood the first Black officers as an extension of ethnic policing, often citing the Italian Squad as justification for the integration of the NYPD. It also makes a larger argument about the uneven development of the NYPD archives and what its absences suggest about racial citizenship in New York and the United States at large.

Chapters 7 and 8 explore the NYPD after the dissolution of the Italian Squad as the NYPD turned to technocratic and European methods. Rather than being dependent on immigrant officers, NYPD administrators like Com-

missioner Arthur Woods created a rigid regime of training that they believed would produce officers who were skillful, adaptable, and interchangeable. This involved starting a training school, a library, and partnerships with institutions like Columbia University to provide classes in law, forensic science, and foreign languages. Making officers interchangeable also meant that the NYPD needed to assure that all their officers were physically prepared to handle any situation. In the years following 1914, the NYPD took a renewed interest in the bodies and hygiene of their officers. Following in the footsteps of Taylorism, Fordism, eugenics, and other scientific discourses that sought to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of laborers, the NYPD began a campaign to break down policing into its component movements and re-teach officers how to do them correctly. Teaching officers how to chew properly and what to eat became a major theme in police publications of the period as NYPD administrators attempted to discourage the presence of overweight police officers among the ranks.

In addition to creating rather than finding more effective police, the NYPD also increasingly relied on European techniques of information management and investigative science to make subjects on the street more understandable and policeable. These techniques were part of a concerted effort to learn from and communicate with municipal police authorities and criminologists overseas. At the center of this transatlantic exchange was Raymond Fosdick, a lifelong bureaucrat by then on the payroll of the Rockefeller-funded Bureau of Social Hygiene. By importing and integrating new technologies such as the fingerprint, files, filing cabinets, and border controls, NYPD administrators hoped that all subjects, no matter how foreign, could be easily indexed and thus identifiable in the paperwork. The type of expertise valued in police work shifted—in essence, the necessity of police intellectuals was overtaken by the growing value placed on police scientists.

Archives, Storytelling, and Police Power

The belief in the power of records has had profound implications for historians of policing in New York City. Since its creation, the NYPD has been a diligent destroyer of its own archive and so has no central repository teeming with documents, case files, or criminal records. Following the threads of the intellectual and racial underpinnings of the NYPD's operations and their changes in this period requires analyzing the existing personal papers of commissioners who served between 1850 and 1920. As records of the men's



previous military service and roles in colonial governments, the commissioners' papers are also valuable for understanding the effects of the US imperial project on domestic policing. The sprawling collections of the Municipal Archives of the City of New York provide a back door into the NYPD's records and everyday operations by means of the records of its frequent contact with other municipal departments including the Office of the Mayor. Published materials, including departmental reports, training manuals, and police publications, have also been central to exploring how and where the priorities of the department shifted over time. Like the personal papers of commissioners, the published memoirs of close to a dozen immigrant and native-born patrolmen and detectives from this era provide a window into the mindset of police, albeit a limited and highly managed one. Police wrote many of these memoirs in the years immediately following Prohibition, and they are drenched in nostalgia for the days before criminals supposedly wielded machine guns and presided over multimillion-dollar bootlegging operations. The voices of citizens who routinely wrote to newspapers and organized rallies to protest police violence in those same years temper the quaint ways that police memoirists describe "harmless" street brawls and laughably inept criminals of the period between 1880 and 1920. The archive created by the policed represents an alternative to the NYPD's diffuse collection of documents and presents the most complete challenge to the worldview of the punitive racial state.

The NYPD's total control over its archives—in the past through destruction and in the present through classification—has also meant an ability to control historical knowledge production about the department. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, department administrators could give new meanings to people and events from the department's past when they became politically expedient or could even erase them entirely. The recycling, retrofitting, and rebranding of historical events and actors happened regularly with the help of websites, exhibits, an internal magazine, memorials, statues, and renaming ceremonies that enforced and disseminated the NYPD's narratives.

Policing is a machine. Its product, the brutalization and subordination of working-class people and racial minorities, the protection of profits, and the enforcement of gender roles and sexual relations, have remained virtually unchanged for centuries. But the machine itself is very different now than it was in 1860. It looks different. Some mechanisms inside have changed—for instance police are expected now to serve more roles traditionally filled by other municipal services and to handle more daily tasks than ever before. But, as scholar Dennis Childs writes about survivors of the racial capitalist

misogynist state, "conditions that render the differences between past and present modes of domination [are] virtually indecipherable, if not completely nonsexist." This is the "time-bending power of the racialized carceral." So why study the machine if its product has remained so similar? Showing the simultaneous change over time and continuity in the history of policing and state violence is explicitly an argument that the machine cannot be rebuilt. No matter how many changes one makes to the interior or exterior of the machine, if it is designed to create a single product indefinitely, it will continue to do so no matter how many alterations it undergoes.³⁶

Policing the multiracial city took a lot of work, both intellectual and physical. Police intellectuals wrote books and articles. They traveled. They held hearings about crime and criminality. All this labor informed, and was informed by, what police did on the street. This book endeavors to show the work of racial state violence. To quote Stuart Hall, "Hegemony is hard work." By prying open the policing machine to show its moving parts, how they function, how they change, who designed its gears, and for what purpose, I hope to expose some of that work.



Introduction

- 1. "Tear Down the Dens of Chinatown and Make a Park of New York's Darkest Spot," *Evening World*, February 28, 1906, 3; Heap, *Slumming*, 118–21, 146–47.
 - 2. Lui, Chinatown Trunk Mystery.
- 3. "Tear Down the Dens of Chinatown and Make a Park of New York's Darkest Spot," *Evening World*, February 28, 1906, 3. "Local Board Calls Public Hearing on the Chinatown Park Plan," *Evening World*, March 6, 1906, 5.
- 4. "Local Board Calls Public Hearing on the Chinatown Park Plan," *Evening World*, March 6, 1906, 5. "Mysteries of New York's Chinatown," *Buffalo Courier*, July 4, 1909, 6; "Detective Is Real Thief: Chinatown Writes to M'adoo Begging for Mercy," *Sun*, April 4, 1905, 6.
- 5. Seigel, *Violence Work*, 11. The best discussion on the intellectual justifications of police violence specifically against African Americans remains Muhammad, *Condemnation of Blackness*.
- 6. The idea that the state may need "anthropologists" to learn about ethnic and religious minorities comes predominantly from Ginzburg's *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method.*
 - 7. "War on the Black Hand," Alexandria Gazette, June 16, 1909, 2.
- 8. McCoy, *Policing America's Empire*, 21; Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*, 7; Unterman, *Uncle Sam's Policemen*; Finn, *Capturing the Criminal Image*, 6.
- 9. Fosdick, *American Police Systems*, 8; "Elsie Siegel's Slayer Fled," *New York Times*, December 9, 1911, 1; "Chinese Prisoners Let Go," *Sun*, February 14, 1905, 12.
 - 10. Czitrom, New York Exposed, 35.
- 11. Peel, "Principles of Law Enforcement"; Harring, *Policing a Class Society*; Hadden, *Slave Patrols*; Browne, *Dark Matters*, 7.
 - 12. Rodgers, Atlantic Crossings.
 - 13. Heclo, Modern Social Politics, 305.
 - 14. "Harlem Murder Full of Mystery," New York Age, March 20, 1913, 1.
 - 15. Bederman, Manliness and Civilization, 13.



- 16. Watkins-Owens, Blood Relations, 12–13; Wilkerson, Warmth of Other Suns, 9; Hicks, Talk with You Like a Woman, 51; New York City Police Department, Report of the Police Department of the City of New York for the Year Ending December 31, 1905, 48; Muhammad, Condemnation of Blackness, 54.
 - 17. Fosdick, American Police Systems, 9.
- 18. Barrett, *Irish Way*, 20; Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, 112; J. Guglielmo and Salerno, *Are Italians White*?, 57; J. Guglielmo, *Living the Revolution*, 16, 33; T. Guglielmo, *White on Arrival*, 7–8; Roediger, *Working toward Whiteness*; Wilder, *Covenant with Color*.
- 19. J. Guglielmo and Salerno, *Are Italians White?*, 57; J. Guglielmo, *Living the Revolution*, 16, 33; T. Guglielmo, *White on Arrival*, 7–8; Roediger, *Working toward Whiteness*; Wilder, *Covenant with Color*.
- 20. T. Guglielmo, White on Arrival, 7–8; Roediger, Working toward Whiteness; Wilder, Covenant with Color.
 - 21. McAdoo, Guarding a Great City, 146.
 - 22. Battle, "Reminiscences of Samuel J. Battle," 33.
 - 23. Heap, Slumming, 118-21, 146-47.
 - 24. Lee, At America's Gates.
- 25. Lew-Williams, *Chinese Must Go*, 36; Benton-Cohen, *Inventing the Immigration Problem*, 196–97.
 - 26. Wu, Color of Success, 7; López, White by Law, 56.
- 27. This is a sprawling and growing historiography, which has particularly impacted me: Flowe, *Uncontrollable Blackness*; Taylor, *Fight the Power*; Haley, *No Mercy Here*; Felker-Kantor, *Policing Los Angeles*; Balto, *Occupied Territory*; Agee, *Streets of San Francisco*; Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime*; Suddler, *Presumed Criminal*.
- 28. Many important books have been written in recent years about the role that sexuality and racism have played in justifying the expansion of police power and violence, particularly in immigrant and Black neighborhoods. Specifically, Pliley, Policing Sexuality; Fischer, Streets Belong to Us; Blair, I've Got to Make My Livin'; Odem, Delinquent Daughters; Gross, Colored Amazons; Hicks, Talk with You Like a Woman; Mumford, Interzones; Lvovsky, Vice Patrol; Canaday, Straight State; Canaday, Cott, and Self, Intimate States; Somerville, Queering the Color Line.
- 29. Most useful for understanding police corruption, party politics, and elections in the nineteenth and early twentieth century has been Czitrom, *New York Exposed*; also enlightening are Broxmeyer, *Electoral Capitalism*; Murphy, *Political Manhood*; Schrag, *Fires of Philadelphia*; Harring, *Policing a Class Society*; Anbinder, *Five Points*; Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*.
- 30. Hernández, *City of Inmates*, 5; Singh, "Whiteness of Police," 1097; Hirota, *Expelling the Poor*, 43.
- 31. Lambert and Gilmore, "Making Abolition Geography in California's Central Valley."

212 NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

- 32. Lambert and Gilmore, "Making Abolition Geography in California's Central Valley"; Singh, "Whiteness of Police," 1096; Molina, *How Race Is Made in America*, 6–7.
- 33. Lui, Chinatown Trunk Mystery, 17; Murakawa, First Civil Right; Seigel, Violence Work; Hernández, City of Inmates; Gilmore, Golden Gulag; Felker-Kantor, Policing Los Angeles; Balto, Occupied Territory; Agee, Streets of San Francisco; Hinton, From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime; Suddler, Presumed Criminal; Lebrón, Policing Life and Death; Schrader, Badges without Borders; Kohler-Hausmann, Getting Tough; Thompson, "Why Mass Incarceration Matters," 703–34.
 - 34. Scott, Seeing Like a State, 17; Cronon, Nature's Metropolis, 148.
- 35. For a discussion of the legal absolution of racial profiling, the fantasy of standardization and deracializing policing, and the difficulty of proving racist intent in policing in the 1980s and onward, see Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime*, 326; Murakawa, *First Civil Right*, 4–11.
 - 36. Childs, Slaves of the State, 11.

Chapter One. Becoming Blue

- 1. Civil Service Roster for the City of New York, 1902; Carey, Memoirs of a Murder Man, 3.
 - 2. Carey, Memoirs of a Murder Man, 3.
- 3. Key texts in this early debate are: Miller, *Cops and Bobbies*; Levett, "Centralization of City Police in the Nineteenth Century United States"; Richardson, *New York Police*; Monkkonen, *Police in Urban America*.
 - 4. Singh, "Whiteness of Police," 1093; Schrag, Fires of Philadelphia.
 - 5. Harris, In the Shadow of Slavery, 264.
- 6. Anbinder, *City of Dreams*, 193; Roosevelt, "Municipal Administration"; Broxmeyer, *Electoral Capitalism*.
 - 7. Rosenwaike, Population History of New York City, 36-42.
 - 8. Von Skal, History of German Immigration in the United States, 25.
- 9. Nadel, Little Germany, 1; Von Skal, History of German Immigration, 29; Barrett, Irish Way, 20; Harris, In the Shadow of Slavery; Sacks, Before Harlem.
 - 10. Dickens, American Notes and Pictures from Italy, 76.
 - 11. Dickens, American Notes and Pictures from Italy, 70.
- 12. Wild, Street Meeting, 3; Barrett, Irish Way, 7; Ignatiev, How the Irish Became White, 112; Anbinder, Five Points.
 - 13. Busey, Immigration, 143.
 - 14. Czitrom, New York Exposed, 35; Busey, Immigration, 127.
 - 15. Walling, Recollections, 54.
 - 16. Walling, Recollections, 54-55; Burrows and Wallace, Gotham, 838.
- 17. Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, 839; O'Malley, "Protecting the Stranger," 138-39.
 - 18. "Fourth of July," New York Tribune, July 6, 1857, 6.

