

# THE INFLUENCE OF IDEAS OF CIVIL REVOLUTIONS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MODERN POLICE IN SERBIA

**Radomir Zekavica, PhD**

University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies, Belgrade, Serbia

**Ivana Krstić Mistridželović, PhD<sup>1</sup>**

University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies, Belgrade, Serbia

## PURPOSE

The end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century represents in many ways a turning point in the development of European societies. For some societies, such as the French, this turning point implied a break with old ideas, values and socio-political heritage, a break so radical that the French Revolution is rightly called a typical “revolution in blood”. In some other societies, such as English, socio-political and economic changes were carried out much more peacefully and evolutionarily, through principled compromises of dominant social groups and gradual adaptation of the government system to new social circumstances, forces and ideas.

The reconstruction of social life in Europe at this time rested on the ideas of the leading thinkers of the Enlightenment, primarily Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau. Their political and philosophical ideas represented a kind of spiritual revolution that came before the political one, which at the end of the 18th century officially ended the old era and began a new era, the era of the liberal democratic state.<sup>2</sup> On the ruins of the old feudal order, a new creation arose whose physiog-

---

<sup>1</sup> [ivana.km@kpu.edu.rs](mailto:ivana.km@kpu.edu.rs)

<sup>2</sup> It is rightly pointed out that the political revolution in France was preceded by a revolution in spirit, which experienced its culmination with the publication of Rousseau’s Social Contract in 1762. (Basta, 1994).

onomy was outlined by the ideas of equality, freedom, brotherhood (the French tricolor), national sovereignty, the division of power and the limitation of state power by laws based on reason and the principles of natural law. The Enlighteners, as Tocqueville points out in his work *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*, made the masses believe that many of the institutions of the 18th century had ceased to have any value and that society should be reorganized on a completely new basis (Peri, 2000, 212).

Establishing society on those new foundations was neither easy nor quick. Especially the first half of the 19th century was the time of great turbulence, conflicts of revolution and reaction. The process of creating a new society, institutions and values started by the civil revolutions and normatively confirmed by declarations on the rights of man and citizens, however, could not be stopped. In that process of fundamental social reconstruction, the changes did not bypass the police either. As a part of the state apparatus of government, the police went through changes both functionally and organizationally. New ideas and values reflected on the role of the police in society, its tasks, work methods, value orientation and a significantly different organization adapted to the demands of the new society. Bearing in mind that in the previous period the police was one of the main pillars of the absolutist government, it is quite clear why, in the new circumstances, the question of police reform was among the priorities. Criticism of the previous society was mostly directed against the police and what was meant by the police state. On the other hand, due to the special importance of the police for the new regime, the authorities and the police themselves stubbornly resisted the introduction of newspapers, especially those that meant limiting police powers. This conflict of interests is precisely the main reason why the ideas of the rule of law slowly penetrated the domain of the police (Milosavljević, 1997, 82).

## METHODS

Increase in the crime rate due to accelerated industrialization, increase in the number of urban population and the poor, weakening of informal social control systems, accelerated development of traffic, etc. further encouraged police reforms in Europe. It was not possible to give an adequate response to the demands placed on the police by the new era under the conditions of the old police model from the period before the revolutions. European police reforms were inevitable, and the reform process can be seen on the example of the English and French police. The reform of these police forces is an excellent example of realizing the idea of the necessity of functional and organizational transformation of the police force. The outcome of those reforms was the emergence of two police models with their



specific characteristics and mutual differences that have survived to this day - the French continental and English Anglo-Saxon police models.

Key changes in the French police occurred immediately after the revolution. The French Ministry of the Interior was established in 1796, and soon as the old institution of the *mareshaussae* was reorganized into the National Gendarmerie. A significant number of police powers were being returned to city police authorities as police commissioners were appointed by voters.<sup>3</sup> In cities with more than 5000 inhabitants, the central government appoints a police commissioner who has the function of a supervisory body of local police authorities (Clive, 1999, 8). A very significant moment for the further development of the French police was the appointment of Joseph Foushe as Minister of the Interior. Fouche was a dominant figure in the process of police reforms and the establishment of the post-revolutionary model of the French police. During Napoleon's reign, this model received its full physiognomy in the characteristics that in the opinion of certain authors also characterize the modern French police. These are the centralization of decision-making and control established under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior and the Minister of Police himself, the dual structure of militaristic-civilian elements, the distinction between the police forces of the city of Paris and other parts of France, and a high level of monitoring of citizens in combination with a criminal justice system that slightly favors the state at the expense of citizens (Stead, 1977, 64). By the end of Fouche's mandate<sup>4</sup>, all the key characteristics of the French police of that period were profiled, above all the extension of the power of the central police force to the provinces. The entire administrative area was divided into six parts for the purpose of easier police work. Fouche's staff consisted of his cabinet, the General Secretariat and six divisions. The first was in charge of tasks reserved for the minister and those that were forwarded by Fouche's personal secretary. The second division dealt with general security and the secret police, the third was in charge of the press and individual liberty, the fourth for emigration, and the fifth and sixth for accounting and archives (Ibif, 76). The police organization continued to develop even after the fall of Napoleon and the departure of Fouche. The changes went in the direction of further organizational improvement. Thus, in 1829, uniformed city guards were introduced, who were recruited from among former soldiers with the task of taking care of order, peace and security on the streets of the city. Two decades later, the Paris Republican Guard was formed and from 1851 central commissariats responsible for the entire local police were established in large cities, and later they were all united in the General Security (Milosvaljevic, 1997, 83). The functional separation of the

<sup>3</sup> By the edict of 1667, the supervision and maintenance of order, public safety, food and cleanliness of the streets were taken away from the city municipalities and entrusted to a special royal official, the lieutenant de police (Alimpic, 1905, 8)

<sup>4</sup> With several interruptions, Fouche's mandate lasted until September 1815.



French police into judicial and administrative was particularly important. The judicial police was in charge of conducting the investigation and was considered an auxiliary organ of the judiciary, while the administrative police was in charge of maintaining public order and peace, security and public health (Ibid, 84).

The main problem of the English police at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century was its inefficiency, i.e. its inability to cope with the growing social problems in the conditions of an extremely large industrial and urban development of English society. The rapid social and economic development also had its dark side in the increase of criminality and the complication of its basic forms. One of the first proponents of reforming the English police system, Henry Fielding, compared London from the 18th century to a vast forest where skilled thieves can find their shelter like wild beasts in the deserts of Africa or Arabia. He was among the first to recognize and publicly criticize the inadequacy of the existing police system, proposing a new, unique and flexible police system that would be much more centrally managed (Rubinstein, 1977, 33). It was this idea that was met with the fiercest criticism and challenge by those who in the centralization of police decision-making saw a great danger to the freedom of citizens and the abandonment of the traditional system that was based on a high degree of autonomy of local authorities.

After Fielding, the contribution to police reforms in Britain was made by Patrick Colquhoun. In his study, *A Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis*, he first of all defines what he means by the term "police": "By the term police we mean all those regulations in the state that can serve as comfort, convenience and security to all citizens, whether directed in the direction of their security against the misery of poverty, or those effects which arise as a product of moral and criminal offences." (Stead, 1977, 51). His vision of British police reform rested on the ideas of a much more humane criminal legislation, a well-regulated and efficient police force, and an understanding of the police work as a duty to detect crimes and prevent crime. He believed that for this purpose, it is necessary to give the police adequate legal powers and provide for the protection of individual freedoms.

The ideas of the mentioned authors represented the announcement of necessary reforms. The reform was initiated by Sir Robert Peel, thanks to whom the Metropolitan Police Act was passed in 1829, which established the Metropolitan Police Force (Metropolitien Police Force) in London, better known today as Scotland Yard. The jurisdiction of the police becomes unique for the entire area of London and its surroundings, excluding the old city center (City of London), the police become uniformed and begin to receive a regular salary for their work. The strategy of the fight against crime and disorder is fundamentally changed by placing an emphasis on preventive work and preventive patrol activity, as well as on a num-



ber of other services of a service nature (responding to citizens' calls, preventing fires, lighting street lights, etc.) (*The Encyclopaedia Britannica 2001*).

In the beginning, the citizens were reserved towards the police, considering the police profession to be a low-ranking profession, but over time this has changed. The police becomes much more open to the public, its service activity creates the trust of citizens in it, and the term *bobby* becomes a designation for an English policeman who does his job with the power of authority, and not with the threat of weapons and force. The results of Peel's reform were the establishment of the foundations of modern English policing, which rest on several basic principles - the first is the emphasis on preventive, not repressive, work and the second, command and control of police work through a centralized, quasi-military organizational structure. Third, the police become patient, impersonal and professional (Ibidem). Ultimately, British police authority now derives primarily from three primary sources – the Crown, the law and the police-community partnership. In addition, thanks to Peel, the first forms of civil control over the work of the police were established in the form of County Police Committees, which were made up of prominent citizens in the counties.

## FINDINGS

The influence of the ideas of the French Revolution on Serbian society in the 19th century was gradual and slow. As a result of the multi-year Turkish rule, Serbia as a society remained immune to the processes of modernization that swept Western Europe at the beginning of the 16th century. In fact, at the same time when the wave of modernization engulfs Europe, when humanism and the Renaissance, and soon the epoch of enlightenment, spread ideas that prepared the ground for the coming civil revolutions - at the same time, Serbia as a society enters a period of total regression, losing its independence and freedom. In other words, at the same moment when the process of modernization and liberation of libertarian consciousness started in Western Europe, at the same time Serbia, thanks to the Turkish rule, enters a kind of dark middle ages interrupting the rich national tradition, culture and art that it had inherited until then. However, after the civil revolutions, and thanks to the advanced spirits of Serbian culture, primarily Dositej Obradović, the beginning of the 19th century, the final revival of the Serbian state and the path by which Serbia managed to regain its full independence by the end of this century (see more, Zekavica, 2016).

The beginning of that path is connected with the so-called Serbian revolution, i.e. the outbreak of the First Serbian Uprising in 1804. This uprising also marks the beginning of the creation of the basic institutions of renewed Serbian statehood,



including of course the police. The formation of police authorities in charge of public and state security even in the first year of the uprising was of great importance for the process of building a domestic apparatus of government instead of the suppressed Turkish one. The insufficient differentiation of military and civilian power in the uprising Serbia, however, caused the organizational and functional intertwining of police and military power. The appointment of Jakov Nenadović as the first minister of the interior in 1811 was an important step for the development of the Serbian police. The collapse of the uprising unfortunately thwarted its institutional formation through a ministry that would have unified police affairs of central importance (Milosavljević, 2004).

The insurgent leaders paid great attention to public safety in the liberated territory, entrusting the exercise of police powers to newly formed domestic bodies. In the insurgent Serbia, there was no complete police organization, because the state organization itself was not completed, but there were bodies that exercised police power, as well as projects for the complete organization of the police. The main tasks of the police in this period included maintaining the established order, preserving the security of the border, protecting the state from espionage and other similar activities that threatened its security, informing about the intentions of Turkey and other countries towards Serbia and conducting propaganda in order to gain support and possibly spread the uprising. Apart from the security of the state, the police authorities also took care of the personal and property safety of citizens (Milosavljević, 2000, 110).

At the assembly of elders held at the end of March 1804, police power was given to voivodes (court princes), princely princes and village serfs. They took care of maintaining public order and peace, personal and property safety, executed the orders of the Leader, the Governing Council and the courts, and were also in charge of collecting taxes. The police function was also performed by lower military authorities, captains or buljubashes, podbuljubashes and armed boys of voivodes, the so-called bejars and sanculottes. In May 1804 at the Ostružnica assembly a decision was made to establish courts in nahijas, the so-called magistrates, composed of two judges and one scribe. The first magistrate was established on May 15, 1804 in Valjevska nahija (Алимпић, 1905, 27-28; Ненадовић, 1951, 94), and from 1807 they were formed in other nahijas as well. Each magistrate was accompanied by a certain number of cops (usually two) making him the holder of not only judicial, but also police functions. Magistrates were responsible for issuing passports, supervising foreigners, issuing police orders, supervising bakeries and shops, setting taxes for food, issuing instructions on catching hajduks, and detecting slaughterhouses (Novaković, 1907, 234). Since 1807 in Belgrade, Valjevo, Smederevo, Požarevac, Užice and Šabac, police directorates with city policemen subordinate to magistrates were established. The network of police authorities of



the insurgent Serbia was completed by numerous customs and border authorities that performed certain police tasks.<sup>5</sup>

The efforts of the insurgent elders to limit the power of Karađorđe were conceptually based on the principle of the separation of powers. The draft of the organization of the Soviet, made by Teodor Filipović (alias Boža Grujović), provides that the Soviet will consist of 12 members, elected representatives of the nahijas, who would choose six ministers from among themselves for certain branches of the state administration. (Јанковић, 1954; Ненадовић, 1951)<sup>6</sup>. Among them was the minister of “peace and order”, in charge of “internal peace and order”. The preserved sermon (the so-called Slovo) shows that Grujović designed the state organization of Serbia based on the ideas of separation of powers, freedom and legality, outlining it as a legal state in which legality will rule.

In the uprising Serbia, the constitutional issue arose in the form of a struggle for supreme power, in which two tendencies present in the country’s political life throughout the entire 19th century were clearly manifested. The bearer of the first absolutist tendency was Karađorđe (that is, the later rulers), while the second oligarchic tendency was represented by the largest elders who demanded greater participation in government. The attempts to resolve the issue by compromise were made on two occasions - in 1808 and in 1811 at the session of the Assembly in Belgrade when the reorganization of the state administration was carried out. The Soviet was divided into six trusteeships and the Great Vilayet Court.<sup>7</sup> In the elaboration Draft of the structure of the police authority in Belgrade dated March 8, 1811 (Ђорђевић, 1911, 7), the desire to place Serbia among the “enlightened nations” and to bring the Serbian race closer to the nations of the whole of Europe can be seen. The draft contained the first provisions on the legal organization of police authority, in which the main ideas of the civil state were presumed. For the first time the difference between the military and police authorities, on the one hand, and the police and judicial authorities, on the other, was clearly highlighted - the police were called upon to protect order and disturbed peace. The replacement of the head of the city police (police master), the legality of the application of physical

5 See more in: Krstić-Mistridželović, I: Development of Police authorities in Serbia in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, The structure and functioning of the Police organization – tradition, state and perspectives (ed. G. Milošević), I, Belgrade 2013, 53-77.

6 In the unspoken Word of Grujović, it is written, among other things, this: “The law is the will of the vilayet, which commands the whole vilayet and everyone good and forbids evil. The first master and judge in the vilayet is the law. Under the law, the lords, leaders and the governing council, the clergy and the military and all the people must be.”

7 The following councilors were appointed as first ministers: Mladen Milovanović (military affairs), Milenko Stojković (foreign affairs), Dositej Obradović (education), Jakov Nenadović (internal affairs), Petar Todorović (grand vilayet judge, i.e. minister of justice) and Sima Marković (finance).



coercion, and the only permitted form of income for police officers, a certain salary, which basically prohibits them from accepting bribes, are also foreseen.

After the military collapse of Serbia in 1813, all results in the construction of the state apparatus were canceled and the Turkish administrative system was re-established. The unbearable situation in which the Serbian people found themselves in the Belgrade Pashaluk under the administration of the new Belgrade Vizier Sulejman Pasha Skopljak resulted in the outbreak of the so-called Hadji-Prodan's rebellion in 1814, which was suppressed in blood. Since the terror did not abate, the people rose up again in the spring of 1815 under the leadership of Miloš Obrenović, one of the few elders who remained in the country after the collapse of the First Serbian Uprising. The Second Serbian Uprising ended in the summer of 1815 with an oral agreement between Prince Miloš and Marashli-Ali Pasha, confirmed by the Sultan's decrees the following year.<sup>8</sup> This marked the beginning of the period of dual rule in Belgrade Pashaluk, i.e. the existence of a mixed Serbian-Turkish administration, which would last until the formal recognition of Serbian autonomy by Hatsheeriff in 1830.

The principle of dual power was also applied to the police. The supervisory police power was held by the Turkish muslim, and de facto by Serbian princes of nahijas and princely princes and village serfs appointed by Prince Miloš. Miloš took advantage of the permission given to the Serbs to keep their weapons<sup>9</sup> in order to carry out the work of the internal administration and began to organize units in the personal service of the prince and units in charge of guarding public order and imperial roads from haiduks. With the introduction of courts in the 1820s, they took over part of the police responsibilities (surveillance of foreigners, issuing passports, etc.), and also received the right to elect city police officers and the right to supervise their work. After Đak's Rebellion in 1825, Prince Miloš started organizing military-police units in nahijas (the so-called registration cops) and formed a network of informers with the task of informing him about the mood of the people.

Serbia was recognized with the right of independent internal administration by Hatisherif from 1830, and Miloš, as supreme prince, was granted the right to "maintain armed forces for the purpose of eliminating unrest and disorder and for the purpose of national police". From the acquisition of autonomy to the adoption of the Constitution in 1838, the state administration in Serbia, including its

---

8 "That's how the Serbs shared the government and the lordship with the Turks." Pasha remains the master in the cities over the Turks and over the Muslims, and Miloš in the country over the people and over the princes" (Стефановић-Караџић, 1947, 376).

9 Allegedly, Marashlija, during the negotiations on the Serbian request to keep their weapons, said this: "You should only be obedient to the Tsar, and if you want, carry the cannons on your belt." (Ibid, 376).



police, underwent frequent organizational changes. In 1830, principalities were renamed captaincies and then counties; In 1834, the country was divided into five large serdarstaves, nahijas called districts with “ispravničestva” as administrative bodies; in the same year, Miloš appointed five trustees (among them of internal works), whose functions were not sufficiently specified (Petrović, 1901, 557). Based on the decisions of the Sretenje Assembly in 1835, despite the repeal of the first Serbian Constitution created by Dimitrije Davidović based on the modern European constitutions, a more detailed organization of the state apparatus was carried out and a minister of police was appointed with the task of maintaining personal freedom, public peace and order (Milosavljevic, 1997, 95), and on August 10, 1835, the Soviet passed the Rules for Policemen and the Police according to which the police were obliged to make sure that “peace, quiet and order are generally maintained”, to keep an eye on cleanliness, watch out for vagrants, to make sure that the night patrols are well spread out and the patrolmen fulfill their duties as accurately as possible, to check passports, to make sure that fire orders are followed, to keep an eye on trade measures and the accuracy of measurements and to see “that no meetings or agreements are made in which anything is done against the Government or against other authorities or generally against the general well-being” (Alimpić, 1905, 52-53).

The following year, the country was administratively divided into four military districts headed by military commanders, who represented “supreme guardians of public peace and order, and ... chief policemen in the command entrusted to them” and supervised the exercise of police authority by county elders and correctional officers. In the preservation of peace and order, the county elders were assisted in the villages by village serfs, and in the towns, as separate administrative units, there were town policemen. Although the Law on the duties of military commanders, correctional officers and county elders of November 11, 1836 determined the scope of local administrative bodies in Serbia for the first time, it also established the supremacy of the military over the civil administration (Nikić, 1927, 70-74). That organization was confirmed in 1837, when the Military-Police Office was established, which unified military-police affairs (Petrović, 1901, 574-577). The establishment of such a system of mixed military-civilian administration with the predominance of military authorities, which lasted until the adoption of the so-called Turkish Constitution in 1838, was a step backwards on the way to building a modern Serbian state and its police. To that extent, the merits of the defenders of the constitution for the introduction of a detailed state organization on the basis of laws drafted with respect for the most important ideas of the civil state including its police will be more significant. It was during the 20 years of the government of the constitutional defenders (1838-1858) that a key shift was made in the constitution of the police, as well as the state administration in general. The Constitution of 1838 clearly demarcated military from civil power and divided it



into legislative, executive and judicial. The defenders of the Constitution carried out a comprehensive reform of the state administration with extensive legislative action, striking the foundations of the modern Serbian state. The police power was first properly separated from the military power, and then embodied organizationally and functionally.

According to the organization of the central state administration of May 29, 1839, the Ministry of the Interior was divided into police-economic, medical with quarantine and military departments.<sup>10</sup> The police department, in charge of maintaining order, peace and security in the country, was subordinated to the district chiefs with their police, and to them again the county chiefs with their police. According to the Organization of District Chiefs and the Main Duties of County Chiefs from May 12, 1839,<sup>11</sup> the district chief was obliged to carry out the orders of the central state authorities relating to all matters of internal administration and to report to the Minister of Internal Affairs on the situation in his district every 15 days, while the county chief with the scribe and a certain number of cops was obliged to protect the people from crime, to guard the village property, to inspect the passports of everyone entering or leaving the county, to supervise the work of the courts in the villages and to send reports to the county chief on the situation in the county.<sup>12</sup> Particularly important for the construction of a modern police force in Serbia was the introduction of control over the legality of the work of the police authority. In the Instructions to district, county and municipal authorities for the performance of police service from July 8, 1839,<sup>13</sup> the duty of district chiefs to control the work of county chiefs, who were made directly responsible for improper performance of their duties, was prescribed.

The law against disturbing public peace and order from 1843, the Decree on replacing corporal punishment with a fine from 1845 and the Criminal Code for Banditry and Theft from 1847 tightened the penal policy and at the same time deprived the police of their right to punishment, which greatly reduced its effectiveness and undermined its authority<sup>14</sup>. The situation was somewhat improved

---

10 *Зборник закона и уредаба за Кнежевину и Краљевину Србију*, књ. I, 1835-1858

11 *Полицијски зборник закона, уредаба и расписа у Краљевини Србији*, Београд, 1905, 6.

12 The head of the district had the right to detain a person for a maximum of 24 hours. He delivered all police crimes to the district chief, and crimes outside the police scope to the district judge. Although the district and county chiefs were executive bodies that performed all administrative tasks, police duties prevailed over all others, and they became synonymous with the police.

13 Continuation as an addition to the police decrees issued so far in: *Police collection of laws, decrees and notices in the Kingdom of Serbia*, 10.

14 As the most extreme example it stated the case of a peasant in the Užice district, which lay down on the ground and did not want to move when the cops came to take him to the captain. (Јовановић, 1991, 54)



in 1846 by giving the police authority the right to physically punish “those who will not come, nor allow themselves to be brought”<sup>15</sup>, and with the adoption of the Police Regulation<sup>16</sup> and the Police Criminal Code in 1850<sup>17</sup> at the proposal of the Minister of the Interior Ilija Garašanin, the police were given the right to impose punishments for police offenses (imprisonment, fine, corporal punishment, suspension of the right of guild or shop for a certain time, exile from the place of residence to another and expulsion from the country), and thus sufficient authority to maintain order and security in the country. This is precisely why the provisions of these police regulations from 1850, despite criticism that they gave the police force to keep the people in submission to the government, remained in force until the first decade of the 20th century.

## ORIGINALITY

As we have seen, the constitution of the Serbian police went along with the constitution of the modern Serbian statehood. The basic question that this paper was supposed to answer was whether and to what extent the ideas of civil revolutions had an impact on the creation and formation of the police in Serbia in the 19th century. Of course, we are talking about ideas that got their basic meaning in the works of key representatives of the Enlightenment era, especially the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, John Locke, and Charles Montesquieu. It was the ideas of these thinkers that contributed to the maturation of the awareness of the necessity of social changes based on the equality of people (at least in formal and legal terms), respect and protection of the natural rights of individuals, especially the rights to life, liberty, and property, as well as to the creation of the necessary conditions for the democratic participation of citizens in election and finally the exercise of political power.

The influence of these ideas on the emergence and formation of new century institutions of Serbian statehood and the police itself should not be overestimated. At the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Serbia was still enslaved by the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, even as such a society, Serbia relatively quickly, already in the middle of the 19th century, got the police whose organization and mission took on the contours of the modern police of European societies. Thus, the regulations passed during the period of the government of the defender of the constitution

15 *Зборник закона и уредаба у Кнежевини и Краљевини Србији*, III, 106

16 Decree on how the police authorities will deal with and punish police criminals, Collection of Laws and Decrees issued in the Principality of Serbia, V, 187. See more. in: Krstić-Mistridželović, I: Adoption and significance of the Police Ordinance of 1850, *Bezbednost*, 1-2/2009, 414-432.

17 *Казнителни законик за полицијне пресупке*, *Зборник*, V, 129.



brought order and established stricter discipline within the police organization. Establishing a strong and stable police was one of the priorities of the defenders of the constitution, which is understandable because the police in Serbia at the time, as well as in other European countries of that time, was almost the same as the entire internal administration. Legal and by-laws define its competences, specify the way of performing tasks and create a basis for controlling the work of police authorities, which enables it to work more efficiently and reduce the possibility of abuse. The most important accomplishments of the government of the defenders of the constitution, which had other numerous flaws, were the establishment of a significantly more coherent state organization, the passing of numerous laws on which it relied on, the elimination of legal (especially property) insecurity of citizens and the creation of institutions whose work was based on written laws, and not on the arbitrary will of the ruler. In a word, the defenders of the constitution decisively contributed to the legal and institutional constitution of the Serbian state, including its police as the most important segment of state administration.

State administration reforms implemented by Mihailo Obrenović during his second reign through the so-called constitutional laws from 1861, 1862, 1864 and 1866 were also the last major development in the development of police authorities in Serbia in the 19th century. The lack of the necessary political consensus and unfavorable economic conditions in Serbia, in the conditions of the unresolved international status of the country, hindered any attempt to further transform the police. Hence, in the development of the police in Serbia in the last decades of the 19th century, there is a tendency to gradually lose the authority of the police authority and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The importance of this ministry, the backbone of the state administration and almost the only effective instrument of Serbian state power until the vice royal constitutional reform in 1869, over time suppressed the authority of other state institutions (courts, municipalities, army, etc.) and various interest groups. Due to the complication of social relations and the further specialization of the state administration in Serbia, the police began to lose their primacy becoming only one part of a complex and politically unstable state organization. The final result of this process was a kind of transformation of the police into the culprit on duty, the scapegoat guilty of almost all evils in the state and society. The professionalization of the police and its depoliticization was particularly difficult after the formal organization of political parties in 1881 and the constitutional reform in 1888, which tried to reduce political life in Serbia to parliamentary frameworks. On the other hand, numerous changes caused by technological progress made influence on Serbia as well. The application of new technical and scientific achievements in the work of the European police increased the efficiency in the fight against crime. Talented Serbian police officers started to be referred to the experts employed by the police forces of developed European countries for training, in order to improve and adapt the police work in Serbia to



the new demands and needs of society by applying the acquired specialized knowledge. With these contradictions, the Serbian police entered the 20th century.<sup>18</sup>

## REFERENCES

- Алимпиић, Д. Ђ. (1905): *Историјски развитак полицијских власти у Србији (1793-1869)*, Београд.
- Basta, D. (1994): *Pravo i sloboda*, Novi Sad.
- Clive, E. (1999): *The Origins of the Modern Police*, History Today, vol 49 Issue 4.
- Јанковић, Д. (1954): *Прваитељствујуици Совјет*, Историјски гласник, 1-2, Београд.
- Јовановић, В. (2005) *Министарство унутрашњих дела Краљевине Србије*, докторска дисертација, Филозофски факултет Универзитета у Београду.
- Јовановић, С. (1991): *Уставобранитељи и њихова влада*, Београд.
- Крстић-Мистрицеловић, И. (2009): *Доношење и значај Полицијске уредбе из 1850. године*, Безбедност, 1-2/2009, 414-432.
- Крстић-Мистрицеловић, И. (2013): *Развој полицијских власти у Србији у првој половини XIX века, Структура и функционисање полицијске организације – традиција, стање, перспективе*, ур. Г. Милошевић, I, 53-77.
- Пери, М. (2000): *Интелектуална историја Европе*, Београд.
- Milosavljević, V. (1997): *Nauka о policiji*, Beograd.
- Милосављевић, Б. (2004): *Полицијске установе у време Првог српског устанка*, Београд.
- Милосављевић, Б. (2000): *Старање о безбедности државе у Карађорђевој Србији*, Безбедност, по. 1, 99-120
- Ненадовић, М. (1951): *Мемоари*, Београд.
- Никић, Ф. (1927): *Локална управа Србије у XIX и XX веку: област-округ-срез*, Београд.
- Новаковић, С. (1907): *Уставно питање и закони Карађорђева времена*, Београд.
- Petrović, N. (1901): *Финансије и установе обновљене Србије до 1842*, Beograd.
- Rubinstein, J. (1977) *Henry and John Fielding-Police Philosophy and Police Technique in: Pioneers in Policing*, New Jersey.

<sup>18</sup> More about the development of the Serbian police in the period of the 19th century, see: Jovanović, 2005; Zekavica, 2005.



- Stead, P.J. (1997): J.P. *Patrick Colquhoun – Preventive Police*, in: *Pioneers of Policing*, New Jersey.
- Стефановић-Карадић, В. (1947): *Први и Други српски устанак*, Београд.
- The Encyclopaedia Britannica 2001*, Deluxe Edition CD-ROM, Police: the formation of the English police
- Зекавица, Р. (2005): *Историјски развитак полицијске службе у Србији XIX века с посебним освртом на контролу њеног рада*, део I, II, „Безбедност“. МУП, 1/05; 2/05
- Zekavica, R. (2016): Uobličavanje srpske države do 1918*, u monografiji: *Kazneno popravni zavodu u Srbiji-primer požarevačkog kaznenog zatvora 1853-1918*, knjiga I, Istorijски arhiv Požarevac, Požarevac
- Зборник закона и уредаба за Кнежевину и Краљевину Србију*, књ. I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, год. 1835-1858
- Ђорђевић, А. (1911): *Цртице за историју београдске полиције и државног уређења у Србији*, Београд

