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In the early evening of March 22, 2013, at the 50th anniversary meeting in Dallas, Texas, the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) held its own Academy Awards, where it recognized the outstanding achievement of not only ACJS members, but those serving the criminal justice discipline as a whole. Of all of the awards given that evening, the three most prestigious awards are generally considered to be the Academy Founder’s Award, the Academy Fellow Award, and the Bruce Smith, Sr. Award. The latter is the only named award of the three and is held by many as the most coveted. The Bruce Smith, Sr. Award is given “in recognition of outstanding contributions to criminal justice as an academic or professional endeavor” and the requirements are two-fold: “1) Demonstration of leadership in the administration of criminal justice as an academic and/or professional discipline in a manner which reflects the highest standards of integrity and performance,” and “2) Active involvement in criminal justice research or other endeavor which has made substantial contributions to the emerging body of knowledge in criminal justice.” The award that evening was given to Gennaro F. Vito, a Distinguished University Scholar and Professor in the Department of Justice Administration at the University of Louisville. Knowing Vito’s contributions to the Academy, he was truly a deserving recipient of this award.

As the 2012 recipient of the Bruce Smith, Sr. Award, Dr. Vito now finds himself in good company, for over the years the award has been presented to other stellar leaders in the field of criminal justice. The first recipients of the award were Sir Leon Radzinowicz and Thorstein Sellin, who received their awards simultaneously in 1976. Since then, the award has been given to such luminaries as James Q. Wilson (1979), Norval Morris (1981), Herman Goldstein (1989), Lawrence Sherman (1994), Samuel Walker (1998), and Meda Chesney-Lind (2001) (See Appendix
In the early years of the award, it was intended to recognize those outside of the Academy who had contributed to criminal justice research, such as James Q. Wilson (1979) and Norval Morris (1981). In later years, the award began focusing on those within the Academy who had a significant impact both inside and outside of the Academy, including such notables as Rolando del Carmen (1997), Todd R. Clear (2004), and Edward J. Latessa (2010). Regardless of their relationship to ACJS, those who have found themselves receiving the Bruce Smith, Sr. Award, like the award's namesake, are recognized as some of the most noted names in the criminal justice discipline.

In 1976, when President Gordon Misner was serving his second term as ACJS President, he proposed the creation of two awards, one which would recognize those within the Academy for their contributions to the criminal justice discipline and one for those outside of the Academy. The accolade which would recognize those within was named the Founder's Award, and V. A. Leonard and William Wiltberger (both disciples of August Vollmer) received the first awards in 1976. The other award, to recognize those outside of the Academy, was named for Bruce Smith, Sr., who at the time needed no introduction; his reputation and contributions were well known to the discipline, especially among the policing scholars. Although he has been called “perhaps the nation’s preeminent police consultant,” his reputation and name have faded with time into the dustbin of criminal justice history. In light of the fact that Bruce Smith, Sr.’s name is one of the most prestigious, if not the most highly esteemed of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences’ Awards, it is important that his story be told anew, so that we do not forget the significance his name holds, not only for our current and future recipients of this coveted award, but for the Academy as a whole.

Early Life

Although known by most as simply Bruce Smith and later as Bruce Smith, Sr., the man that has a preeminent place in criminal justice history was born Clarence Bruce Smith, Jr.; he was named after his father, Clarence B. Smith. Rather than go by Clarence, Jr., he simply went by his middle and last names, Bruce Smith, and would not pick up the suffix of Senior until he decided to name his own son after himself. At that point, however, he actually preferred to be called Uncle Jack, “a title indicative of the warm personal relationships that he established.”

Bruce Smith was born on May 23, 1892 in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, New York, and he remained a New Yorker his entire life. The Smith family traced a long lineage of New Yorkers for one of his ancestors was an early settler on Long Island and was the recipient of a land grant for which Smithtown is named. His father was a banker and real estate agent, and his mother was Jessie Annin. Smith grew up as a typical kid in Brooklyn and attended Public School No. 3 on Bedford Avenue. When asked if he had any memories of police officers in his early years, he reported he only held a few fleeting memories of the local police. One rather fuzzy memory was of a “red-headed cop on the beat in his neighborhood who was jovial enough,” but like most kids his age, “[Smith] was inclined to regard all cops as pests who interfered with such normal pursuits as batting baseballs through windows and throwing snowballs with rocks in them.” In fact, Smith was somewhat of a troublemaker in his youth, often getting into trouble, into fights, and into detention at school. He ran with a group of friends who were considered troublemakers who most likely be labeled a gang by today's standards. Later in life, Smith often made the rather alarming comment that “Any boy who doesn’t belong to a gang isn’t brought up well.”

Smith attended Erasmus Hall High School where he graduated in 1909. His father then sent him to Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut, hoping that a change in environment might settle his rambunctious ways. Unfortunately, Smith found himself running up against the rules and getting in just as much trouble at Wesleyan as he did in the schools in Brooklyn. One of his favorite pranks in college was to go up the hill above Main Street where there was a memorial to the soldiers from Middletown who fought in the Civil War. The memorial featured a Civil War cannon replete with cannonballs, and he would roll them down the hill, one by one, toward Main Street. He also took great pleasure in shooting at various birds with a shotgun out of his dorm window which, needless to say, was frowned upon by the Wesleyan administration. In his senior year, in 1913, however, he committed his last prank. Wesleyan required mandatory attendance at the church services on Sunday mornings, and one morning
at chapel, Smith timed the minister’s speech with a stopwatch. “When he finally finished,” Smith loved to recall, “I got up and announced that the prayer alone had taken seven and six-tenths minutes.” “The old boy didn’t appreciate it,” he added. For that little prank, he was expelled from Wesleyan, despite it being his senior year.

Smith was not too upset for he had long desired to return to the city. He applied to Columbia University, but encountered a few roadblocks. At first, Wesleyan refused to transfer his credits, but it is believed that his father had a few influential friends who notified Wesleyan that they might withhold their next donations, and the credits were transferred. There was not, however, before the President of Wesleyan contacted the Dean at Columbia University and warned them that if they admitted Bruce Smith, the University would be acting “at its own peril.” Columbia University did admit him, and it turned out to be the place where Bruce Smith’s life turned around and where he ended his immature ways.

He graduated from Columbia University in 1914 with his B.A. and enrolled in the Master’s program in Political Science. While working on his Master’s degree he met a young lady on Long Island named Mary Belle Rowell, ironically the daughter of a minister. They married in 1915, while Smith completed the last of his classes for the Master’s degree and began writing his thesis. His thesis was titled *Extra-Judicial Opinions: Their Origin, Development, and Legal Effect.* The thesis focused on the U.S. Supreme Court’s ability to declare laws unconstitutional, and whether a similar right was found at the state level. It was this research that attracted him to studying the law, so after defending his thesis in 1916, Smith enrolled in the LL.B. program at Columbia.

His dedication to his research brought Smith to the attention of several people in the Political Science Department. He was recommended to Professor Charles Austin Beard as a potential student worker in his newly created New York Bureau of Municipal Research. Beard, at the time, was a professor of political science and public administration, but he became more renowned as a historian. The two became close friends and associates, and Smith had the utmost reverence for his new mentor. “Uncle Charlie took me out of the Lion bar on a Hundred and Tenth Street, and put me in a library,” was how Smith later described the impact Beard had on him. “The man’s appeal to a young, inquiring, and naïve mind was simply overpowering.” As a result, when Smith finished his law degree at Columbia, he had no desire to take the bar examination, but rather went to work full-time at the Bureau and enrolled in the doctoral program in government.

The New York Bureau of Municipal Research soon changed its name to the Institute of Public Administration. Beard organized the institute, for the discipline of Public Administration was coming into its own and breaking away from Political Science. The purpose of the institute was to improve government management by introducing many of the principles and methods of public administration to federal, state, and local governments. Originally, it was located in a six-story Georgian house located at Park Avenue and Sixty-Eight Street, and Smith divided his time between the Institute and Columbia University’s library. Since Beard encouraged Smith to focus on public administration and city finances, Smith spent much of his time poring over actuarial tables.

One day, in late 1916, Smith was working on city financial issues for St. Louis, when he received a call from the Institute’s field-work division. Clement J. Driscoll, a former deputy police commissioner from New York City, was conducting a police review in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and needed some assistance. Smith was told to pack his bags and leave for Harrisburg as soon as possible. He did not want to go and argued that he was not the right man for the job, that someone else should be assigned. He was then ordered to go. “That’s how I got into police work,” Smith later recounted, “I was dragged in squealing and protesting. I knew nothing about cops. Boy, how I hated to leave those actuarial tables!”

**Police Surveys**

At the time that Smith received the call to assist in this first police survey, he “presented an imposing appearance that radiated confidence and authority.” He was described as being “an inch over six feet, his erect bearing, bold mien, and booming voice reminded the onlooker of a policeman,” but he had never served in that capacity. Despite that fact, his trip to Harrisburg was about to tie Bruce Smith to American policing for the rest of his life.
Smith took the train to Harrisburg and met with Clement Driscoll; they stayed up all night discussing the problems of the police department. By the early morning, Smith still did not have a good grasp of the situation or what he was required to do. Then, Driscoll returned to New York City leaving Smith in charge. Smith remained there for three weeks, living out of a hotel, exploring every facet of the police department, the city, and the criminal underworld. “We even visited a few of the local dens of sin in the course of our study,” he proudly recalled. Ultimately, Smith created a record keeping system that allowed the Harrisburg Police Department to access information about all of the various types of crimes and disorders occurring in the city by type, time, and location. When Smith turned over the final police survey as well as a report on the new record keeping system, the city was overwhelmed and simply thanked him and encouraged him to return to the city – New York City, that is.

Smith did not have a chance to conduct another police survey before the United States entered World War I. When he decided to do his part for “God and Country,” Smith enlisted in the U.S. Army Signal Corps Aviation section. After spending eight weeks at Cornell University training as an aviation cadet, he was then sent south to Kelly Field Number 2 in Texas, where he first trained on the Curtis Jenny trainers and then the JN-4s. “The exhaust pipes were right alongside the cockpit,” Smith later recalled, “and when I landed, my face used to be streaked with carbon like Casey Jones.” In fact, the loud noise from these exhausts damaged his eardrums “and he was compelled to restrict himself to surface travel thereafter, always a matter of inconvenience and disappointment to him during the later years of his life.”

After a year of training, Smith was finally sent overseas to France in August 1918 as a Second Lieutenant. He was one of 5,000 Airmen sent to Europe, but of those, only 642 saw any type of combat; Bruce Smith was not one of them. “The rest of us,” he explained, “spent our time drinking wine and standing two formations a day.” After three months of drinking wine in France, the Armistice was signed, and Smith returned home to New York City.

Smith resumed his duties at the Institute of Public Administration, and he began conducting police surveys up and down the east coast. By the time he went to conduct a survey in New Orleans in 1923, he was serving as the manager of the Institute of Public Administration and had settled into a routine of conducting one survey after another. Smith typically spent six to eight weeks on site, visiting as many administrators, supervisors, and police officers as he could. He toured the police departments, went on ride-alongs, and assessed the level of support and political control of the city government. He collected data on the current status of the police department, not what should be or what was said on paper, but rather what was truly present through his observations. He also requested copies of the department’s organization chart, its policies and procedures, and other documentation detailing anything related to police control.

To Bruce Smith, police control was the most important aspect of the police organization and hence his surveys. He defined police control as consisting of two elements: “popular control over general policies, and the control commonly exercised by administrative heads in directing day-to-day operations by the rank and file.” Toward this end, Smith looked at whether the police department was under state or local control, and he would assess the commissions overseeing the department. Inside the department, he looked at such things as unity of command, span of control, control through lay administrators and technically trained leaders, the tenure and turnover of leadership, the organization of the police department—assessing both its efficiency and effectiveness; he looked at all of the various services from criminal investigation to record keeping.

Although Smith advocated the removal of politics from the police, the most significant impact he had on American policing lies in his recommendations for its organizational structure. He found in nearly all of his surveys that the police departments were poorly organized and highly fragmented. In a typical police department, the police chief or police commissioner often had far too many people reporting directly to him, and most of those reporting were either at the beat or district level. In Chicago, he found 48 individuals reporting to the police commissioner, and most of them were district commanders. In Wichita, Kansas, the police department had nearly the same type of organizational structure, despite the fact that it was much smaller than the Chicago Police Department. In each of these police surveys by the mid-1920s, Smith was recommending an organizational chart based on function. More specifically, he began recommending that police departments organize by the
following divisions (or bureaus): personnel, traffic, patrol, detectives (investigation), records and vice. In this reorganizational structure, the police chief or commissioner went from having four or five dozen people reporting directly to him; Smith brought the number down to between six and eight individuals—a more realistic span of control. This organizational model is the standard organization chart found in nearly every police organization in the United States today. It exists largely because of the police surveys and publications of Bruce Smith, or as police historian Fogelson put it, this reduction in the number of officials who report directly to the chief was “devised by [August] Vollmer, refined by [Bruce] Smith, and later on popularized by [O.W.] Wilson.”

Bruce Smith conducted over 50 of these police surveys during his career. In the early years, until the late 1920s, Smith was the primary field investigator and author of the police reviews. Over time, he took more of a supervisory role and directed the investigations and the writing of the police reviews. However, he always spent time visiting the police officers in the field and hanging out with them in the police station. In addition to the surveys of Chicago, New Orleans, and Wichita, he also conducted surveys in St. Louis, Kansas City, Boston, Cincinnati, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Providence, and Milwaukee. In the 1932 survey of Chicago, Smith came close to recommending, for the first time, that the entire police force be fired, and the city start all over with a brand new organization. In 1946, he was asked to return to New Orleans, where he was saddened to find the same deplorable conditions as he had found in 1923. His final report was almost a repeat of the earlier survey, calling for nearly all of the same reforms. He was then asked to come back a year later, in 1947, to assess the progress of the department. He saw little progress and as he noted, “You’ve got to want reform to get it. It’s not like taking the waters. It’s a major operation.”

Despite operating out of the Institute of Public Administration in the heart of New York City for 35 years, it was not until 1952 that the New York City Police Department requested that Bruce Smith conduct one of his famous police surveys of their own department. In November, when he released his report, he spoke at a public hearing at City Hall and announced that “New York’s finest” were no longer the finest. Smith was vilified. His own city, the city he so loved, came out against him. The police ridiculed him, the public ridiculed him, and even Arthur Godfrey, the famous radio broadcaster, vilified him. Godfrey railed against Smith one morning on the radio, stating “I think we’ve got the best police force in the United States right here in New York City. Oh, my! Those guys – you never know, you never know. They used to call it New York’s finest? For my money, they always will be New York’s Finest. They’re a doggone nice bunch of guys, and they try to do a job – all of them.” Needless to say, reporters all across the city clamored to hear Smith’s reaction to Godfrey’s denunciation of him. “What I object to is the ‘all of them,’” Smith told them. “I don’t suppose Mr. Godfrey had time to read the report.” Eventually the flap died down and the N.Y.P.D. made many of the changes Smith had recommended, albeit ever so slowly over the next decade.

There were several times over the years when Smith took time off from conducting police surveys. The first came when World War II broke out, and Smith’s expertise was called upon to deal with the bureaucratic organization of the U.S. Army Air Force. During the interim years between World War I and II, what became the Army Air Force had grown in size and was burdened with a lot of “deadwood” and “sacred cows,” as they were often called. Smith’s reorganization recommended that nearly all of them be reassigned from their Washington, D.C. desks to the field. His recommendations were not well received by the Commanding General, H.H. “Hap” Arnold, since many of the deadwood and sacred cows were friends of his, and Arnold fought against Smith and his recommendations. Smith stood his ground and Arnold, knowing Smith had been a Second Lieutenant in the Army Air Force, threatened to re-commission him so he could order him around. Smith did not back down and the 350 Colonels were all reassigned to the field. “Bruce was the only man I ever saw talk back to Hap Arnold,” recalled a military officer who worked in the same office as General Arnold during World War II.

In the civilian world, Smith was called upon many times to assist in various endeavors that were focused on government, crime, and the police. He was asked to provide counsel to the State of New York’s Joint Legislative Commission on Taxation and Retrenchment (1922-1923), the Mayor’s Advisory Committee for the City of Chicago (1931-1933), and the Westchester County Committee on Government (1934). Smith also served on the executive board of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology from 1930 to 1942. In addition, he was a member of the American Bar Association’s Committee on Police Training and Merit System (1938-1955), and for one year he
served as the committee chairman (1943-1944). He was also asked in 1954 to advise both the U.S. Department of the Treasury and the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which he did until his death the following year. Of all of these various associations, however, Smith’s most memorable was when he was asked to assist the International Association of Chiefs of Police (1928-1931) and was made an honorary member.

The task that the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) called upon him to work on was based on some of Smith’s early exploration of policing in Europe. As a result of his visits with police departments in England, France, Belgium and Germany during the 1920s, Smith came to the realization that one of the things necessary to understand crime and to improve policing was to have better and more consistent crime statistics. As early as 1923-1924, when August Vollmer served as President of the IACP, that organization had been calling for some form of uniform crime reporting. Smith’s advocacy for something similar motivated the IACP to use his knowledge and experience to obtain such a reporting mechanism. Smith went to Washington, D.C., and while creating a list of the seven most serious and definable crimes that occurred in the 48 states, he learned that a bill was about to be presented before Congress to create a national bureau of identification, similar to the one already established in California. Since he knew that Fiorello H. LaGuardia was a member of the Judiciary Committee, Smith paid him a visit and encouraged him to include a provision for uniform crime reporting, which LaGuardia did. The bill passed in June of 1930, and soon the collection of these uniform crime statics fell to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Thus, Smith played a significant role in the development of the UCR.

There were several times throughout his career that Smith took time off from serving as a consultant and conducting police surveys, in order to spend time overseas visiting foreign police departments. Other than camping in his early years and sailing in his later ones, observing foreign police departments in action to understand how they organized and went about the task of policing the populace was one of his favorite past-times. He conducted numerous trips to Europe in the 1920s, visiting England, France, Belgium, and Germany. The Depression and War years limited his travels until the late 1940s and early 1950s, when again he resumed his visits with police departments throughout Europe. It was with the London Metropolitan Police, more than any other, that he spent much of his time and where he developed a number of close friends, including Colonel Sir Frank Brook, Inspector of Constabulary for England and Wales. He enjoyed not only visiting with the police in that department, but he relished learning about their history and how it essentially shaped American policing from the Colonial era forward.

Bruce Smith’s police surveys had an impact on the policing field, but they were generally limited to the agency he was reviewing. Each report was tailored to the political, social and economic climate of the city under review, and the unique culture of the specific police department. Yet, among all of these surveys he recognized common problems as well as common solutions. From early in his career, Smith began writing on these topics and he proved to be “a prolific writer.”

Author

In the early 1920s, Smith spent much of his time in New York State conducting police surveys on rural agencies, so it is not surprising that his first publication in the Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law & Criminology was on “Rural Justice in New York State.” The article dealt with many of the lesser known aspects of criminal justice found in the rural environment, including coroners, justices of the peace, sheriffs, and constables, as well as the New York State Police which had formed in 1917. This particular interest and fascination with how rural policing was carried out may have stemmed from the fact that what he learned was so different from his experiences growing up and living in New York City. Ultimately, this interest developed into several book publications. His first book was published in 1925 by Macmillan and was titled The State Police: Organization and Administration. He returned to the topic of the state police in a later journal article when he analyzed the various factors influencing their development. His second book, Rural Crime Control, was published on 1933 by the Institute of Public Administration through Columbia University. The book details rural crime and criminal justice and has individual chapters covering the history, development, and organization of the sheriff, the constable, county constabularies,
the state police, the coroner, and justices of the peace. From a historical perspective, the book provides a good treatment of the history, but it is most useful today for its snapshot of rural policing in the 1920s.

His first book does not appear to have had a high degree of reception, for there does not appear to have been any book reviews written for Smith’s *The State Police*. However, he did garner some attention for his second book on *Rural Crime Control*, from no less than Berkeley Police Chief August Vollmer. Vollmer wrote in a review published in the *Columbia Law Review* that “Bruce Smith has again contributed a valuable work to the literature of public administration, this time presenting a picture of the administration of criminal justice in the rural areas of the United States.”\(^76\) Vollmer argued that not only should the student of Public Administration and policing read Smith’s book, but that it “should be in the hands of every citizen who has the welfare of his country at heart.”\(^77\) Frank Stewart from the University of California at Los Angeles also found Smith’s book a significant contribution to the field when he noted that “the author’s extensive experience in police and crime work have given him an admirable opportunity to know at first hand the administration of crime control in rural areas” and that he should be “congratulated for contributing a much needed study on a very vital problem.”\(^78\)

The lion’s share, and probably Smith’s primary contribution to the policing field, came as a result of his police surveys and his articles and books that were squarely focused on the organization and reorganization of the American police. It could easily be referred to as the “Bruce Smith Way” of organizing a department. The first of these publications came in 1929, after a decade of conducting policy surveys in such cities as Schenectady, NY; Syracuse, NY; Newark, NJ; Detroit, MI; and Buffalo, NY, in which he addressed his findings of “Municipal Police Administration” and offered recommendations in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.\(^80\) He continued to write on elements that impeded the professional development in such articles as “Politics and Law Enforcement,”\(^81\) “Civil Service as Negative Control,”\(^82\) and “Enforcement of the Criminal Law.”\(^83\) In his later years, he also published two articles that were assessments of how far policing had come in its development since he first started conducting the reviews. The first article, published in 1943, surveyed the years 1918 to 1943, and while praiseworthy of the developments, it voiced a word of caution for policing in the post-war years.\(^84\) The second of these articles was published in 1954, and this retrospective on policing covered the years 1924 to 1954 and served as the introduction to a special issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* which focused entirely on the status of law enforcement in the United States.\(^85\)

Out of all of Bruce Smith’s writings, however, there is one that was unequalled in worth and praise, and that was his last book *Police Systems in the United States*. First published in 1940, it was then “revised and enlarged” and published again in 1949.\(^86\) The earlier version featured a “Foreword” by Raymond B. Fosdick, who until August Vollmer’s publication in 1936 and Smith’s 1940 publication, had written what was considered to be the definitive treatise on American Policing, published in 1920.\(^87\) The 1949 version dropped the Foreword, and Smith, having clearly established himself as one of the leading authorities on policing at that time, authored a preface to the second edition. Both versions of the book included Bruce Smith’s lifetime knowledge and expertise on policing in the United States and covered the problems of crime and policing, reviewed the types of police, and focused heavily on police organization (the “Bruce Smith model” so to speak).

There were at least twelve separate book reviews written on this publication, and all of them were highly praiseworthy. One professor of law at the University of Chicago noted, “With Vollmer’s retirement and Fosdick’s shifting to other interests it is no exaggeration to say that Bruce Smith at present stands alone as an authority on American police”\(^88\) while another noted, “there is available for the first time since the publication of Raymond Fosdick’s *American Police Systems* in 1920 a general description and appraisal of police systems in the United States.”\(^89\) Another review stated that “this volume, as far as this reviewer is concerned, is the most important as well as the most ably presented analysis of American police systems that has yet been printed.”\(^90\) The same reviewer concluded that “when better books on American police are written, Bruce Smith will write them.”\(^91\) Additional reviews were published in the *Harvard Law Review*, *American Sociological Review*, and the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, with the latter review noting that “Bruce Smith is THE authority in this field
and the one man in the country who could write this book.”92 Even the revised version of the book, published in 1949, received a number of book reviews and high praise, including one from Thorsten Sellin at the University of Pennsylvania.93

In light of his publication, he was often asked to lecture at various police departments and universities. He guest lectured at Harvard, Columbia, Yale, and Chicago and was a visiting faculty member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s National Police Training Academy. Although Bruce Smith once remarked that “rarely does a major piece of police work receive the accolade of general approval,” this clearly did not apply to him.94

**Twilight Years**

Bruce Smith’s life-long affiliation with the Institute of Public Administration brought him in close association with Luther Gulick, who became the director of the institute in 1921.95 Because Gulick was called upon for so many varied consulting positions, including the Brownlow Committee in the Roosevelt White House (1937-1938) and to serve as the City Administrator for New York City (1954-1956), Smith found himself serving as the acting director of the institute. He took over during the years 1937-1938, 1941-1946, and 1950-1952.96 When Gulick became the city administrator, he left for what he thought was good, and Bruce Smith became the director in 1954, serving until his death in 1955.97

The year before his death, in 1954, Bruce Smith was interviewed by Robert Shaplen, a writer for Smith’s most beloved periodical, *The New Yorker*.98 Shaplen had a long standing feature in the magazine titled “Profiles,” where he wrote about a person of unusual interest, generally detailing their public side, but including colorful commentary about their personal side as well. Shaplen noted that Smith was the “leading authority” on the police and he described him at the time as “a tall, ambassadorial-looking man of sixty-one, who is director of the Institute of Public Administration.”99 In more detail, Shaplen noted that Bruce Smith was “Six feet one and straight-backed, with firm, well-shaped features set off by hair that is turning white and a full, neatly trimmed mustache, he looks like a roughhewn composite of Dean Acheson [U.S. Secretary of State under President Truman] and Anthony Eden [British Prime Minister] who might easily be asked to pose for an advertisement for a twenty-year-old Scotch whiskey.”100

O.W. Wilson, at the time the Dean of the School of Criminology at the University of California–Berkeley, described Smith “in the latter years of his life” as having a “nearly white crew-cut and full, neatly trimmed but somewhat bristly mustache, combined with his regular features to produce an attention-demanding, distinguished appearance.”101 He further noted that Smith was “a man of swiftly changing moods that were mirrored in facial expressions that varied unmistakably from the earnest and solicitous to the scowling and indignant; his moods were also evidenced by boisterous laughter or roaring disapproval frequently accompanied by loud and impetuous curses.”102 He also pointed out that “Smith combined the best qualities of policeman, executive, statesman, and scholar.”103

Smith had always been a man of adventure, and he enjoyed engaging in activities that were challenging and strenuous in nature. Throughout his early years, one of his passions was the outdoors—camping, hiking, and canoeing. For nearly 25 years he made an annual trip to Canada along the boundary waters, where he canoed, fished, and camped for several weeks.104 When it came to canoeing, he was a firm believer that the proper paddling style was on his haunches, a method that is efficient but tiring after a short time period. “Bruce is at his best when he’s enduring hardship,” was how one long-time camping companion described Smith’s attitudes.105 His real passion, however, started off slowly and developed over his lifetime—sailing Long Island Sound. Smith loved to sail and most of his friends were either sailors or visited with Smith on sailboat excursions. One associate who knew him for most of his life once said, “I’ve always had an image of Bruce standing indomitably at the helm in a storm, his jaw jutting out, at war with the elements.”106

For this reason, Shaplen spent much of his time describing Smith’s passion for sailing. As he aged into his midlife years, Smith spent less time camping and canoeing and more time sailing. This was due in part to his changing
interests, but also because of his increasing salary during that time frame. He could afford to spend more time sailing. Initially he owned several small sailboats that were fine for a party of four, but he eventually traded up to a 26 foot racing sloop he named *The Tartan*. In 1954, at the time of the interview, he was in the process of purchasing a 36 foot racing yacht from a British manufacturer. He dubbed the new sailboat the *Lady Maguerite*, and it was on this boat that Bruce Smith would meet his fate.

Smith was a member of the Port Jefferson Yacht Club, and a friend at the club once noted that Smith’s boat was always the first one in the water in the spring “and the last one out of the basin in the fall.” When he purchased the new boat, because of its size and his decision to only sail Long Island Sound, he decided to dock his boat at the Seawanahaka-Corinthian Yacht Club at Oyster Bay. The same individual noted that “Smith often sails happily all day alone, sometimes roundly cursing a dying wind as he makes his way in the late afternoon back to the Long Island shore.”

It was on such a day, September 18, 1955, that Bruce Smith set out from Oyster Bay into Long Island Sound, on his new sailboat, the *Lady Maguerite*. At some point during the day, sailing alone, he was suddenly stricken with a lung ailment that caused him to suffer a major heart attack. It was not unusual for the boat not to return by sundown, for it was entirely like Smith to arrive just after dark; this time, he did not. A search was launched, and they found him slumped over on the sailboat, dead at the age of 63.

**Legacy**

Bruce Smith, Sr.’s legacy lived on initially through his son, Bruce Smith, Jr., who continued to conduct police surveys like his father. Bruce Smith, Jr. had not initially followed in his father’s footsteps, choosing a career in forestry instead, but life eventually led him in that direction. When America entered World War II, Smith, Jr. was commissioned and eventually assigned to command an infantry company and later a military police company. Once he obtained the rank of Major, he became the chief of counter intelligence in the office of the Chief of Ordinance in the U.S. Army, conducting industrial security and protection surveys. Upon leaving the U.S. military, this background positioned him well to follow in his father’s footsteps, so he joined the Institute of Public Administration and began conducting police surveys.

In addition to his son, another individual who fell under the tutelage of Bruce Smith was Donal E. J. MacNamara. MacNamara was a student at Columbia University and attended Bruce Smith’s lectures. After leaving Columbia, he studied at the University of Southern California, then returned to New York City, joining the faculty at John Jay College. MacNamara was instrumental in shaping the American Society of Criminology in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Today, one of the other Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences awards is named for him, the Donal E. J. MacNamara Award, which is given annually to the outstanding journal publication of the year from one of the ACJS publications – *Justice Quarterly, Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, or *ACJS Today*. MacNamara had the highest respect for Bruce Smith, as did so many others he met along the way. Colonel Sir Frank Brook, whom he had met and befriended in England, noted after Bruce Smith’s death that “He was an amazing man, and his knowledge of policing in all its aspects was, I think, not equaled anywhere. I am sure that over here we have never had anyone comparable to him.”

Bruce Smith’s legacy came primarily through his police surveys and publications and the fundamental changes he made to police organization, management, and leadership. While his contributions to the creation of the Uniform Crime Reports cannot be undervalued, it was his application of public administration principles to American policing that helped advance policing out of the political era and into the reform era during the early Twentieth Century. Bruce Smith had a profound impact on American policing.

Although he was never a police officer, Smith spent so much time with police officers when conducting his reviews, that they came to respect him, and he, they. One person described the success of Smith’s relationships with police as resulting from the fact “policemen in general are natural-born complainers and Smith is a natural-bom listener.” “Bruce speaks our language,” was how one police officer summed it up. “He’s as much at home
batting the breeze with the cop on the corner as most folks are reading the paper in their own living-room.”

Smith, on a number of occasions and by a number of individuals and groups, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, was heralded with what is considered the highest praise in policing circles, when he was called “a cop’s cop.”

Bruce Smith helped pave the way for future scholars of American policing and criminal justice. It is thus altogether fitting and proper that one of the highest awards in the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, an organization dedicated to the scholarly study of Criminal Justice and improving the Administration of Justice, would name its highest award, an award given “in recognition of outstanding contributions to criminal justice as an academy or professional endeavor,” after Bruce Smith, Sr. Truly, it is through this highly coveted award that his legacy lives on.
Appendix 1
Past Recipients of the Bruce Smith, Sr. Award

2012 - Gennaro F. Vito
2011 - Scott H. Decker
2010 - Edward J. Latessa
2009 - Geoff Alpert
2008 - Robert M. Bohm
2007 - Bruce A. Arrigo
2006 - Joycelyn Pollock
2005 - James Marquart
2004 - Todd R. Clear
2003 - David Bayley
2002 - Gerhard O.W. Mueller
2001 - Meda Chesney-Lind
2000 - Jeffrey Fagan
1999 - Gary Marx
1998 - Samuel Walker
1997 - Rolando del Carmen
1996 - Francis Cullen
1995 - Coramae R. Mann
1994 - Lawrence Sherman
1993 - Peter K. Manning
1992 - Lloyd Ohlin
1991 - James Inciardi
1990 - Donal MacNamara
1989 - Herman Goldstein
1987 - Simon Dinitz
1986 - James Short, Jr.
1985 - William Chambliss
1984 - Jerome Skolnick
1983 - Jerome Hall
1982 - John Conrad
1981 - Norval Morris
1980 - Albert Reiss
1979 - James Q. Wilson
1978 - Ralph Turner
1977 - NO AWARD GIVEN
1976 - Sir Leon Radzinowicz & Thorstein Sellin
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