

**HARMONY IN FUNCTIONAL EXECUTION:
A HISTORY OF THE
ARLINGTON COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT**

By

David B. Brown

Arlington County was created in 1920 by the General Assembly of the State of Virginia out of what had previously been the County of Alexandria. It was hoped that this name change would eliminate the confusion that had existed between the city and county of Alexandria.¹ The name, Arlington, came from the home of Robert E. Lee, the Arlington Estate, which is located upon a hill that overlooks Washington, D.C.

During the Civil War, this area was occupied by Union troops who built numerous fortresses in order to protect the city of Washington. The presence of this large military population had a profound effect upon the growth of the area. Profiteers, con-men, and prostitutes crossed the Potomac River from Washington and went to work providing their unique services to the Union soldiers. The two "cities" of Rosslyn and Jackson sprung up on the south shores of the Potomac about this time, and served as havens for this criminal element. Immediately this part of Alexandria County acquired a reputation for lawlessness. One saloon, near Rosslyn, became known as "Dead Man's Hollow" for its penchant for producing dead bodies within the establishment once a week.² In the 1890's, St. Asaph's Race Track and Gambling House was erected in Jackson City.

For most of the next decade, not much was done to curb the criminality that became associated with the area. This was due to the fact that the area operated outside the realm of the available law enforcement agencies. The police in the District of Columbia were busy with their own problems³ and were, most likely, happy to be rid of these bad seeds. The city of Alexandria could not curtail the crime in the county, because the criminals had the protection of certain corrupt officials.⁴ In this atmosphere, things continued to get worse. Farmers who had to travel through the area to get to the produce markets in Washington, D.C. formed armed convoys to protect themselves from bandits.⁵

Finally, at the turn of the century, a "Good Citizens League" was begun with the goal of gaining enough political control of the government of Alexandria to bring law and order to the area.⁶ In 1903, the League convinced Crandal Mackey to run for the post of Alexandria Commonwealth Attorney.⁷ Mackey was a crusader who was determined to rid the county of its criminal element. To achieve this goal, he set his sights on Jackson City, St. Asaph's

and Rosslyn. After he discovered that no one was willing to come forward to bear witness against the illegal activity in the area, he formed a posse to raid the establishments himself. Armed with axes, sticks, hammers and at least one sawed-off shotgun,⁸ Mackey and his followers raided the saloons, brothels and gambling houses of Rosslyn and Jackson City. The group shut down St. Asaph's and secured indictments for most of the gamblers who congregated there. This raid and a series of others succeeded in ridding the area of most of this type of crime by 1904. No longer would the area be identified as "the Monte Carlo of Virginia," as it had been in an 1890 guide of Virginia distributed to the state's justices of the peace.⁹

For the next three decades Arlington County's laws were enforced by one sheriff, one deputy sheriff, twelve special officers, three justices of the peace, and one constable.¹⁰ It was their job to patrol all 25.8 square miles of what was the fastest growing county in the United States from 1910 to 1930.¹¹ This job was not particularly easy. Arlington's close proximity to the District of Columbia continued to make the area a haven for fugitives and it also became a through-way for bootleggers.

During and immediately following World War I, Arlington County experienced a large population growth as military men with their families, and civilians looking for jobs, moved into the area. In 1910, Arlington County (still called Alexandria County) was mostly a wilderness, with a population of 10,231.¹² By 1930, the population had risen to 26,000,¹³ and significant construction of residential dwellings had begun in the area.

At this time, Arlington's law enforcement agency was nothing more than a very small sheriff's department, made up of men whose method of operation had not changed since the early nineteenth hundreds. They were not paid salaries; instead they earned money for every arrest they made or warrant they served.¹⁴ Some of these jobs were not dangerous; for instance, when much of Arlington still had no indoor plumbing, they were paid to inspect the county's outhouses.¹⁵ But now, changes would be required if the police force were going to meet the needs of Arlington's growing population. The sheriff's department was going to have to become a real police force if it was to meet its community's needs.

The extent to which Arlington's law enforcement agency was being overwhelmed was best illustrated by the support, or lack of it, that the special officers of the sheriff's department received when they were on the road. For example, on February 12, 1930, while chasing a car that was transporting illegal alcohol on the Potomac Road (now Arlington Ridge Road), Special Officers Raymond Crack and Lyman King exchanged gunfire with four bootleggers. They had no back-up, due to the small size of the force, and had to rely on their own resources. A few minutes into the chase one of the bullets fired from the car hit Officer Crack in the mouth; unfazed; he continued

his pursuit for two more miles until he was overtaken by pain and loss of blood. Finally, he fell off his motorcycle; at that time Officer King discontinued his pursuit to check on the condition of Crack. Officer Crack signaled that he was all right and for Officer King to continue the chase. Unfortunately, by this time the bootleggers were long gone.¹⁶ They had made their escape because the small and backward Arlington police force had not been able to provide back-up support or adequate communications.

Beginning in the mid-1930's, both *The Washington Post* and *The Washington Star* consistently referred to the small Arlington Sheriff's Department as a "police department."¹⁷ Even the special officers considered themselves members of an organized police force. This designation as Arlington County Policemen, rather than special officers of the Sheriff's Department, became so important that interdepartmental photographs taken in 1935 reveal the letters "ACP" upon the officer's tie clasps. This insistence upon the term "police" rather than "sheriffs" is significant. It was as if this distinction in terminology would allow the small force to respond better to the rapid growth of the county and their increasing responsibilities.

Clearly the county needed better enforcement of its statutes than the small force could muster. Many major department stores had moved into the community from Washington, D.C., in order to serve the suburban clientele. This led to an expansion of Arlington's business district, and more store owners began to request spot checks of their premises during off hours. There was an increase in the number of cars on county roads and stricter enforcement of the traffic laws was now required. Also the number of accidents was increasing and it was becoming just about impossible for the Arlington police to respond efficiently to their increased workload.

In order to respond to these increased responsibilities the County Board hired new officers. These personnel increases made it more difficult for Sheriff H. B. Fields to control the inner workings of the department. Fields was a slightly overweight man in his middle 50's, just under six feet tall, with an imposing walrus mustache. He was the picture of a small-town sheriff; he never carried a gun, but used the strength of his personality and a poison-eyed stare to enforce the county's laws.¹⁸ By the end of 1939, Sheriff Fields began to push for a reorganization of Arlington's law enforcement agency. In a letter to the County Board dated January 30, 1940, he stated, "Because of the growth of the County and the police force with it, I agree with the general trend of public opinion that there should be a change in the police set-up, and would like to request that the administration of the Police Department, including the recommendation of men for appointment thereto, be transferred to the County Manager."¹⁹

Real estate speculators, United States Government officials, and county residents had been pushing the Arlington County Board to reorganize the

police into a real police department. On February 1, 1940, the Board ordered the creation of the Arlington County Police Department. At first there were nine members on the force, mostly former special officers. Harry Woodyard became the first Chief of Police. Woodyard was a forty-three year-old Arlington native who was a former deputy sheriff²⁰ and a J. Edgar Hoover look-alike. Under his command were two sections: the Administrative Section and the Uniformed Patrol Section.²¹ This created a rational chain of command where everything was under the direct control of the Chief of Police, and it provided a framework for the organized growth of the department. In addition to the structural changes, the police department now enjoyed a new importance in the minds of County Board members, who believed that the police were important for the future development of the county. Also, as a full-fledged "department" the police department would enjoy the direct allocation of money from the County Board for its continued growth and operation. By 1943, the force had grown from its original nine members to a complement of thirty-nine officers.

Even this growth seemed inadequate as Arlington continued to expand during World War II. The construction and operation of the Pentagon brought more and more people to the area. Between 1941 and 1944, Arlington County's population doubled, from 57,000 to 120,000.²² During this time the Arlington County Board created a volunteer Auxiliary Police Force of 45 men²³ who could assist the regular police in emergency situations.

In 1946, when Chief Woodyard asked the County Board to appropriate enough funds to hire twenty-five additional officers, he pointed out that at the time Arlington had a force of fifty-five men protecting 130,000 residents. Woodyard said that in order to keep pace with the National Safety Council's observation that the nation's safest cities had a ratio of one police officer for every 1,000 inhabitants more officers would have to be hired.²⁴ Woodyard also noted that since Arlington was a quiet residential community with a low crime rate, it did not have to conform strictly to the NSC's calculations. The request was granted by the Board.

It is interesting to note that the statistics that the Arlington County officials continually cited when building the police force were those which dealt with American cities rather than other suburban areas. Although it may be assumed that these statistics were the most readily available for comparison, it is clear that the county's hierarchy thought of the area as a city that only happened to have suburban characteristics. Perhaps the relative smallness of the county had something to do with this idea. Whatever the case, this mind-set greatly influenced the development of Arlington's police department. It led to a tendency of the department to adopt the law enforcement techniques of major cities rather quickly. It also led to an environment that anticipated problems rather than waiting for them to occur before responding.

Another change that occurred in 1946 was in the area of education within the department. At this time, two training schools opened for the education of Arlington's police force in the latest law enforcement techniques. These schools offered a modest curriculum by today's standards. Officers received twenty-eight hours of training, mostly in the enforcement of traffic laws. This of course reflected the most prominent responsibility of every Arlington policeman. Many of these men may have joined the force believing that they were going to chase down criminals and become heroes, but before long they all found out that in Arlington, 85% of their work was devoted to the enforcement of the traffic laws.²⁵ Traffic enforcement remained the most important job of the Arlington County Police for years to come.

One other major change occurred during the reorganization decade of the 1940's. On May 14, 1948, the members of the Arlington County Police Department became permanent employees of the county. Now they were sworn in for "an indefinite period of time during (the) good behavior of the appointee."²⁶ Previously they had been sworn only for one year terms by the judge of the Circuit Court under whose jurisdiction the police department lay. All seventy-five officers that were already on the force took the oath. The intended purpose of this change was two-fold: it gave the policemen job stability that had not already existed and promoted job loyalty.

In August of 1950, a private company, Griffenhagen and Associates, was hired by the Arlington County Board to analyze the performance of the Arlington County Police Department and to make recommendations for its future. At this time Arlington County was still growing at a rapid pace. As of the 1950 census Arlington's population was 135,000 people, most of them working in some form of government employment. A little less than one fifth (4.4 square miles) of the county's land was owned by the federal government.²⁷ The rest of the county, according to the Griffenhagen report, was mostly "high class residential district with scattered shopping centers representing the principal business area."²⁸ Most of the county's streets had some kind of paving, which was important because these streets had become some of the most traveled in the world. Five of the State of Virginia's eight most traveled roads and highways were located in Arlington or went through the county at some point.²⁹ Arlington County ranked first in the state in terms of traffic density. Furthermore, it was noted that more cars were traveling over the "Twin Potomac River Bridges" (the 14th Street Bridges) into Arlington each day than the "combined traffic flow across the Hudson River between New York and New Jersey by bridge, ferry, and tunnel."³⁰ The Arlington Police had to deal with the greatest traffic problem in the world as the 1950's began.

This was the Arlington that the Griffenhagen report studied. The analysts who wrote the report decided that, "Arlington is not a crime-ridden community"

and it was a community where "the crime-breeding influences are limited."³¹ The report said that most of the area's crime was directly related to traffic laws; 84.3% of all violations were traffic offenses and another 8.8% were drunkenness or disorderly conduct arrests.³² In effect, Arlington was hardly a dangerous place.

The report analyzed the rapid growth of the police department and characterized that time as a period when Arlington's police force had undergone "the stresses and strains of growing pains, manpower shortages, inadequate office space, inexperienced men, and sheer bad luck."³³ The report pointed out that improvement was occurring, but said, "There is evidence, however, of less than the desirable and attainable level of coordination among the department units and among individuals . . . It harks back over the span of years to the days of individualism rather than harmony in functional execution."³⁴ The existence of this mentality within the police force most likely reflected the personality and habits of the Chief of Police. After all, Chief Harry Woodyard was once the county's deputy sheriff, and he had enforced the law in times when one had to be individualistic in order to survive. When Woodyard was on the road he could not count on any back-up, so he had to rely on himself. No doubt this ideology was passed down to the members of his force while he was in charge of the police department. Being the rough individualist that he was, Woodyard probably took many of the criticisms of the report personally (after all, it was *his* department) and did not even notice the compliments.

Whatever the case, after receiving the report Chief Woodyard responded with a plan that addressed some of the criticisms. He drew up what he called the Six Year Improvement Plan, and based it on an estimated population of 183,000. He introduced this idea with a backhanded swipe at the Griffenhagen Report by saying, "The Police Department could not estimate its needs on the basis of what some other department in another section of the country found to be satisfactory."³⁵ Woodyard's plan made three suggestions: first, "Increase the number of scout cars in order to cover additional beats as more men are needed;" second, increase the number of motorcycles and equip them with radios; and third, build a training building with a pistol range.³⁶ Before the close of the decade all of the suggestions of the Griffenhagen Report and those put forth by Woodyard would be adopted. However, Chief Woodyard would not live to see them adopted. In 1951 Woodyard retired, and in 1955 he died of a stroke.

Despite Woodyard's efforts to lessen the impact of the Griffenhagen Report, the Arlington County Board decided to take a significant amount of power out of the hands of the Chief of Police. In 1950, the Police Department was combined with the Arlington County Fire Department into the Department of Public Safety, with Carlisle Johnstone as its head. The

police department was further organized at this time into five bureaus: Administrative; Uniformed; Detective; Safety-Traffic; and Juvenile. Although police operations fell completely under the Chief of Police, ultimate control of the police department was in the hands of Johnstone.

In December of 1951, William Fawver succeeded Woodyard as Chief of Police. Fawver was a disciplinarian who came to the job ready to act upon the complaints that those who administered the law lacked departmental communication. No longer would the men in the field be able to act on their own. In that same year, Doris Bieswanger, assigned to the Juvenile Bureau, became the first woman to be hired by the Arlington Police Department.³⁷

The decade was not too far under way when tragedy struck the police force. On January 20, 1954, an Arlington County Sheriff entered a house in North Arlington intending to serve a "sanity warrant" on a "dangerous" man who "sleeps with a gun and keeps it with him day and night."³⁸ The sheriff discovered that the young man was locked in his room with a gun and was ready to exchange fire. At this point the sheriff decided to leave and get support from the Arlington County Police Department in making the arrest. A little later, he returned to the house with four police officers and several canisters of tear gas. They fired the tear gas into the house and then three officers entered the house to apprehend the man. They discovered that no one appeared to be in the house. At this point, Detective Russell Pettie stepped outside the house and onto the porch. Suddenly there was a gunshot from the attic area of the house and Detective Pettie crumpled to the ground. Reinforcements were immediately called for, and after an exchange of gunfire, the house was riddled by the bullets of policemen, sheriffs, and even state police. When the smoke cleared the young man was dead and so was Detective Pettie.

Detective Pettie was the first Arlington County policeman to be killed in the line of duty. This event had a sobering effect on the department and the county. There was now a new seriousness to police duties. Although the main job of the Arlington Police would continue to be traffic enforcement, there was a shift in attitudes. The innocence was gone. Now people in the county realized that this was a dangerous job.

This event would begin a year when criminal activity was on the rise in Arlington. Beginning in the summer of 1954, four banks were robbed during a four month period. The police increased their patrols and singled out the banks that they thought were the most vulnerable, those closest to Washington, D.C. The police believed that the criminals were entering Arlington from the city with the intent of performing the deed and then making a getaway across one of the numerous bridges back into Washington. They watched a bank on Route One, in Crystal City, very closely because it was right across the 14th Street Bridge from the city and they figured it

would be a target. No matter what precautions the police took, however, they had no luck in apprehending any of the robbers.

This pointed out a major vulnerability in Arlington: its location. This had always been a problem, ever since the days of St. Asaph's. However, toward the end of the 1950's, and especially during the volatile 1960's, Arlington's close proximity to the District of Columbia would become more and more of a burden. Crime was exported from Washington into Arlington, but even more important from a police standpoint were the protests and marches that besieged the Capital City and spilled over into Arlington.

The middle part of the 1950's was a time when police expenditures rose every year, often to supply the Arlington Police with the latest technical advances. Most of these came in the area of traffic enforcement, but the police were now also supporting background checks and security clearances for federal employees. The force experimented with the use of helicopters to control traffic, they expended a significant amount of the budget on a new communications system (1954), and the central records system was updated to assist the tracing of fingerprints and the checking of people's backgrounds.

As the police department budget increased an interesting division began to exist between the citizens of Arlington and the police force. Until this time there had been a sort of blank check for the force's expenses written by the County Board. Now as it was called upon to do more, its resources began to be watched and restricted by the citizenry. In May of 1955, for the first time, a major request for the physical improvement of the force was refused by the county government. The Arlington Police Department was having considerable trouble dealing with drag-racers in the northern part of the county, and felt that they should respond by placing officers in unmarked cars. This way officers could sneak up on the drag-racers and make arrests before they could speed away. However, the Arlington County Board and many county citizens did not feel that unmarked cars were necessary. Arlington County Board member Wesley Cooper even said that they were "an unwarranted intrusion upon the rights of Arlington citizens."³⁹ The Board voted unanimously against the use of unmarked cars.

Prior to this vote it had always appeared that the needs of the police department were directly related to the needs of the people of the county. Now many citizens of the county were becoming critical of the police force for their seemingly overenthusiastic enforcement of the traffic laws. No one seemed immune to the enforcement of the traffic codes. One Arlington policeman actually issued a parking ticket to his own wife.⁴⁰ On another occasion two Arlington County officers chased John Taylor, a Fairfax County Sheriff, for speeding, out of their jurisdiction into Falls Church.⁴¹ Incidents like these began to make many county residents feel that the police were

overzealous, and they began to accuse the police of attempting to increase county revenue by issuing large numbers of tickets. In fact, in the same speech in which Wesley Cooper denounced the use of unmarked cars he also said, "Arlington operates one of the most fabulous fine-collecting agencies in traffic history . . ."

This "fabulous fine-collecting" agency did bring a lot of revenue to the county and it continually won awards and praise from many national agencies. For instance, every year since 1952 the Arlington Police Department received one award or another from the National Safety Council in recognition of their superior enforcement of the traffic laws.⁴² However, it seemed to many that they were a little too efficient when it came to writing tickets, and rumors began to spread among residents of the county that perhaps the department required its officers to write a certain number of tickets every month.

In October of 1956, these rumors of a ticket quota system became front page news when Pvt. James V. Huffman told Sam Eastman, a reporter for *The Daily Sun*, that he resigned from the Arlington Police after he was reprimanded for not making enough traffic arrests. The Director of Public Safety was questioned about Huffman's story and denied that the police force had an established quota system, but added that he "believed any patrolling officer who failed to see at least one violation during the day's cruising was not being observant."⁴³ In this case it was found that Pvt. Huffman had made only 131 arrests in the fifteen months that he had been on the force — far below one per day of duty. With a record like that, it seems probable that Huffman was less than attentive while on duty; however, the question of a quota system was now more than mere speculation, and a minor uproar ensued. After a two month investigation of the matter, the American Automobile Association (AAA) said on December 12, 1956, that the Arlington County Police Department did not use quotas, but "arrest comparisons." The AAA said that this meant that, "If an officer does not have a record comparable to an officer in the same position then he is questioned as to why."⁴⁴ For some reason the AAA found this system more acceptable than the use of quotas and dropped the issue. However, hoping to put an end to the grumbling of Arlington County residents and the criticism of *The Daily Sun* on the issue of quotas, Johnstone ordered police to discontinue the use of the term "arrests" in association with the issuance of traffic tickets. From that point on policemen referred to this part of their job as "traffic contacts."⁴⁵ The new terminology worked, because the issue of traffic ticket quotas did not come up again.

Perhaps the most important development to come out of the whole quota incident was the adoption of an attitude by the press and the public that the Arlington County Police force was more interested in issuing traffic tickets

than solving crimes. The public's confidence must have been further shaken at the end of 1956, when it was announced that crime had increased by 28% in Arlington. Chief of Police Fawver explained this increase by blaming the neighboring areas and by once again stressing Arlington's similarity to many big cities rather than other suburbs. Unfortunately for Fawver and the rest of the police department, this explanation did not satisfy the public.

In July of 1958, the loudest and staunchest critic of the Arlington County Police Department emerged in the guise of a former vice squad sergeant, Russell L. Runyon. Runyon had retired from the force in 1956 because of a back injury he received while apprehending a criminal. He was now an independent candidate for the Arlington County Board and apparently had decided to win the election by railing against the county's police force. He made such charges of police impropriety as: unauthorized use of police cars by off duty officers; the keeping of recovered stolen property; cheating by officers on a promotional exam; charges of police brutality; and the tipping off of the Arlington Fire Chief before the raid of a strip joint.⁴⁶ Runyon was not able to make any of these charges stick and he did not win the election, but he was able to make a career out of criticizing the police, especially Chief Fawver, whose resignation he called for continuously.

On May 16, 1963, the Arlington Police Department was subject to a grand jury investigation for the first time in its history. The records of the investigation remain closed; however, the newspapers said that the investigation involved charges of profiteering by certain members of the police force. The grand jury called the Chief of Police before them for questioning twice.⁴⁷ After four days, the grand jury ruled that no evidence of wrongdoing had been found and closed the investigation. As was the case when the question of quotas reached the papers, the revelation of this inquiry gave material to critics of the police department. Once again Russell Runyon appeared on the scene to criticize Chief Fawver. At this time, Runyon was no longer simply another resident of the county. In 1962, he had been reinstated to the police force. Now he risked his job when he called for the resignation of Fawver and the reorganization of the police force.⁴⁸ Fawver responded to the criticisms of Runyon by demoting him. This did not quiet Runyon, however, who used the newspapers to express anti-Fawver views for the next two years. This internal feud came to an end in 1965, when Runyon again retired from the force at his own request.⁴⁹

On September 9, 1963, another reorganization of the Police Department occurred. The Department of Public Safety was eliminated and the Police and Fire Departments were made into separate units. Arlington County Manager Bert W. Johnson explained that this was done in the "interests of succinctness and administrative efficiency."⁵⁰ This move gave total administrative control back to the Chief of Police, where it had been until 1950.

This gave Chief Fawver more control and also more headaches, because he was now held directly responsible by the newspapers and the public for the actions of his officers.

In 1967, criticism of the police shifted from internal to external when Arlington's African-American community criticized the police following a riot in the Nauck community.⁵¹ The police were accused of excessive force while quelling the riot. The Arlington Community Action Committee (ACAC), an anti-poverty organization,⁵² called for greater courtesy from the police toward Nauck community residents and the addition of African-American officers to the all-white force. As had so often occurred in the past, the police department responded to criticism by changing its procedures. Chief Fawver asserted that the treatment of Arlington's African-American residents would be no different than that of the county's white residents.⁵³ Also by the end of 1967, The Arlington County Police Department hired its first African-American officer, a former Marine named Irving Comer.⁵⁴

The 1960's were described by *The Daily Sun* as a time of "growth and change" for the Arlington Police Department.⁵⁵ Certainly during this period the Police Department matured and expanded. It improved service to the community by adopting more efficient methods of operation and it developed a history of responding to the needs of the residents of the community.

As the 1970's began, the Arlington Police Department had developed into one of the most decorated and highly regarded suburban police forces in the United States. Throughout its history it had received every major traffic safety award that existed and now it found itself visited by policemen from foreign countries who studied the department as an example of efficient police administration. As the department had grown and expanded so had Arlington County. It was no longer a wilderness area with dirt roads and outhouses. Now, Arlington was a major suburban center with a large population. The growth of the police department and the county occurred in unison. In many ways they complemented and mirrored one another. Arlington was able to develop as it did because the police force was able to respond to the needs of its citizens, while the police force maintained order and made the county an organized suburban community. Arlington's police force had helped to make Arlington an orderly home for thousands of suburban families.

Notes and References

- *David B. Brown, an Arlington resident, received his BA degree from George Mason University this spring; he is currently pursuing a Master's degree in American History from the same institution. This article is adapted from a paper prepared for a seminar in Suburban History conducted by Dr. S. Diner.
- ¹Michell Nuneville, *Arlington County Police Department 50th Anniversary Historical Report* (Arlington: Arlington County Police Department, 1990) p. 9.
- ²Ibid.
- ³Kenneth Alfery, *Law and Order in the Capital City: A History of the Washington Police* (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Press, 1976), p. 53.
- ⁴Nan and Ross Netherton, *Arlington County in Virginia: A Pictorial History* (Norfolk, Virginia: The Donning Company, 1987), p. 98.
- ⁵Ibid.
- ⁶Ibid.
- ⁷Ibid., p. 102.
- ⁸Nuneville, *ACPD 50th Anniversary Report*, p. 9.
- ⁹Netherton, *Arlington County in Virginia*, p. 102.
- ¹⁰Nuneville, *ACPD 50th Anniversary Report*, p. 9.
- ¹¹William G. Fawver, *Arlington County Division of Police Protection and Crime Investigation Annual Report* (Department of Public Safety, Arlington, Virginia, 1954), p. 1.
- ¹²Netherton, *Arlington County in Virginia*, p. 98.
- ¹³Fawver, *Annual Police Report*, 1954, p. 2.
- ¹⁴Nuneville, *ACPD 50th Anniversary Report*, p. 9.
- ¹⁵Ibid.
- ¹⁶*The Washington Star*, 2/14/30. The fleeing bootleggers were later captured just outside Baltimore; Officer Crack completely recovered from his injuries.
- ¹⁷*The Washington Post*, 9/15/35.
- ¹⁸Tom Phillips, interview.
- ¹⁹Nuneville, *ACPD 50th Anniversary Report*, p. 9.
- ²⁰*The Daily Sun*, 4/16/55.
- ²¹Nuneville, *ACPD 50th Anniversary Report*, p. 10.
- ²²Netherton, *Arlington County in Virginia*, p. 156.
- ²³Nuneville, *ACPD 50th Anniversary Report*, p. 10.
- ²⁴*The Daily Sun*, 12/20/46.
- ²⁵Bob Sandlin, *The Daily Sun*, 6/21/55.
- ²⁶*The Daily Sun*, 5/14/48.
- ²⁷Fawver, *Annual Police Report*, 1954, p. 1.
- ²⁸Griffenhagen and Associates, Consultants in Public Administration and Finance, *Analysis Report of the Arlington County Police Department*, (Arlington, Virginia: August 1950), p. 1.
- ²⁹Fawver, *Annual Police Report*, 1953.
- ³⁰Homer Hoyt, a geographer, who wrote an "Economic Survey of Land Uses of Arlington County, Virginia," quoted in Fawver, *Annual Police Report*, 1953.
- ³¹Griffenhagen and Associates Report, p. 4.
- ³²Ibid.
- ³³Ibid., p. 18.
- ³⁴Ibid., p. 21.
- ³⁵Harry Woodyard, *Arlington County Police Department Report* (Arlington, Virginia), 1950.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Nuneville, *ACPD 50th Anniversary Report*, p. 11.

³⁸*The Daily Sun*, 1/21/54.

³⁹*The Daily Sun*, 5/30/55.

⁴⁰A story related by former Arlington Policeman Leonard Brown.

⁴¹*The Daily Sun*, 4/16/55. The arresting officers were themselves ticketed for unlawful arrest.

⁴²Fawver, *Annual Police Reports*, 1952 to 1958.

⁴³Sam Eastman, *The Daily Sun*, 10/4/56.

⁴⁴*The Daily Sun*, "Auto Club Board Charges County Has Arrest Quota," 12/12/56.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Jerry Doolittle, "County Board Drops Inquiry After Hearing", *The Daily Sun*, 6/22/58.

⁴⁷*The Washington Star*, "Arlington Police Role in Secret Probe Hit," 5/16/64.

⁴⁸*The Washington Post*, "Runyon Urges Police Shake-up," 4/22/64.

⁴⁹*The Daily Sun*, 8/6/55.

⁵⁰*The Washington Star*, "It's a Department Now, County Consolidates Arlington Police Set-up," 9/8/63.

⁵¹*The Washington Post*, 1967.

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴*The Washington Post*, 12/30/67.

⁵⁵*The Daily Sun*, 1970.



WHY DO WE CALL IT?

Fort Barnard

In 1861 a fort was constructed on this height commanding a view of the Four Mile Run valley, as part of the defenses of Washington. It was named for Major General J.G. Barnard of the U.S. Corps of Engineers who was in charge of the engineering work for the defense of Washington during the Civil War and responsible for the construction of most of the forts and other field works built in the County at that time. Traces of the fort remain in the Fort Barnard Playground across Walter Reed Drive from the County water-tower.