

These police, the best police, the police who read his books—all of these psychological things that he spelled out, he spelled out this morning—they are spelled out in the books as standard operating procedure. (See, e.g., Inbau & Reid, *Criminal Interrogation and Confessions* 14, 16, 27, 31, 58–59, 109 (1962).)

Now, it seems to me that, as a legislator, perhaps you ought to get some true information. I mean, it may be that the newspapers digest and redigest these crime cases until everybody has gone crazy—it seems to me that the question is not whether there is crime in the District of Columbia, but whether it is due to the *McNabb-Mallory* rule—and the House report says that it doesn't matter (Rept. No. 579 on District of Columbia Crime, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963) at p. 5), it doesn't matter whether it is good or bad elsewhere. But it does matter. Whether it is just as bad elsewhere—that is the whole point.

If it is just as bad elsewhere and nobody else has the *McNabb-Mallory* rule, how can you blame it on the *McNabb-Mallory* rule?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, assuming that they are not blaming it on *Mallory*.

Mr. KAMISAR. Well, if they are not blaming it on that, if they are not going on that, what is the—what is this big movement, the big movement to repeal the *McNabb-Mallory* rule? We have had it for 20 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Sir, I understand your point on the *Mallory* rule. All I am trying to solicit from you are suggestions as to how we can have better law enforcement.

Now, I am very well aware at this point that you are making, the point that the statistics compare favorably. Now, I don't know what the Minneapolis statistics are.

I don't think that that is getting the job done just making the point about favorable statistics.

Mr. KAMISAR. Well, I will suggest—I'll suggest what can be done, Senator, by putting it this way.

The CHAIRMAN. Not only what can be done, that is not exactly what I am asking you: What would you do?

Mr. KAMISAR. Well, I would say that it would be more profitable to turn our attention to the deep social factors which cause crime and stop making the Supreme Court of the United States and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia the scapegoats.

Now, nobody hates to be made a scapegoat more than a police department, and nobody resents being made a scapegoat more than a police department. And, now, when anybody suggests that there is crime, why don't the police put a stop to it—what is their answer?

Chief O. W. Wilson, of Chicago, has answered that a major source of antagonism toward the police is the tendency to blame policemen for a high incidence of crime instead of recognizing that there are many causes such as slum conditions, lack of parental responsibility, unemployment, cultural inequalities, and other social factors over which the police have no influence or control.

But in the same speech, he blames the Supreme Court. Now, the Supreme Court has no more influence or control over those factors than the police department and it is outrageous to blame this on the Supreme Court.