

Now obviously the cheapest way to do it is in the Army, because you could not possibly put enough police into any one city to take care of the problem, and why train 50 National Guards when you might as well just have one group within the Army.

So the problems that are presented are not as simple as they seem on the surface, and the first problem you would have with the last suggestion is that you now have created a Federal police force, and we are not for a Federal police force. You would have then the political problem.

Mr. YLVISAKER. Madam Chairman, may I respond again on this point?

Representative GRIFFITHS. Certainly.

Mr. YLVISAKER. Because I come from the same situation that you do, what we saw in the recent disturbances was the necessity for cooperative federalism. There is probably too much talk about the discrete character and operations of three levels of government. As we have a national economy that is melded, we also have a national policy that should be melded. We found in Newark when that riot broke out, that it is a traumatic experience for the mayor to call in the Governor. It is a traumatic next step for the Governor to call in the President. I think this results from the discrete way in which we have handled our security arrangements.

Certainly what we need are the security forces of all three levels with much greater continuity in escalation than now provided. Let me give you an example.

When we began communicating with the Federal system (through the Attorney General, late one night), we realized that we would in effect, and legally, be admitting our inability to control the situation by calling in the National Guard. (We also could not avail ourselves of emergency Federal relief unless we were formally designated as a disaster area which we would gladly have done if the legislation had provided for such cases.) Yet we badly needed a continuous escalation and later a continuous deescalation of security forces. We did not want to move suddenly and in dramatic steps from one designated condition to another. What we needed then and what we need now is a joint program, a security program of local, State, and Federal troops, so that its decisions and strategies and levels of force become variable by degree. So I would say "No, we do not want a national police force or a national riot force. We want a coalition of forces which would work together, and this can be done."

Representative GRIFFITHS. In the meantime you hear from the people you represent, we who are the good people, who are locked in our houses without a drink while everybody else is out looting the liquor stores.

Mr. ECKER-RACZ. May I add this thought. I would not want the subject to be dropped without observing that the problem of security which you are discussing is a passing problem and that if we had a more responsible and a more responsive governmental structure to the social needs, perhaps we would not need so many police.

Mr. YLVISAKER. If I may add, Madam Chairman, we have recently made some calculations which I think ought to receive some national attention, even if they are saddening figures. At the present rate of growth, to keep the Negro ghetto at its present size, which we think is too big in the cities we have dealt with, roughly a half million Negroes