

of software for police functions will enable the departments, perhaps through a police computer users' organization, to make use of the information both for more effective tracking down of criminals and more efficient use of their resources.

2. Improvement of the police command and control function (housed in the police communications center) through improved design of these facilities for more rapid and complete information transfer, more intelligible display of the current crime or disorder situation, and more rapid and effective dissemination of control orders to the units on patrol. This improvement could make a significant dent in the 20-50% of response time attributable to delay and processing in the communications center. The use of on-line, real time computers could make a significant contribution here but much could be done, even without introducing a computer, through better display of information and reorganization of the functions and facilities.

3. The development of a light-weight low-cost portable police radio so that every police officer can be in continuous contact with headquarters at all times.

*Q. 3. In your testimony you refer to a new research institute which should be outside of government. What do you consider to be the advantage of having such an institute outside of government?*

A. In order for such an institute to conduct basic examinations into the causes and nature of crime, and to conduct fundamental re-examination of the criminal justice system, it must be able to recruit the nation's best scientists and their investigations must be free of any responsibility or commitment to current methods of operation. It would be very difficult to recruit these people into the government.

*Q. 3a. How would it be funded and what would it cost?*

A. It should be funded by government grant in a manner similar to the funding of the recently created Urban Institute. It should be started by the Justice Department, but it should be free to accept additional funding from other sources, especially foundations. The cost, of course, would depend on the size it reached, but about five million dollars a year or 100 research staff, should be appropriate after about a three-year buildup. Funding should be with a sufficiently long lead time, about three years, to assure continuity of operation. The funding formula might be 100% for the coming year, two-thirds for the second year and one-third for the third year.

*Q. 3b. How would the institute disseminate its results to local law enforcement agencies?*

A. There are a number of mutually complementary methods by which its results would reach implementation. These include the following:

1. Primarily through close liaison among the institute's staff, the staff of regional technical assistance groups, and internal operations research or technical groups in operating departments.

2. Publication and wide dissemination of its reports directly to law enforcement agencies.

3. Maintenance of its results in a central information center.

4. Creation of a new criminal justice research journal to which it would contribute.

5. Distribution of a quarterly publication translating its research results into operational recommendations.

*Q. 3c. Would such an institute still be necessary if the institute as specified in the Safe Streets Bill is authorized?*

A. Yes. The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice called for in the Safe Streets Bill is a governmental agency whose primary function is the dissemination of funds for research and development. While such an agency would be likely to have an internal research component, it could not be expected to be of the quality nor have the independence required in the research institute discussed above.

*Q. 4. Roughly speaking, what do you estimate it would cost per year to reverse the increasing crime rate, or at least bring it into harmony with the population rate? In what broad field would you apportion these funds (training, operations, research, etc.) and why?*

A. This seemingly simple question is the best argument for the need for a major national research program. We simply do not know what are the effects on crime of any of the various things we might do to try to control it. Furthermore, we do not even know if *any* degree of additional expenditures on law enforcement would reverse the increasing crime rate without addressing some of the more basic long-term social causes of crime. I wish I could even guess at an answer, but I am unable to.