

Meeting of the  
Executive Committee

New York City  
January 25-26, 1968

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

Present: Bruno Cormier, President-Elect  
Jacob Chwast, Vice-President  
Albert G. Hess, Vice-President  
Donal E. J. Mac Namara, Vice-President  
Charles L. Newman, Vice-President  
Samuel A. Kramer, Secretary-Treasurer  
Walter Reckless, Past-President  
Marvin Wolfgang, Past-President

Presiding: Gerhard G. W. Mueller, President.

AGENDA

The agenda of this meeting is to consist of the items listed in the presidential communication of December 28, in order, plus the following items:

1. Should the American Society of Criminology sponsor publication of an Encyclopedia of Criminology?
2. Offers by various universities to take over publication of CRIMINOLOGICA.
3. Possibility of meeting in Columbus for the annual meeting 1969.
4. Treasurer's Report.
5. Progress report by Dr. Mac Namara on the report on the History of the American Society of Criminology, and the history and purposes of its various awards.
6. The Nominating Committee.
7. Should there be another Executive Committee meeting this year?
8. The Question of U. N. Relationships (Dr. Hess).
9. The Nature and General Programs of Annual Meetings (Mixed Scientific Panels?).

## I. CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

- (1) Separation of the Office of the Secretary-Treasurer into the Office of the Executive Secretary and the Office of the Treasurer

In compliance with a long-felt need, the president suggested that the office of the Treasurer should be split from that of the Executive Secretary. The existing Constitution seemingly uses the terms indiscriminately. All comparable societies have the two distinct and separate offices. The expected increase in transactions might require compliance with general organization principles and sound administration practice.

Dr. Kramer feels that for the small membership we have at present it is really not a difficult task to be Treasurer. At the present time Dr. Kramer does not feel that separation is necessary but if our membership committee is successful and we get the number of members to which we are entitled, then he thinks the office should be split.

Dr. MacNamara felt that since constitutional reform constitutes a planning for the future, the separation of this office would provide for the type of growth the Society needs. He thought that separation should have been done a long time ago.

Dr. Cormier felt that the posts could be held by the same person even though they were separated so that they could be divided up later if necessary.

Professor Mueller felt that the Secretary should be an energetic "junior" executive, on whom the Society could rely for much of the leg work. One of the purposes, he said, of establishing two offices, was to distribute the workload of the Society. He saw no difficulty in the distribution of the workload nor in the sending back and forth of communications with the membership with modern Xeroxing facilities.

Dr. Kramer related that the Executive Treasurer had been called upon to answer detailed evaluative questions about research and accredited education in criminology. Professor Mueller felt that the Secretary merely because he was an officer of the Society, should not be authorized to make recommendations in the nature of accreditations. No member of the Executive Board has that authority. The Secretary should forward requests of this nature to somebody else in the Society qualified in the specific area, but the Society itself should refrain from endorsement of programs.

Professor Mueller then referred the Executive Committee to page four of the proposed new Constitution, D. The Secretary, which outlines the envisaged appointment procedure and functions of the Secretary. The remainder of the functions of the old office of Secretary-Treasurer would be left to the Treasurer (see page 5, E. The Treasurer, proposed new Constitution).

Dr. Kramer felt that the proposed new Constitution should read that the Treasurer "shall send out the invoices at the stipulated time to each member and to each participating member . . . .".

Dr. Mac Namara suggested the word "invoice" should be added and that the new amendment should read under E(3) "shall invoice and receive....."

(2) Definition of Criminology  
(Preamble to the Constitution)

The Executive Committee felt that the old definition was too functional and not scientific enough. (see proposed new Constitution, Preamble, page 1).

Dr. MacNamara suggested that the word "delinquency" be added (. . . . prevention of crime and delinquency).

Dr. Hess felt that the word "causes" (all human knowledge concerning the causes) be removed.

A discussion of the Executive Committee ensued and the definition listed below was accepted by the Executive Committee:

"The term criminology as used hereinafter is defined as all human knowledge concerning the ideology, control, treatment and prevention of crime and delinquency, the detection of crime and enforcement of criminal laws, the system of criminal law and justice, social defense and corrections."

Dr. Newman felt that one of the legitimate functions of the Society was to define criminology. He stated that one of the early issues of CRIMINOLOGICA ran a series of letters relating to the definition.

(3) Modified Provisions for Constitutional Amendment

see p. 7--V. By-Laws and Amendments:

A. The words "upon due notice having been given" were added.V (A) now reads:

"Any section of this Constitution may be amended, upon due notice having been given, when the proposed amendment shall have been approved by two-thirds of those members who cast a ballot, whether by vote of those assembled at the annual meeting, or by mail ballot."

The amendment was unanimously accepted by the Executive Committee. Professor Mueller stated that this amendment now specifically authorized the Executive Committee to construe "mail ballots" as those published in CRIMINOLOGICA.

The Executive Committee voted to accept changes in the wording of V(A) 1 and 2 (page 7 of the proposed new Constitution) so that it should now read "Executive Secretary" in all places under 1 and 2 of V.

Dr. Mac Namara then proposed that the phrase dropped without substitute under V(B) (page 7 of the proposed new Constitution) be restored (except that the majority at an annual meeting may vote such changes or additions). The restoration was accepted by the Executive Committee.

Professor Mueller proposed that "a majority of the membership" ( V ) ( B ) p. 7 Proposed New Constitution) be accepted as defined under II ( A ) ( 1 ) ( a and b ) ( page 2 Proposed new Constitution.)

Dr. Cormier stated that in an open meeting anyone could bring up new business.

Professor Mueller replied that V ( A ) ( 1 ) would take care of this problem ( proposed new Constitution.)

Dr. Mac Namara felt that we could leave certain things to the good sense and responsibility as well as professional ethics of our fellow members. Dr. Mac Namara stated that he would like to avoid rigidity and limitations being built into the proposed new Constitution.

Professor Mueller felt that the Proposed New Constitution was implicit in stating that in order to get on the agenda at a meeting, any proposed change of the By-Laws would have to be channeled through the Executive Committee.

Dr. Cormier suggested that anything to be discussed at the Annual Meeting should be done by notifying the Executive Committee a specified time prior to the meeting and then the proposal would go to the Executive Committee and that after action by the Executive Committee, the membership would receive notification of the proposed amendments. If something were to be proposed directly on the floor of any given Annual Meeting, it would then be referred from the floor to the Executive Committee for the Committee's consideration.

Dr. Mac Namara related his experiences with the provisions for presentation at meetings of the AAAS and thought they had worked out badly. The AAAS allows only proposals chanelled through the Screening Committee to reach the floor and Dr. Mac Namara felt that only those which the Screening Committee felt should reach the floor actually did. On the other hand, at the annual meetings of the American Correctional Association, any matter raised from the floor is discussed and decided thereon. Dr. Mac Namara feels this is much more democratic than the screening process.

Dr. Newman felt that as a check on motions made from the floor a motion could be made to refer the matter to Committee for study.

Professor Mueller stated that the Executive Officer could substantially control the procedure at an annual meeting. But if irrational decisions were taken by dissidents, the members could revise such action by regular vote on a later occasion.

Dr. Cormier proposed that a compromise could be worked out whereby when members receive invitations to an annual meeting they forward any proposal or change in agenda to the Executive Committee, during a specific time limit. Anything received after that time limit would systematically be held until the next Executive Committee meeting.

Dr. Newman felt that there was no serious problem since the Constitution could not be changed unless there was due notice and that the By-Laws provided for more latitude.

Professor Mueller stated that there is a danger and calculated risk and much depends on the skill of the Executive Officer at the meeting. He felt, however, that the danger was not great because of the provisions of the By-Laws.

It was proposed that under (V)(2)(B), first sentence, the words "of this Constitution" be stricken. (p. 7 Proposed New Constitution). (V)(2)(B) now is to read:

Any By-Laws shall become effective when approved by a majority of the membership, after fulfilling the same requirements as outlined in regard to amendments except that the majority at an annual meeting may vote such changes or additions.

The discussion was then centered around II. Officers (p. 1-5 Proposed New Constitution).

Dr. MacNamara objected to the plural of Editor as it read under II(A)(1)(b)(3) "The Editor[s] of Criminologica." It was moved and agreed that the "s" be stricken to make Editor singular.

Dr. Newman raised the question of whether appointed officers should be voting members of the Executive Committee.

Professor Mueller stated that the crucial novelty was the proposed addition of six Executive Councillors as non-voting members. Professor Mueller further stated that the executive councillors, among others, would have the task of attracting members into the Society. These executive councillors likely may later become elected or appointed officers. Executive Councillorship is a training ground for becoming an officer.

Dr. Newman asked whether the Executive Committee regarded it as necessary to designate an order of succession among vice-presidents.

The discussion then moved to p. 3 of the Proposed Constitution, B., The President. The last line reads "such committees and officers as deemed necessary." The motion for addition of the words "and officers" was carried and the change was made.

Dr. Kramer then brought the discussion back to I. Purposes and Objectives, (p. 1, Proposed Constitution) and stated that students were nowhere specifically indicated. Dr. Newman thought that the word "foster" under I B took care of this objection.

No further discussion of this point ensued.

Dr. Kramer then brought into discussion the question of emeritus members. A motion was put before the Executive Committee to add a statement under III., Membership (p. 6 Proposed Constitution) to include emeritus members.

The Committee voted to change III., Membership to include E. Emeritus Members. This now reads:

E. Emeritus Members shall be:

Formerly active members who are retired and upon whom the Executive Committee has bestowed this title.

III. Membership now contains definitions of:

- A. Active members
- B. Associate members
- C. Student members
- D. Honorary members
- E. Emeritus members
- F. Membership shall be achieved.....
- G. Voting privileges of active members

Dr. Hess suggested that we omit the words "clearing house for collection" (I. Purposes and Objectives (D) p. 1 Proposed Constitution).

Dr. Newman suggested that this be amended to read "forum for the dissemination," etc. This motion was accepted and the section was so amended.

Dr. MacNamara proposed that the words "and skills" be deleted and this motion was also accepted.

The wording of I(D) (p. 1 Proposed Constitution) as accepted now reads:

"To serve as a forum for the dissemination of criminological knowledge."

Dr. Hess then made the point that, as regards elected and appointed officers, the Proposed Constitution seemingly makes it possible for the President to control the Executive Committee votes because he appoints three of the officers voting on the Executive Committee. Professor Mueller made mention of the fact that the appointed officers are appointed with the approval of the Executive Committee so that there is no difficulty of a president's assuming dictatorial powers. The Constitution fully guards against such a contingency.

Professor Mueller then made a motion to accept as a package the Proposed Constitution.

The motion was unanimously accepted.

It was agreed to disseminate the new Constitution for mail ballot vote by the membership, in a mailing included in Criminologica.

## II. Executive Councillors

After the acceptance of the Proposed Constitution, the discussion then centered around II.(1) (b) (3), Executive Councillors. The President sought the approval of the Executive Committee for the appointment of six executive councillors, pending the constitutional referendum. Several names were proposed by the President.

Dr. Newman wondered whether executive councillors should be brought in from the outside as such, or whether only members who have shown some initiative in the affairs of the Society should be appointed.

Dr. Chwast agreed that the executive councillors should not be brought in on the managerial level.

Professor Mueller explained that with the advent of executive councillors to advise the President he was trying to reach and involve the group of young criminologists who are not now involved. He cited as an example Dr. Stanton Wheeler of Yale and the Russell Sage Foundation who has not done much for the Society and who has been somewhat alienated. Professor Mueller did not know whether Dr. Wheeler was willing to serve, but he mentioned him as the kind of person Professor Mueller was trying to reach for the Society. Professor Mueller also suggested as an example Dr. Joseph Satten of the Menninger Foundation and Mr. Ralph Susman of H.E.W.

Dr. Kramer made a motion that the President should be permitted to submit any six names out of the list who in his estimation show interdisciplinary interest and an interest in the Society, provided that they are members at the time of appointment as Executive Councillors.

Professor Mueller asked for the guidance of the Executive Committee on additional names whom the Society could accept.

Dr. Cormier seconded the motion on Executive Councillors.

Professor Mueller then stated he would compile a complete list and then notify the Executive Committee of his choices in order of his preference and seek the approval of the Executive Committee before proceeding further.

Dr. Newman spoke against the motion. He felt that anybody who came into the Society only on the basis of being an Executive Councillor would stay only during the tenure of the President. He further felt that anybody who was not willing to come into the Society on its own merits would be a questionable Executive Councillor.

Dr. Cormier stated that although some people did not want to join the Society they could be useful to the Society and that is why the Society wanted them.

Dr. Newman concurred that such an advisory group would be a more valuable one to the Society, but it seemed to him that this advisory group would be structuring the course of an organization that they did not seem to want to belong to. He questioned the validity of admitting them on a co-equal basis.

Dr. Chwast addressed himself to Dr. Newman's statement and stated that he felt that it showed in what low esteem we held the Society in that we offer such high rank to non-members. He felt perhaps there should be a "testing-out" period with an understanding that this could lead to selection for this role. One of the decisions during the "testing-out" period could be made upon presentation of a paper or some kind of activity in the Society which could then lead to an appointment as an Executive Councillor.

Dr. MacNamara stated that the Executive Committee had a major commitment to the profession and to the Society. He felt that in order to bring representative criminologists into the organization to make it better able to serve the profession, membership did not make that much difference. He cited as examples Dr. Sykes, Dr. Matza, Dr. Ohlin, Drs. Cloward and Vorenberg, Savitz and Niederhofer. Whether they are members or not, they should be involved to make the Society more serviceable.

Dr. Newman stated he had two points to make:

1. He had no objection to Executive Councillors, but felt that they must be members of the Society.
2. He reminded the Executive Committee of another organization with the same name as the Society which, to enhance its own status, was using the names of people who were not members. He mentioned that this Society had failed.

Professor Mueller then reiterated that no one could become an Executive Councillor without being a member of the American Society of Criminology.

Dr. Kramer suggested that this be modified to "whether or not they are members of the Society at the time of the appointment."

Professor Mueller stated that the modification should read "whether or not they are members at this precise moment" not "at the time of the appointment." He felt that being an Executive Councillor was an intellectual bridge to the leadership in the field. He stated that the objective was to reach the leaders, not the unknown newcomers.

Professor Mueller further reiterated that under no circumstances are non-members entitled to officer's posts.

Dr. Cormier suggested that the requirement of membership would perhaps cause you to miss the benefit of having some people that you simply want for a year. The Society may want someone as an advisor whether or not he is a member. He suggested that this was a useful tool to bring big names into the Society such as, for example, Judge Bazelon who did not want to be a permanent member of the Society but could be an advisor.



Dr. MacNamara reminded that these Councillors should not be voting members of the Executive Committee, but officers of the Society.

Motion was made and accepted that the Executive Councillors should be members of the Society at the time of their appointment.

Dr. Hess suggested that the Executive Committee explore the possibility of using visiting professors for this position.

Professor Mueller stated that the Society wanted resident people who have access to their branch of the profession, but that the President could avail himself of visiting professors.

Dr. MacNamara suggested, as a precaution, that the Executive Councillors be dropped if they do not attend a specified number of meetings.

The total motion regarding Executive Councillors was voted and accepted, i.e., that a list be compiled by the President and submitted to the Executive Committee for approval, and that Executive Councillors should be members of the Society at the time of their appointment.

### III. Membership Drive

Discussion then moved to the question of membership (p.6 Presidential Communication).

Dr. Newman suggested as a possible source of names of people to be recruited the use of anthologies of research in progress, such as those compiled by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and similar sources. He felt that the status of being invited to membership might be impressive.

Professor Mueller stated that the Committee which would be appointed for the purposes of recruiting membership should investigate these sources. He also agreed that the form of invitation plays an important role in a decision to seek membership.

Dr. MacNamara asked about the cost of a four-page printed invitation.

It was suggested that most societies seek membership by individual solicitation, by various well known members.

Professor Mueller suggested that all suggestions could best be handled by the Membership Drive Committee. He felt that this Committee should be widely diversified. He suggested that he himself would immediately invite the following to join the Society:

Dr. Melvin Herman  
 NYU Graduate School  
 of Social Work  
 3 Washington Sq. North  
 New York, New York 10003

Mr. Stanley Sadofsky  
 NYU Center for the Study  
 of Unemployed Youth  
 853 Broadway  
 New York, New York 10003

Mr. Stanley Einstein  
 Institute for the Study  
 of Drug Addiction  
 680 West End Ave.  
 New York, New York 10025

Mr. Robert Sobolevitch  
 South Philadelphia Youth  
 Development Center  
 Fort Mifflin Road  
 Philadelphia, Penna. 19153

Mr. Albert P. Carterelli  
 Department of Sociology  
 University of Pennsylvania  
 Philadelphia, Penna. 19104

Dr. Wyatt Jones  
 Florence Heller Graduate  
 School of Social Work  
 Brandeis University  
 Waltham, Mass.

Bernard L. Segal, Esq.  
 Suite 600 Juniper &  
 Market Streets  
 One East Penn Square Bldg.  
 Philadelphia, Penna. 19107

Dr. Herman Pivin  
 New York University  
 Graduate School of Social Work  
 3 Washington Square North  
 New York, New York 10003

Mr. John Rawlin  
 Southern Illinois University  
 Center for the Study of  
 Crime and Delinquency  
 Carbondale, Illinois

Dr. Jack Otis  
 University of Texas  
 School of Social Work  
 Austin, Texas

Richard D. Atkins, Esq.  
 One East Penn Square Building  
 Suite 1616  
 Juniper and Market Sts.  
 Philadelphia, Penna. 19107

Mr. Bernard Russell  
 Department of Housing  
 and Urban Development  
 Washington, D. C.

Dr. Reese Hall  
 Federal Bureau of Prisons  
 101 Indiana Avenue  
 Washington, D. C.

Hon. Ted Rubin  
 Juvenile Court  
 Denver, Colo.

Dean Richard Myren  
 School of Criminal Justice  
 221 Ontario Street  
 Albany, NY 12203

Dr. John Martin  
 Fordham University  
 Department of Sociology  
 New York, New York

Dr. Lamar T. Empey  
 Chairman, Department of Sociology  
 University of Southern California  
 Los Angeles, California

Dr. Desmond Cartwright  
 University of Colorado  
 Department of Psychology  
 Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Richard Brotman  
 New York Medical College  
 23 E. 105th Street  
 New York, New York

Professor Anthony Amsterdam  
University of Pennsylvania  
School of Law  
Philadelphia, Penna. 19104

Mr. Peter Garabedian  
Sociology Department  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, Arizona

Lt. Richard Davies  
New York Police Department  
240 Centre Street  
New York, New York

Mr. Robert P. Barry  
4 Washington Square Village  
New York, New York 10003

Mr. Victor Gioscia  
Jewish Family Service  
33 West 60th Street  
New York, New York

Mr. Roland Tharp  
University of Arizona  
Department of Psychology  
Tucson, Arizona

Dr. Leonard Pinto  
University of Colorado  
Department of Sociology  
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Stanton Wheeler  
Russell Sage Foundation  
230 Park Avenue  
New York, New York

Mr. Ivan Schier  
Boulder District Court  
Boulder, Colorado

Professor Mueller proposed that a Membership Drive Committee be appointed to canvass all branches of the profession, and its report be submitted as soon as possible.

Dr. Newman directed the attention of the Executive Committee to the question of student memberships. He felt that student clubs on campus might provide an opportunity for later Society membership. Criminology Club members could be student affiliates of the Society. Dues could be collected through the student club. Club secretaries could do the work and submit it to the Society secretary.

The Executive Committee moved to study the feasibility of student clubs. Membership fees would be the same as individual student memberships.

Dr. Reckless felt that a principle of integrity was needed between the organization and the club and that perhaps a seminar of some sort should be given or some kind of meetings, summaries of which could be printed in CRIMINOLOGICA. This, he felt, might give the clubs more of a feeling of "belonging" to the Society.

Dr. Newman suggested that the Executive Committee check the possibility of including a student section in annual meetings.

#### IV. Criminologica.

The next topic for discussion was the Journal, CRIMINOLOGICA (p. 8, Presidential Communication).

Professor Mueller stated that with the last issue Criminologica had reached a very high level of scholarly standing and he thought it was better than it had ever been before.

Dr. Reckless stated that at the present time 450 copies were printed for each issue, that Ohio State had been getting a steady increase of good articles and that Dr. Dinitz and Miss Schultz were very effective in producing the issues. The size of the journal has been held down for financial reasons, but Dr. Reckless felt that as the membership grew and as circulation from the libraries grew, the size could be increased. The cost of publication has been rather modest as far as Ohio State is concerned. The Editor does not get paid. The editorial assistant gets about one half of a graduate research assistant's stipend, which is taken out of research funds. Mailing costs are supplied by the University (Ohio State). On the basis of 450 copies, these amount to about \$17-18 an issue, and with the increase in mailing charges would probably be increased to about \$21. Other secretaries in the Sociology Department office have been used to help with the mailing when necessary. Dr. Reckless stated that they have gotten along pretty well on a very modest budget. Nevertheless, Dr. Dinitz felt that it would be the better part of wisdom to have the journal circulate among interested departments or schools

that are interested in criminology, if not on a three year, then on a four year circuit. Dr. Reckless agrees with him. The next change should be effective February or March 1969.

Professor Mueller estimated Ohio State's subsidy for the journal to be about \$3500-4000 per year.

Professor Mueller then asked for the printing costs and Dr. Kramer stated that the last issue of 72 pages had cost \$690, for 450 copies.

#### THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED FOR LUNCHEON RECESS

The meeting resumed with a discussion of Criminologica, and the Treasurer's Report, as a sub-topic:

As of January 24, 1968:

On Deposit	\$1306.64	
Outstanding	300.00	to Dr. Kramer
	8.70	to Pitney-Bowes for address plates
Bond	1000.00	Intact

#### ANNUAL MEETING COSTS

<u>Expenditures</u>		<u>Income</u>	
Printing of program	\$ 89.70	71 full registrations	
Engraving and framing		at \$12.50	\$887.50
of awards	60.00	3 registrations for	
Office supplies	25.00	cocktails and	
Cocktail party-NYU	157.45	dinner ( 5 and 8	
Banquet-Fifth Ave.		dollars each	
Hotel	617.00	respectively)	24.00
Cleaning services-NYU	39.00	4 registrations at	
Token payment to		\$5 for dinner only	20.00
John Jay for cocktails	<u>100.00</u>	5 registrations at	
		\$3 for cocktails only	<u>15.00</u>
TOTAL	\$1304.22	TOTAL	\$946.50

Total Expenditures:	\$1304.22
Total Income	<u>946.50</u>
Loss	\$ 357.72

With this financial background information, discussion then turned again to CRIMINOLOGICA. There are 320 subscriptions to CRIMINOLOGICA to be mailed to that number of paid-up members, including those who have not yet paid but are considered paid up for purposes of CRIMINOLOGICA due to the overlap of time.

Dr. Newman stated that this means we have an inventory of 100 copies per issue which would have a value of around \$120.00 per issue.

Professor Mueller stated that the Society had \$1000.00 on hand. He questioned whether we could project and tell whether we would be able to pay the cost of printing CRIMINOLOGICA during the current year.

Dr. Kramer stated that we now have enough to pay for printing two more issues of CRIMINOLOGICA.

Professor Mueller stated that our membership drive would have to be very active. If we get additional members we will possibly make up for loss of revenue at our Annual Meeting.

Dr. Reckless offered to try to get \$200.00 or \$300.00 from his research funds, to help offset the loss of revenue at the Annual Meeting.

Dr. Wolfgang reminded the Treasurer to submit a bill to him for \$70.00 to cover the cost of his students who attended the ASC luncheon.

Professor Mueller asked, if and when some other University takes over CRIMINOLOGICA, with what kind of financial burden could the Society saddle that University? How much of the expenses can they subsidize? (\$3-4-5,000?, 1/3 secretary, 1/2 graduate student, 2 credit hours released time of the Editor-in-Chief?, plus postage, subsidy of the Journal). If the journal, through library subscriptions, reaches 800 subscriptions, then we break even on costs of producing. We already have 35-40 library institution subscriptions. This is a wide open field and with very little effort we should be able to place the journal in 400 libraries.

Dr. Newman stated that each member could make sure that CRIMINOLOGICA got into his own University or Association library.

Dr. Wolfgang asked whether the Society had libraries as "members" and was told that we have no such classification. He stated that the International Society of Criminology does have such a classification. Many university libraries, however, are not permitted to become members of organizations, while they are permitted to subscribe.

Dr. Newman stated that most of our subscriptions come in through the various magazine or publishing agencies. They do all the work and get nothing out of it. We charge \$5.00 and they charge \$5.00. Dr. Newman would like to suggest that we increase subscription charges to \$7.50 or \$10.00 and allow 10% rebate to the subscription agencies. They will then have a vested interest in putting our journal into libraries.

The discussion then centered on the amount of a library subscription cost.

Professor Mueller mentioned his discussions with Mr. Rothman of Fred B. Rothman & Company, a firm which publishes and distributes a few journals in this country. They would not be willing to handle our journal even at \$10.00, unless we gave them a substantially larger portion of the subscription price than the Society at the moment is willing to give them. Moreover, they would handle it only if they be given free range to reprint the volumes that we have printed so far, to sell them to libraries at a price to be set by them (which may be quite high) so that the libraries have our journal from the start and could stock up on existing back volumes. It is unrealistic, Professor Mueller stated, for the Society to expect libraries to pick up CRIMINOLOGICA unless they can get volumes 1-5. The Society needs a publisher that would reprint volumes 1-5, who then conducts a library drive, placing our Journal on the library shelves. Rothman does not want to handle it. Professor Mueller then advised the Executive Committee that he had not negotiated with other companies.

It was noted that the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science had a subscription list of 4500-5000. Williams and Wilkins publishes and distributes that journal for Northwestern University, and has reprinted and deals in the early volumes. Professor Mueller stated that this is the kind of thing the Society should investigate. He suggested that the presence of Dr. Hess on the committee for CRIMINOLOGICA was necessary because of his experience in these areas. The problem range is clear: reprint past issues to reach libraries, drive for continuing subscriptions, plus whatever subscriptions we can pick up through the membership drive.

Professor Mueller proposed that as of the next issue we print 600 copies. He stated that if the Editorial Committee was staffed properly, these problems could be resolved in a reasonable time.

Dr. Newman proposed that thought be given to increasing the cost of CRIMINOLOGICA and allowing rebates to subscription houses. More and more libraries buy books which come out from subscription houses.

Dr. Hess felt that a 10% rebate was not enough and suggested that the Society follow the custom of other scholarly journals.

Professor Mueller sought the advice of the Executive Committee on raising the price of subscription to \$8.00.

Dr. Newman recorded the fact that *Criminologica* contained more content in 60 pages than many of the other journals in 120, and that the Society should explore the possibilities of advertisements.

Professor Mueller noted that it cost between 5-6 dollars to publish and distribute an issue, and that it is impossible to run it with a deficit.

Dr. Reckless stated that journals are of more use than just articles, notes, book reviews, etc., and he hoped that the cost could be kept down, although he stated that he would go along with the \$8.00 figure.

Dr. Kramer suggested that the \$5.00 rate be kept for the remainder of the year, until the Society could contact a lot of libraries and once the journal is known, we could explain that due to increased costs, the price must be raised. By that time we should have the journal placed in 400 libraries.

Professor Mueller related his discussions with commercial publishers and stated that no printer would be able to handle the Society's contract at these rates. The only other way to obtain monies is through subsidy.

Dr. Chwast mentioned the fact that there had been some apprehension about the fact that advertisements would affect the tax-exempt status of the journal. Other journals have been able to get advertisements to offset costs and still maintain this status.

Dr. MacNamara mentioned that the Internal Revenue Service regulations provide that a non-profit organization making less than \$1000.00 in profit would not be prohibited from maintaining its tax exempt status, even if it took advertisements.

Dr. Hess stated that the subscription price plays a very small role as far as the number of subscriptions is concerned. *Excerpta Criminologica*, the *International Journal of Education* and the *Journal of Research* have a potential of 3000. They are priced at \$40.00 and from the point of view of getting more subscriptions there should not be too much objection to raising the price. The Society does not need to print more issues of *CRIMINOLOGICA* at this stage. They only need to send out copies of the summary of articles or a reprint of the Table of Contents, etc. The only difficulty is that of finding the individual who is in charge of making decisions to subscribe. Therefore, both the library itself and its acquisition services have to be approached. And when sending out mailings for new subscriptions you have to send one out now to reach the old budget and one around September 1 to get in on the new budget.

Professor Mueller proposed that the Society itself could not handle the solicitation of subscriptions but it would have to be done by a mailing service or journal distributor. They would do it only on a package deal--handling the reprinting of the past issues and getting subscriptions with a rebate.



Professor Mueller proposed the establishment of a committee to explore that issue and to come up with the right kind of answer. He deemed it necessary that Simon Dinitz, Christine Schultz and Dr. Hess be on the committee. He suggested the inclusion of a lawyer such as Professor Nicholas Kittrie of American University plus Dr. Kramer for financial reasons, and perhaps somebody in government who could explore NIMH grants such as Mr. Ralph Susman of HEW and members such as Lenore Kupperstein and John Batt.

Dr. Wolfgang proposed that the best way to sell the journal was to increase its excellence. He proposed devoting single issues of the journal to specific topics. He mentioned that "The Annals" had a membership of well over 20,000 because of the breadth of the organization of each specific issue which is devoted to a given topic such as Crime which was a best-selling issue. He mentioned also Duke University's "Law and Contemporary Problems" which devoted single issues to sentencing, narcotics, obscenity. He thought that rather than having a haphazard issue, if we had issues focused on specific topics and selected papers, we might find that the journal would blossom, like Berkeley's "Issues in Criminology", because of its quality.

Dr. Reckless felt that Dr. Wolfgang's suggestion would involve more of an editorial staff than we have at present, and although Dr. Dinitz would be willing to try for a year or so to get a couple of issues on that basis, it would take a lot of time. Dr. Reckless related his experiences of spending more than six months free time getting the Montreal papers ready for publication.

Dr. MacNamara proposed appointing a special editor for each issue.

Dr. Wolfgang proposed that the Society find someone who would be willing to do this under the general editorship of Dr. Dinitz.

Dr. Reckless also made mention of the fact that the Society had to issue a special volume of the annual proceedings.

Dr. Chwast felt that one real service which the journal could perform would be to serve as a forum for the three meetings, the regular annual one, the AAAS meeting, and the American Orthopsychiatric Association meeting.

Dr. Newman stated that the journal had gone through a series of progressions, starting as a newsletter. At Ohio State it has assumed a new format. We are now talking about a planned change in editorship which represents a third step. The next editor the Society seeks ought to be a person who would respond to this new type of format. Rather than getting someone and then telling him the Society is changing the rules of the game, we should get someone whom we can tell that these are the rules, and who would be interested in editing a journal of three issues devoted to specific topics and one compendium-type issue.

Dr. Newman further stated that in talking about a rate increase and a rebate to subscription houses we should formalize it so that the Society can move forward and so that the Society can increase the rate of subscription to CRIMINOLOGICA to \$8.00 and that the Society allow subscription houses 10%. Dr. Newman set this forth in the form of a motion, starting with volume 6 number 1 of May 1968. He stated that this would require immediate action. He suggested that each of the subscription houses that now send the Society subscriptions be advised of the rate change and of the discount which is now being allowed to them.

Dr. MacNamara seconded the motion.

Dr. Chwast thought we should raise the price to \$8.50 and Dr. Kramer proposed that we change the motion to read that there are no subscription rates and each member automatically gets CRIMINOLOGICA, with his annual dues of \$10.00.

Dr. Cormier felt that the ASC could not compare itself to the AAAS, AMA, American Sociological Association. He felt that the subscription to the journal should remain.

Dr. MacNamara seconded the motion to raise subscription rates to \$8.50 and the motion was carried by a majority of votes.

The discussion then moved to the rebate to be allowed and Professor Mueller suggested that the Society start on the basis of allowing 10% and if there is any difficulty at that rate the Executive Committee consider raising the discount.

The Committee which will be formed as an Editorial Advisory Committee for CRIMINOLOGICA will be informed of the motion to raise the subscription rates and grant 10% discount.

The Executive Committee was informed that there are three universities who have indicated an interest in having CRIMINOLOGICA. One of them is the University of Delaware, through Dr. Frank Scarpitti of the Sociology Department. Another is the Center for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Southern Illinois University, under the Director, Charles Matthews. The third is N.Y.U.'s Graduate School of Public Administration, Dr. C. R. Jeffery. John Jay College has also expressed some interest. It was decided that the President would send letters to these organizations inviting them to submit detailed memoranda to the Society regarding space, personnel, subsidy, etc.

Dr. Wolfgang noted for the record that the Center for Criminological Research at the University of Pennsylvania was also interested, but that due to the fact that he himself was on the editorial board of the University of Pennsylvania Press, there was a conflict of interests but that perhaps during the next rotation in three years or so, they would submit a proposal to have CRIMINOLOGICA at the University of Pennsylvania (1972).

Dr. Chwast feels that if the journal could be housed in the university of one of the Executive Committee members, it would be advantageous to the Society.

Professor Mueller then asked whether the Executive Committee members had any other matters regarding CRIMINOLOGICA to discuss.

Dr. Newman proposed an informal expression of appreciation to Dr. Dinitz and Ohio State University, commending them for the good work done on the journal.

## V. Annual Meeting, 1968, Toronto

### (1) Place and Time

All members of the Executive Committee had agreed on holding the next meeting in Toronto.

A committee is being formed of Canadian members including Messrs. Turner, Friedland, Hogarth, Gigeroff and Mohr. It was agreed that the meeting should have four consecutive sessions and that as much as possible it should be profit-making, or at least break even. The committee is exploring the possibility of having the meetings at the University of Toronto. The question of hotel and campus arrangements is very difficult, unlike New York. The Park Plaza Hotel was suggested as meeting headquarters with sessions possibly at the Clark Institute of Psychiatry, which has a new building, 15 stories high, with a Forensic Psychiatry Clinic and a Cafeteria for meals. Other sessions could be at the hotel itself where most participants will be housed. Rates: Single \$16.00, Twin \$20.00 Executive Suite \$24.00, Bedroom suite \$28-33. Meals could be provided for 150 guests, with receptions with drinks at \$.90 each. A cocktail party could be held at the Faculty of Law at the University of Toronto. Meals at the Clark Institute cafeteria are about \$1.00. The Park Plaza Hotel could provide pre-registration cards which could be mailed directly to them.

It was agreed that Dr. Cormier would be in full charge of arrangements.

### (2) Program

Professor Mueller suggested that Dr. Cormier invite Dr. John L. J. Edwards and his Centre of Criminology to participate in the coordination of the conference and perhaps he could have a chance to invite participants to his Centre. Professor Graham Parker was noted to be arranging a workshop on the History of Crime and Criminal Law to be held in June in Toronto and he was to check with Dr. Cormier regarding this.

Dr. Newman mentioned that he planned to arrange for 10-15 of his students to attend the annual meeting. He was a little worried about the prices for student accommodations. He asked whether or not there was a less expensive place where students could be housed, and was answered that there was.

The date for the annual meeting was set for November 1-3, Friday through Sunday, 1968, and 75 rooms in a bloc have been set aside at the Park Plaza Hotel in Toronto.

Regarding the program for the annual meeting (see page 10, Presidential Communication) topics 1-4 were accepted.

Professor Mueller went on record as strongly in favor of the topic on the Phenomenology of the Crime Concept.

Dr. Newman went on record as strongly urging student participation.

Dr. Reckless supported Dr. Newman's recommendation and proposed a possible afternoon session with student participation.

Professor Mueller proposed a student paper to be delivered at each panel session.

Dr. MacNamara suggested that a junior colleague be present at each panel session.

Drs. Newman and Reckless thought Dr. MacNamara's suggestion would leave the junior colleagues in an awkward position.

Dr. Cormier thought perhaps there would be no time to fit in a junior panel.

Dr. Cormier further thought that "student" should be defined as a graduate student with no less than an M.A. degree, but preferably a Ph.D. candidate.

Dr. Wolfgang agreed with the idea of getting junior colleagues involved. He suggested that law students might be asked to comment on the whole socialization process of going into a criminological career (Criminological Careers from a Student Perspective).

Professor Mueller suggested a separate junior colleague panel session on Friday night.

Dr. Reckless addressed himself to topic 2, Corrections (p.10 Presidential Communication) and suggested that perhaps the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training should be involved. Perhaps Dr. Heyns would present a paper.

Suggestions for panelists on the Corrections panel included Mr. McGrath of the Canadian Corrections Association, Dr. John Conrad of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

The following schedule was proposed:

Friday	November 1	Panel Session I	2:30 or 3 pm
		Business session	
		Junior Colleague Session	5 or 6 pm
Saturday	November 2	Panel Session II	
		Panel Session III	
		Dinner and Reception	
Sunday	November 3	Panel Session IV	
		Coffee Break	

### (3) Distribution of Panel Topics

Each one of the vice-presidents would undertake to correspond with the chairman of a session assigned to him and coordinate what is expected of the chairman.

Topic 4: Dr. J. W. Mohr-, Chairman-designate  
 Dr. Bruno Cormier, Executive Committee Representative  
 PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE CRIME CONCEPT (emphasis on methodology)

Topic 1: Dr. Robert Morris MacIver, Prof. Em., Columbia, Chancellor, New School

Suggestion, Milton Luger, Chairman  
 Suggestion, Jacob Chwast to deliver paper

Dr. MacNamara, Executive Committee Representative, to select chairman

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Professor Mueller suggested a mixture between formal and informal papers and panel type discussion. Executive Committee Representatives should see to it that some people deliver scientific papers, while others participate as free lance panelists.

Dr. Newman noted it was imperative that scientific information be interestingly presented.

Dr. Wolfgang suggested as a compromise a couple of papers and then a couple of discussions, similar to the arrangement at the meeting in Cleveland. The Chairman should be very firm about the fact that the papers should be available in advance of the discussion.

Dr. Reckless noted that one of the best meetings was Montreal where all the papers had been prepared in writing in advance.

Professor Mueller advised the Executive Committee Representatives that they should insist in all communications with panel chairmen that all papers be ready in mimeographed form for distribution at the meeting.

Topic 2: Corrections

Dr. Reckless, Executive Committee Representative,  
to select chairman

Topic 3: Psychiatry

Dr. Satten, Chairman-designate

Dr. Hess, Executive Committee Representative

Dr. Wolfgang suggested a further topic on research methods and Professor Mueller proposed that this was a suitable topic for the Presidential paper by Dr. Cormier with panel discussion by students from their perspective. Topic 5 was proposed as "Criminological Careers from a Student Perspective". Dr. Newman is to supervise and pick a chairman for that session.

#### (4) Future Congresses

The discussion then moved to the topic of Future Congresses (p. 11, Presidential Communication).

The President proposed the appointment of a committee to explore policy guidelines.

Dr. MacNamara reported that Dr. John Martin's session at the AAAS meeting was the best representation the ASC ever had. It was the best attended and received session of the AAAS meeting.

Dr. Newman reported that it was difficult to get quality programs unless we were a little stingy and saved our best people for our own annual meetings, since they usually went unheralded at the AAAS meetings.

Dr. Newman was appointed as chairman of a committee to explore the topic of future congresses, with Drs. MacNamara, Chwast, Martin, Hess plus two further members, to be appointed, as committee members.

It was proposed and accepted that all committee reports be submitted by March 1, 1968.

## VI. Awards

The next agenda item for discussion was Annual Awards Committee (p. 12, Presidential Communication).

The Executive Committee accepted the names presented to them so far and proposed the establishment of an Awards Committee, to be chaired by Dr. Sellin, with Drs. Reckless and E. Glueck as members.

## VII. A Vacancy in the Vice-Presidencies

Discussion then turned to topic VII (p. 12 Presidential Communication). The President reported that due to a series of unhappy misunderstandings, and although he seriously and earnestly tried to mediate, particularly with the intervention of Dr. Wolfgang, Dr. Stephen Schafer has resigned his vice-presidency. It was further noted that Dr. Schafer has not resigned his membership in the Society. The President further stated that Dr. Schafer should be seriously considered for an award from the Society. Professor Mueller noted his sincere regret that this resignation should occur during his term of office. Approval was granted by the Executive Committee to send a letter by the President on behalf of the Executive Committee expressing their appreciation for his services to the Society.

Dr. Newman proposed that Schafer's position not be filled and Dr. Cormier stated that if there was no Constitutional opposition thereto this should be done. This proposal was accepted.

## VIII. Nominating Committee

Agenda item next to be discussed was VIII, Nominating Committee (p.13, Presidential Communication). The appointment was previously made and reported in the Presidential Communication. Dr. Wolfgang is the chairman and Drs. Reckless and MacNamara are the members.

The chairman of the committee, Dr. Wolfgang, expressed his desire to address himself to the issue of replacing the vice-presidency vacated by the resignation of Dr. Schafer. He stated that in the view of the sentiments expressed, the Nominating Committee was not in a position to make a report.

Professor Mueller suggested that the Executive Committee make alternative plans for disposition under the new Constitution. He also stated that the Nominating Committee recommendations were not binding on the Executive Committee.

Dr. Wolfgang requested that the two members submit to him as quickly as possible their recommendations perhaps via a three-way telephone call.

### IX. Next Executive Committee Meeting

Dr. Newman suggested another Executive Committee meeting to be held in Lexington, Kentucky, April 5-6, 1968, and the suggestion was favorably received.

### X. Quebec Society of Criminology

As regards Topic IX (p. 13, Presidential Communication) Professor Mueller suggested that we send as a representative of the ASC to the Sixth Conference on Research of the Quebec Society of Criminology a junior member of the Society and that Dr. Cormier, if he so pleases, be there as the President of the ASC. The name of Dr. Brian Grosman of McGill was suggested and accepted, as our representative.

Dr. Cormier will contact Dr. Grosman regarding the representation.

### XI. New Business

The next item on the agenda was new business. The President reported that he had been approached by Oceana Publications as to whether or not the Society or Professor Mueller or both would be willing to work on an Encyclopedia of Criminology, somewhat to parallel the German Encyclopedia edited by Sieverts, Schneider, et al., Oceana might be willing to contribute a part-time assistant. The President felt that this undertaking would enhance the prestige of the Society. Each entry would cover approximately 30 printed pages. The Society would maintain entire editorial control. The control would be in the selection of writers. There would be 2-3 volumes of 500-600 pages each. Mr. Cohen, President of Oceana, was guided by the German experience in encyclopedia compilation. He envisaged a two-three year time period. Oceana proposed to underwrite the cost of production and distribution, plus funds for a part-time editorial officer or an assistant, or an honorarium to an editorial supervisor of the Society.

The Executive Committee voted to further explore this proposal by Oceana.

### XII. History Report by Dr. MacNamara

Dr. MacNamara then reported on the progress of his article re: History of the American Society of Criminology. He said that he had written to four or five of the older members and only gotten one reply so far but the article is in fairly good shape. He expected it to be ready for the next or the next following issue of CRIMINOLOGICA. The article contained a brief history of the Society, the names of the former officers, names of award recipients, purposes of awards, etc.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to the disposition of the topics enumerated in Dr. Kramer's communication of January 1, 1968, all of which were either cleared by general agreement, or tabled.

Adjourned, 5 p.m., for cocktails, at Professor Mueller's Village apartment, 17A, 33 Washington Square West.