

Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
April 7, 1968

PRESENT:

G. O. W. Mueller, President

Bruno Cormier, President-Elect

Albert Hess, Vice-President

Donal E. J. MacNamara, Vice-President

Charles E. Newman, Vice-President

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Immediate Past President

Thorsten Sellin, Past President

Jacob Chwast

Samuel A. Kramer, Secretary-Treasurer

Miss Christine Schultz, Editorial Associate,
Criminologica

Mr. Ralph Susman, Chairman, Criminologica Committee

PRESIDING:

Professor Mueller

Secretary:

Miss Judith Chazen

The President called the meeting to order with a moment of silence in deference to the events of the preceding week, particularly the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

The President asked for suggestions as to amendments to the minutes of the last Executive Committee meeting.

Dr. MacNamara moved and Dr. Cormier seconded a motion that the minutes be accepted as prepared. The Committee unanimously approved.

The President expressed gratitude to Dr. MacNamara for his contribution to the American Orthopsychiatric Association Congress in Chicago. Approximately 1000 people attended this meeting. The topic was "Mental Health Implications of the President's Crime Commission Report."

1. Treasurer's Report

The first item on the agenda was the Treasurer's Report:

On hand at bank	\$1486.06
Receiveable	220.00 from new membership dues
Bond on hand	1000.00

We now have 245 active members at \$10.00 each
24 student members at 5.00 each
40 subscriptions at 5.00 each
4 emeritus memberships 5.00 each
4 years' advance
subscriptions
to Criminologica
1 membership for three years
2 emeritus memberships in advance

We also have interest on the bond at \$25.00. The Society has 97 individual members in arrears on dues and 35 agency memberships, in arrears on dues. Dr. MacNamara suggested that Professor Mueller send letters to these people asking them why they did not pay.

Dr. Newman suggested we pull out addressograph plates on these people and send them a separate dues reminder.

After subsequent discussion it was decided that Professor Mueller would provide the Secretary-Treasurer with letters regarding dues in arrears and Dr. Kramer will send the letters out.

Dr. Dinitz, through his proxy, Miss Christine Schultz, suggested that we send out delinquent dues letters in Criminologica.

Dr. Kramer provided the Executive Committee with a report on new membership.

We have received 22 new membership applications and bills have been sent to these.

In addition, we have fourteen members who have already paid by sending in their checks with their membership applications. This makes a total of 36 new members.

The President reported that he had sent out 30 special membership invitations and had received 19 affirmative responses.

Dr. MacNamara took the responsibility of personally checking on delinquent dues of Society members connected with John Jay College.

The Treasurer's Report ended with a statement to the effect that the finances of the Society were in good shape, except for the February mailing of Criminologica which means that members delinquent on dues will get two free issues of Criminologica. Discussion then centered around whether it was easier to send the two free issues or whether it costs more to follow up the delinquent bill payers first.

Professor Mueller suggested that we continue the present practice as regards delinquent bills.

Professor Mueller then presented the Treasurer with a check for \$125.00 out of the funds of the Comparative Criminal Law Project of New York University to help offset the high cost of the 1967 Annual Meeting at N.Y.U.

Professor Mueller added one further item to the Treasurer's Report, items 8 and 14 on the agenda. He suggested that a membership certificate be immediately printed and sent to members. Dr. Newman suggested that an embosser be made and that certificates be designed with space for a gold seal, which could be sent out each year, embossed with the new year, and then placed on the original membership certificate.

Dr. Sellin mentioned that Fellows were the only voting members in the American Sociological Association. He also suggested that seals for membership certificates were not a good idea, since members often misplace their original certificates.

Dr. MacNamara asked how many people really kept membership certificates and suggested that perhaps this was a waste of money.

Dr. Wolfgang requested that the Society explore the possibility of a membership card, wallet-sized, rather than a certificate. He stated that this was relatively inexpensive.

Dr. MacNamara suggested a card somewhat like that of the American Correctional Association, which card he submitted to the Committee as a model.

Professor Mueller said that due to the limited stock remaining on certificates, and since we did have to reprint anyway, wallet-sized cards should be ordered.

Motion was made for the Treasurer's Report and the discussion regarding membership cards to be accepted and it was seconded and approved and the President expressed his thanks to the Treasurer for the good job he had done.

Dr. Newman suggested that we add an agenda item (#19) to discuss formal acceptance of the Pennsylvania State University Student Chapter to the Society.

2. Toronto Congress, 1968

The next agenda item discussed was the item regarding preparations for the next annual meeting in Toronto. Dr. Cormier stated that everything was ready for the Annual Meeting, November 1-3, 1968. He then spoke on specific local preparations:

The conference hotel will be the Park Plaza.

Friday	November 1	two working sessions at the hotel, one afternoon, one evening
Saturday	November 2	Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, Awards Dinner one morning working session one afternoon working session
Sunday	November 3	one working session

Receptions will be tendered at the Centre of Criminology and the Faculty of Law.

The hotel will provide registration forms.

It was decided that the programs will be printed in Canada.

Dr. MacNamara suggested that we send the programs out the third week in September due to the fact that University travel fund requests must be accompanied by official programs of the events. Professor Mueller suggested that we send a tentative program out to be used for this purpose, and follow up at a later date by a final program.

Dr. Newman suggested that a postcard with the date, time and place should be sent out, and then a preliminary program (out of the Secretary's office).

Dr. Cormier will prepare postcards and send these to the Secretary for mailing.

Miss Schultz stated that five pages of the next issue of Criminologica were being saved for an announcement of the meeting. The announcement should be prepared and sent to the Criminologica office at Ohio State for insertion in Criminologica no later than June 20.

It was decided that the postcard for mailing should be prepared as soon as possible.

The vice-presidents in charge of general supervision of the panels should communicate their panel information regarding names and topics to Dr. Cormier as quickly as possible.

Discussion then moved to reports of panel sessions:

Topic 1: Research in Juvenile Delinquency

Dr. Eleanor Glueck, Chairman
Dr. Donal E. J. MacNamara, Discussant

Research papers by:

Dr. C. R. Jeffery on his D. C. Project
Dr. Clarence Sherwood of the Department of
Corrections on Positive Approach to
Reading Skills and Delinquency
Dr. _____ La Brie, Harvard statistician on
New Statistical Methods for Evaluating
Delinquency Prediction Tables

Topic 2: Student panel

Dr. Newman could not get anyone to accept the responsibility for this panel. He was advised to contact Drs. Matthews and Lohman. Dr. Wolfgang will arrange for student papers to be presented. Miss Schultz has available a paper from an Ohio State student for this purpose. Dr. MacNamara suggested we contact Dr. Edward Sagarin of CCNY.

Miss Schultz informed the Committee that Dr. Dinitz would like to chair the student panel session, and the offer was accepted.

Professor Mueller will send a letter offering the services of one of the Project Assistants of the Comparative Criminal Law Project to report on one of the Project's research efforts.

Topic 3: The Psychiatric Panel

Dr. Hess has not yet heard from Dr. Satten. Other suggestions were offered for the chairmanship if Dr. Satten could not do it.

Dr. Newman suggested that we ask somebody from the West Coast, due to the fact that we use too many people from the East Coast. Dr. Bernard Diamond of California should be contacted for this purpose.

The name of Dr. Melitta Schmeideberg of the International Association for Psychiatric Treatment of Offenders was proposed since she had expressed an interest in delivering a paper on Offender Therapy on the Psychiatric Panel.

It was mentioned that Dr. Maxwell Jones would be in Toronto at the time of the Annual Meeting and could be a substitute in an emergency.

With these suggestions at hand, Dr. Hess will continue his work on the formulation of this panel.

Dr. MacNamara asked for the cooperation of the Committee so that his panel could be held on a Saturday morning to accommodate Eleanor Glueck.

The Student Panel will have to be at one of the Friday sessions.

Dr. Cormier asked which panel should be held on Sunday.

Topic 4: Hans Mohr has been contacted.

Dr. MacNamara suggested a further panel, to be devoted to correction problems. He suggested that Dr. Howton of City College, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, be invited to give a paper on "Attitudes in the Minds of Correctional Officers Between Their Uniforms and Their Jobs." It was also suggested that Thomas Murton be invited to deliver a paper on "Problems of a Penal Administrator in a Political Setting."

The question of where to place the panel was brought up. All were agreed that they would like to have this panel but that time was not readily available.

Dr. MacNamara suggested that these men could become either luncheon or dinner speakers.

Professor Mueller thought that technical topics should not be used at dinner, but in a scientific setting. He suggested that perhaps we could structure a meeting with the AAAS for December around these topics.

Professor Mueller asked Dr. MacNamara to investigate the possibility of using the above topics in connection with the AAAS meetings and to make such other recommendations at the next Executive Committee Meeting as he deems wise.

Dr. Chwast put forth Dr. Hess' suggestion regarding doing something for Dr. Murton. He believed we should perhaps use the Executive Committee as a platform for this purpose. This was added to the agenda as item 13. Perhaps Dr. Murton should be added to the meeting in Toronto.

Costs of the Toronto meeting were next discussed: Estimated fee should cover registration, including dinners, partial coverage of the cocktail parties, and some subsidy for publication of the proceedings. It was noted that in the past the fees in actuality never did cover all these things. Ideally funds should be left over from the registration fees to print at least one issue of *Criminologica* devoted to the papers of the annual meeting.

Dr. Cormier suggested a minimum fee of \$15.00. There will be, he said, no costs for receptions as this will be included in the fee. He can assure that there will be no

deficit, but we cannot guarantee a surplus. We would need about \$7.00 left out of each fee, for printing the proceedings issue of Criminologica.

Dr. Cormier suggested that we charge \$20.00 to include the luncheon. Tickets for all functions will be given out with registration.

It was decided that the program announcement should indicate the cost of registration and what it includes. The question of what to do with student registrants was discussed next. The Society had not in the past charged students a full rate.

Miss Schultz feels that students could be charged the full registration rate since most of them are university-sponsored.

Dr. Chwast felt that we should consider the Toronto students since they will be the largest number of student participants.

Dr. Kramer felt that too high a rate would discourage them and that our purpose should be to encourage their attendance.

Dr. Cormier mentioned that students must specify that they are full-time, registered students and be prepared to identify themselves as such.

It was decided that the fee for registration at the Annual Meeting would be \$20.00, including receptions, and that there would be no charge for working sessions.

Miss Schultz made a motion that a three-line summary be prepared on each working paper for the meeting to be placed in Criminologica. These must be submitted before July 1.

This motion was accepted.

The vice-presidents in charge of the panels will communicate with their panelists and get these abstracts in before July 1 for publication in Criminologica.

3. The Proposed New Constitution

The issue was resolved so far and the Executive Committee has accepted the proposed plan for adoption. The editors of Criminologica will either print the proposed new Constitution in the next issue or distribute with the next issue of Criminologica a copy of the Proposed Constitution with a return ballot card.

Dr. Dinitz feels that the Constitution should be a permanent part of Criminologica and should be printed in the August issue.

Dr. Kramer suggested that we delay the May issue which is ready for mailing and save ourselves three months time of waiting. The August issue, he believes, would be a poor choice for distribution of the Constitution since most people will be away.

Dr. MacNamara felt that the Constitution as approved should be printed in Criminologica. He felt that the Constitution when accepted by the membership should be printed in Criminologica. He suggested that the Proposed Constitution be sent only to members in good standing and therefore we need 300 copies of it.

It was decided that the stencils of the new Constitution be typed at the offices of the Comparative Criminal Law Project and sent to Dr. Newman to be run off. Postcards will be addressed for return to Dr. Kramer and sent to Miss Schultz for mailing. The name of the member must appear on the postcard.

4. History and Awards Criteria

The next item for discussion was agenda item 2, History of the Society, Criteria for Society Awards.

Dr. MacNamara sent a list to Dr. Sellin, containing all previous Sutherland, Vollmer and Bloch Award recipients, so as to provide a basis for ascertaining criteria. He suggested that we formalize these criteria in the future.

The Sutherland Award should be given for scholarship in research or teaching, to people in academic life.

The Vollmer Award should recognize criminological application in administration of agencies of corrections, and of the administration of criminal justice.

The Bloch Awards should be given for service to the American Society of Criminology.

There is one further award, the Cesare Beccaria Award, which has never been given and accepted and which should, therefore, be discontinued.

Dr. Sellin feels we should put these criteria down in writing. He said that when awards are given by any Society the Society defines the criteria which govern the award. Such criteria should be established in regard to any award given by the ASC.

Dr. Sellin was appointed to write the formal statements governing each award.

Professor Mueller suggested that the criteria be incorporated in the By-Laws of the Society.

Dr. Sellin felt that we should deal with the Sutherland and Vollmer awards only. He felt there was a proliferation of awards. He believed that the Bloch Award was not designed as a permanent one and should be dropped.

The President expressed his gratitude to Dr. Sellin for accepting the task of establishing awards criteria.

Dr. Kramer brought up the problem of providing for uniform citations for the awards. Dr. MacNamara thought that each one should be individual since we were giving honors for specific individual contributions. Professor Mueller stated that the wording of the citations should be left to the individual officers each year.

Dr. MacNamara then proceeded to the report of the History of the Society from the period 1936-1949.

Dr. Dinstein will also send some materials to Dr. MacNamara.

A preliminary paragraph of the report about the first thirteen years of the Society has been prepared without the use of the materials promised:

There were only two officers during the early years: From 1936 to 1946 August Vollmer was President, and from 1946-1951 O. W. Wilson was President.

The full and final report should be ready for the August issue of *Criminologica*.

To preserve the history of the Society, Dr. Sellin mentioned that notes regarding the Society were published in the *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* which was the official organ of the Society regarding annual meetings and awards.

Occasional comments were also published in the "Police Chief."

Mr. Susman suggested that the Society might want to consider publishing in the last issue of its Journal each year a brief history of the activities, highlights and accomplishments of the Society. It could be made the task of the out-going President or of the Editor of Criminologica to publish this as an editorial. It was also suggested that the Editor of Criminologica could be designated as the Historian for the Society.

5. Awards Committee

Regarding Agenda Item 11, Dr. Sellin contacted Drs. Reckless and Glueck of the Awards Committee and they both agreed with the procedure for selection. Dr. Sellin will send out letters to approximately one dozen of the most active members of the Society asking them for two names for consideration by the Awards Committee.

Dr. MacNamara cautioned not to rule out Europeans.

Dr. Sellin stated that one did not have to be a member of the Society to get an award. He will put a statement to this effect in his letters asking for recommendations.

Dr. Kramer asked whether we might not interfere with the International Society of Criminology if we were to give awards to non-Americans.

Dr. Wolfgang reported that the International Society awards prizes only every five years, and that therefore an award to a non-American would not be inappropriate.

Dr. Sellin stated that the report of the Awards Committee should be ready in one month. He proposes to submit two names for each award to the Executive Committee for their ultimate choice of award recipients.

6. Membership Drive Committee

The President reported that Dr. Satten has accepted the chairmanship of the Membership Drive Committee and has promised to write to the designated members of his committee.

Dr. Sellin reported that the American Academy did not have a specially selected membership but sent out 30,000 invitations every month, on the basis of selected mailing lists. The return was about 4%. This is not a comparable situation to that of the ASC. The American Academy now has 24,000 members.

Dr. Kramer mentioned that he thought that invitation meant automatic membership.

Dr. Newman stated that some time ago the Executive Committee authorized the Executive Secretary to act in their behalf to make decisions on eligibility. It was his understanding that this authorization was a permanent one.

Dr. MacNamara felt that the Society should take care that members should be involved in academic life.

Dr. Wolfgang asked about the virtues of limited membership.

Dr. Newman said that there were three classes of membership in the Society:

Active, which was a restricted membership, Associate, which was a little less restricted, and Student, which was the broadest.

Professor Mueller noted that the Society had built up a good reputation through a selective process of admission to membership, without any rigid criteria.

Dr. MacNamara felt that membership could be misused by not designating status of membership. He questioned what the objectives were: did the Society want to be a professional organization of criminologists, campus-oriented?

Dr. Sellin suggested that the Society proceed in accepting membership by invitation only and not accept unsolicited applications.

Dr. Newman felt that the application itself had adequate space for proper identification.

Professor Mueller assumed that the Society had acted properly in the past by asking specific questions on the application.

7. Criminologica Committee

Agenda Item 4 was next discussed, the Criminologica Committee, chaired by Mr. Susman. Mr. Susman was instructed to proceed in assembling his committee members.

The functions of the Committee will be to:

1. Consider transfer to a new place of editorship, in accordance with the wishes of Ohio State University.
2. Look for possible subsidy, possibly out of government funds.

3. Do whatever else might be done to provide for further progress and improvement of the journal in an advisory capacity.
4. To advise the outgoing and incoming editors of the journal.

The Editorial Advisory Committee will work through the summer and come up with some recommendations, formulated along the lines of functions 1-4.

Dr. Dinitz made the following recommendations re Criminologica:

1. A book review editor should be named (Dr. Sagarin?).
2. Four regular issues should be sent out every year and then a final issue containing abstracts of all papers delivered at the Society's annual meeting.
3. Joining with another journal (Youthful Offenders?).
4. Since there is a shortage of stock of volumes 1-3 of the journal, a printer has been contacted. Reprint cost would be no more than one regular issue of the Journal--\$700.00.
5. Three complimentary copies should be sent to all people whose articles appear in the journal.
6. There are less than 100 copies of the February issue left.

Dr. Hess was appointed to make arrangements with reprint houses. The Society would get royalties.

It was decided that the Editorial Advisory Committee would take charge of reprinting all old issues.

Miss Schultz reported that the printer is holding the last three issues in lock (2 issues of volume 5, one of volume 6) so he can re-run on request. He would print 450, which means we get in actuality 25 free copies.

Professor Mueller instructed Miss Schultz to have 250 copies of each of the issues in lock reprinted if the cost is no more than \$700.00.

Dr. Chwast asked what kind of reprint arrangements are possible.

Professor Mueller stated that the customary arrangement was:

1. Reprint house takes over back stock.
2. They are guaranteed the right to handle reprints on issues that are out of print.
3. The reprints are used to stock libraries.

There is a high fee charged for stocking libraries.

Miss Schultz suggested that the Journal should have a Board of Review for articles regardless of where the journal is moved.

Dr. Hess feels that an Advisory Board is alright but a Review Board is not feasible.

Miss Schultz explained that Dr. Dinitz, who made the original Review Board suggestion, meant that the Board would be used only on questionable articles.

Professor Mueller suggested that the decision on a review board should be postponed until the journal is moved. If there is any doubt on an article the Editor will simply confer with colleagues on the Executive Committee.

It was noted that it was thought that there had been deliberate action taken at the Cleveland meeting not to publish book reviews.

Dr. MacNamara proposed that the Committee revise its decision regarding book reviews but it should make sure that the book reviews were short.

Dr. Newman proposed that the Criminologica Editorial Advisory Committee should make the decision on this matter.

Dr. Kramer objected and said it was not the function of this committee to make a decision like that; it was simply an editorial advisory committee.

Dr. Cormier said that book reviews were not abandoned in Cleveland.

Dr. Newman proposed that the Editorial Advisory Committee be charged with the task of expanding the total content of the journal including such questions as book reviews, specific sections on law, on behavior, on sociology, etc.

Professor Mueller agreed with this suggestion and stated that the committee is simply advisory. It is a vehicle to bring matters before the Executive Committee for deliberation.

Dr. MacNamara suggested that the question of the single issue devoted to one subject could also be taken up by the Editorial Advisory Committee.

Miss Schultz suggested that at this time it is not possible to devote a single issue to one topic, except for one issue per year. Criminologica doesn't have enough one-subject articles.

Dr. Wolfgang suggested that we select a topic and then solicit articles on it.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH.

The meeting was resumed after lunch with the topic of Criminologica:

Professor Mueller reported that a letter had been sent to 100 Latin-American criminologists, informing them of Professor Jaime Toro Calder's appointment as Latin-American editor for Criminologica. Response to this letter was most enthusiastic.

The next question on Criminologica was where it should be moved to. The President stated that due to the receipt by NYU of a Ford Foundation grant for criminal justice, the law school could house the journal. He stated that the Graduate Department of Sociology of Washington Square College and the Graduate School of Public Administration could not do it. If the Criminal Justice Project takes it over, however, the cooperation of members of both schools (Quinney and Jeffery) would be secured. Specific details would have to be worked out. The take-over would be for a limited number of years. The University of Delaware is no longer interested, Southern Illinois University is still interested as is John Jay College, and John Jay would be interested in having it at the next rotation.

Dr. MacNamara stated that the editor should be a resident of the University at which the journal was housed.

Dr. Hess suggested that since Criminologica was supposed to be an interdisciplinary journal, the editorship should be shifted among the different disciplines.

Dr. Chwast suggested a board of editors from the various disciplines.

Professor Mueller thought perhaps it was possible to shift the editors among the disciplines but they should all come from one place.

8. Personnel

The topic designated as #10 on the agenda, Personnel, was next discussed.

Professor Mueller stated that if and when the Constitution is accepted by the membership, then the President is specifically granted the power to appoint Executive Councillors. The President will then also have the authority to appoint an Executive Secretary.

9. Student-affiliate membership

Agenda item #19, student affiliate membership in the ASC was discussed next.

Dr. Newman reported that a student group had been organized

at Pennsylvania State University. They had prepared a Constitution, patterned after the Constitution of the ASC. There are 25-30 interested students in this group. It was recommended that this group be invited to become an affiliate group of the Society, that they be allowed to use the identification "Student Chapter of the American Society of Criminology."

Professor Mueller thinks that the students should be encouraged. He suggested a letter of recommendation to the President of the Pennsylvania group.

Dr. MacNamara asked whether each member of the student group would become a student member of the ASC.

Professor Mueller stated that once he had the official word from this group that they were interested he would send them a letter personally thanking them for their interest and stating the terms and conditions of membership. Right now, in answer to Dr. MacNamara's question, we have only one category of student membership, at \$5.00.

The question arose as to whether there should be a group membership fee.

Dr. Newman related that the dues of the student organization at Pennsylvania State were \$1.00 per year. He assumed that they intended to charge a larger amount for membership in the American Society of Criminology.

Dr. Hess suggested that this group pay \$4.00 membership fee to the Society and \$1.00 to their student chapter.

Professor Mueller asked whether it was possible to send them *Criminologica* at this price.

Dr. Kramer expressed concern about the student chapter. What if they make a statement on any topic? Would the Society have any kind of control or editorial policy or a disclaimer against them?

Professor Mueller responded that the Society could immediately request the right to have a statement of similar size in the same journal and could make it clear that the Society did not support the student statement.

Dr. MacNamara felt that the Society could adopt a by-law making only the President and Executive Committee responsible for making public statements on behalf of the Society.

Professor Mueller stressed the educational value of having a student group as members of the Society. The only limitation is that they identify themselves as a student chapter.

Dr. Newman stated for the record the objectives of the student chapter, which were almost parallel with the objectives of the Society, as contained in the Preamble to the Society's Proposed New Constitution.

Dr. Chwast stated that there was no need to worry about the student chapter making statements without the authority of the Society since it was a local chapter and they most probably would make statements which appertain only to the Pennsylvania State area.

Professor Mueller mentioned that if necessary the Society could always make a statement disavowing itself from any dissident group.

Dr. Wolfgang said there was no guarantee against any statements since mass media were beyond the control of any Society.

Dr. Cormier advised that as soon as the Society admits any student chapter the Society has an active responsibility as to what can be done for them.

Professor Mueller thought that any student group who wanted to affiliate with the Society should be highly encouraged.

Dr. Chwast said that this first student affiliate might become a model for groups throughout the country.

Dr. Wolfgang noted that a student group created a sense of camaraderie and that students would become more solidified.

Dr. Hess noted that the student chapter interest might vary with the size and structure at any specific university.

Dr. Cormier questioned the difference between a student chapter and individual student membership.

The President suggested that student groups could be most helpful if it were decided to hold regional meetings.

Dr. Chwast proposed the idea that the student group hold regular meetings and discussions on criminological issues with guest speakers and that they could be most helpful in supporting the Society on any projects it undertakes.

The personal inclination of the President would be to send a message back to the student group at Pennsylvania State through Dr. Newman that the President welcomes the development and encourages them to write to the President detailing their planned project and personnel, outlining particularly what they expect from their affiliation with the Society. This letter will then be brought before the Executive Committee for final deliberation.

The proposal of the President was accepted and it was decided that a letter from the student group would be brought before the Executive Committee for its decision.

Dr. MacNamara thought perhaps the question of student affiliation might be brought to the attention of the membership of the Society for comment.

Dr. Wolfgang suggested that student groups could be affiliated members whereby one membership is created for the entire group and each student would be an individual member of the ASC and could therefore double their membership by designating themselves as members of the student group and individual student members of the ASC.

Professor Mueller noted that as individual student members of the ASC they could get Criminologica but not on the basis of a membership just in the local student group.

10. Group memberships

Dr. Kramer noted for the record that AAAS has sent the Society a bill for \$10.00 for group membership. Dr. Kramer further noted that there was an outstanding bill for membership by the ASC in the International Society of Criminology.

Dr. Wolfgang said he would check on what the ASC owes the International.

11. Regional meetings

Regional meetings, agenda item 15, was discussed next. The President stated that the Committee was not prepared to discuss the issue at that point, but Dr. Kramer reported that there was heavy membership in California and New York. Outside of that, the membership was scattered throughout the country. Regional meetings would be feasible only for California and New York.

Dr. MacNamara thought the original idea was to hold cooperative meetings with other organizations. This has been a successful, although intermittent, practice.

The President stated that agenda item 15 should also include a discussion of agenda item 18, participation and possible program at AAAS meeting in December, etc.

Dr. Newman questioned whether the Committee was putting forth the idea that any member of the Society could serve as an official representative of the Society any place in the country.

Professor Mueller noted that the Executive Committee would be definitely opposed to that.

Dr. Newman suggested that before any member of the Society officially participates in any affiliate organization meetings, he request the approval of the Executive Committee, except for the AAAS or AOA meetings.

Dr. Kramer stated that at all times the President of the Society should be authorized to make a decision on behalf of the Executive Committee as to whether or not the Society officially participates at any meeting.

The President stated that he would prefer to clear all such participation with the Executive Committee, rather than by Presidential authorization.

Dr. Newman suggested that the President should authorize participation without the Executive Committee, except in cases of doubt where he would then seek the advice of the Executive Committee.

It was decided that the President would make all decisions regarding participation at affiliate meetings and would seek the advice of the Executive Committee only in case of doubt.

12. Charter Flights

The next item on the agenda was topic 17, chartered flights to Japan for the 1970 Criminological Congress. It was noted that there was one Congress in Madrid and another one week later in Tokyo.

The President mentioned that he had appointed Mr. Susman to check into the matter, and he reported as follows:

Pan American could not give exact figures since prices could go up or down. Approximate figures were given as follows for the U.S.-Japan round trip flights:

\$475-525 per person round trip from the East Coast with intermediate stops, including meals and drinks. It was noted that the regular fare for this would be \$1200.00. This is for a 167-passenger aircraft.

In the event that the Society could not get 167 people, there are means by which we could work out group charters (75 persons) flying from the West Coast at approximately \$500 round trip, plus fare from East to West Coast.

A group of 25 or more flying from the East Coast to California could get a rate reduction on their fare from East to West Coast.

Other airlines contacted have not as yet submitted rates. It is believed, however, that their rates would be somewhat below Pan American.

It was stated that the Japanese government might sponsor a number of charter flights since this was the year of Expo '70 which will be held in Osaka.

Pan Am could give a more solid figure with the information on hand well in advance of the proposed flight.

Dr. MacNamara brought up the point that people who were planning to attend should be designated as delegates of the American Society of Criminology.

It was noted for the record that the length of stay in Japan did not change the amount, however, the group must come and go as a group.

Mr. Susman was instructed to finalize the data and submit specific report, after which Professor Mueller and Dr. MacNamara will draft a memorandum to the membership and request an expression of interest.

Dr. Wolfgang suggested that an announcement be made up for the journal and a flyer sent out.

Dr. Chwast suggested a printing of preliminary circulars right now.

Professor Mueller suggested that the preliminary announcement appear in Criminologica right now, mentioning that those who want to take advantage of the charter must be members in good standing of the ASC six months prior to departure.

13. Societal Stands on Public Issues

Agenda item 13, the question of the Society's taking a stand on crime legislation was discussed next. The item was amended to include the question of whether not only to take a stand but a public stand on such matters.

The President also added to this question the question of whether the Society should do something about Dr. Murton, perhaps in the form of a letter to the Governor of Arkansas.

Dr. Newman stated that as a group of scientists concerned with criminology, it would be singularly inappropriate to take a stand without having made a study of the facts. He felt that acting only on knowledge obtained through the public press is not appropriate. However, if an investigation were done, it would be appropriate to take a stand on legislation.

Dr. MacNamara proposed that the Society order an investigation of the situation and having such report make the feelings of the Society known. He felt that especially in the Murton case the Society had both the opportunity and the responsibility to do something. He felt that Dr.

Austin MacCormack of the Osborne Society could be appointed to handle the responsibility of making such a report, upon which the Society could then take action.

Dr. Kramer was very much in favor of the Society's getting the facts in the Murton case. He felt that the Society could ask for the facts from Gov. Rockefeller of Arkansas and all the information necessary. After all information was gathered the Society could make a stand.

The President proposed that whenever a public issue is raised, a small committee or an individual should be appointed to investigate the facts and come up with specific information which would be immediately circularized to the Executive Committee. The President emphasized that all facts must be gathered since the professional prestige of the Society would be at stake, and, therefore, the Society could not afford to be wrong.

Dr. MacNamara stated for the record that the Society was not looking for publicity but felt it could be helpful to those involved.

Dr. Hess sought clarification of the duties and responsibilities of a professional in such situations.

Mr. Susman agreed with Dr. Newman and was not troubled by a lapse in time. He stated that we are dealing with situations which defy scientific understanding since they revolve around political situations.

Dr. MacNamara suggested that the Society could vote censures as some other professional societies do.

Dr. Newman added that this could be done on the basis of protracted research.

It was decided that Dr. MacNamara would get in touch with Dr. MacCormack and they would constitute a committee of two to investigate and circulate a report to the Executive Committee who would then evaluate and send to members.

Dr. MacNamara suggested that Mr. Clinton Duffy and/or James V. Bennett also be contacted for this report.

The President reported on legislation pending before Congress. There are two bills, one on juvenile delinquency and one "Safe Streets" bill.

Dr. Kramer suggested formation of a committee to investigate this legislation. This committee could submit a report to the entire Executive Committee or the President and then a determination could be made.

Mr. Susman reported that the House had passed HR12120 in October 1967 (juvenile delinquency). In so doing, they re-wrote the administration's bill. It became an anti-OEO and anti-administration bill. 75% of the money would go into block grants to the states, with an 80% return to local communities. It was deemed a restrictive, narrow bill. The Senate Subcommittee reported out the bill with Sen. Javits' amendments.

Financing of the bill is as follows:

	Government financing
1. Planned services	60%
2. Rehabilitation services	90%
3. Construction	50%
4. Research and Administration	100%
5. Preventive services	75%
6. Technical assistance and evaluation	100%

A bill should be through the Senate by the first of June. The bill should pass through Congress by the end of June.

Dr. Newman raised the question of whether taking a position on a prospective piece of legislation would in any way affect the tax status of the Society.

Professor Mueller stated that if the legislation in question falls within the area of scientific inquiry of the specific organization, it would not affect the tax status of the organization.

Dr. Kramer and one other colleague from D.C. were designated to report on the Juvenile Court reorganization bill, with their recommendations, after which the Society could decide on whether or not to take a stand.

The President proposed that Mr. Susman as chairman with Dr. Chwast as a member prepare a similar report on the juvenile delinquency bill.

Dr. MacNamara reported on Senate Bill 1760 (Hart Bill) (abolition of capital punishment under the federal criminal

code). He proposed appointing Dr. Sellin to investigate and report on this and that Dr. Wolfgang serve with him so that the Executive Committee could have a report and take a stand on this.

Reports of the committees appointed to report on pending legislation will be submitted to the President for distribution to the Executive Committee.

14. Nominations Committee

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Chairman, with Drs. Reckless and MacNamara as committee members, reported as follows in their advisory report:

For President-Elect Albert Morris, devoted, long-time member of the Society, scheduled to retire from academic post at Boston University and still President of the Massachusetts Correctional Association. Highly respected and reputable criminologist.

Vice-Presidents: Dinitz and Newman still have one further year as v.p.'s, two new vice-presidents: Drs. Sagarin and Chwast.

After some discussion, off the record, the following names were added for final consideration:

Dr. Franco Ferracuti for one of the vice-presidential positions.

The Executive Committee will consider other names. However, only one slate of names will be submitted to the membership. This would absolve the Executive Committee of its duties and obligations. The report of the Nominations Committee was accepted with gratitude.

Miss Schultz advised the Executive Committee of Dr. Dinitz' wish that Dr. Ferracuti be nominated as one of the Vice-Presidents and stated that she herself would like to propose Dr. Joseph Satten.

The question was raised that if the Constitution is accepted the number of vice-presidents would be reduced to 3 and that if Dr. Ferracuti were one of the three it might reduce the effectiveness of the vice-presidents. However Dr. Wolfgang said that if the Society could get along without the actual physical presence of Dr. Ferracuti he could support his nomination for vice-president,

Dr. MacNamara pointed out that the new Constitution would also provide for Executive Councillors which would compensate for the fact that Dr. Ferracuti was not actually in the country.

The President asked the Executive Committee to think further on the nomination of Dr. Morris.

Dr. Wolfgang stated that he thought the Society was less a reflection on the President alone than it is of the Executive Committee.

Dr. Newman thought that the nominations did not have to be closed at this time if there were to be another meeting of the Executive Committee in September.

Further discussion of this topic was held over till the Fall meeting.

15. The Next Executive Committee Meeting

The last item on the agenda was the possibility of holding another Executive Committee meeting in New York in late summer or early September. It was decided that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held in New York on Saturday, September 28,

The President asked all members of the Executive Committee for further specific recommendations of candidates for Executive Committee posts, to be submitted to him. These could then be circulated to the members of the Executive Committee, so that a choice could be made on September 28.

No further agenda items remained to be discussed, motion was made and seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.