



# THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

1314 KINNEAR ROAD • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212 • (614) 422-9207

## ASC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

May 6, 1978

Philadelphia Sheraton Hotel - Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

**RESIDENT**  
C. Ray Jeffery  
School of Criminology  
Bellamy 159  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306

**RESIDENT-ELECT**  
Ronald L. Akers  
Department of Sociology  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

**ICE-PRESIDENT**  
Don M. Gottfredson, Dean  
School of Criminal Justice  
Rutgers University  
15 Washington Street  
Newark, NJ 07102

**CE-PRESIDENT-ELECT**  
Frank R. Scarpitti  
Department of Sociology  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19711

**CRETARY**  
Joseph E. Scott  
The Ohio State University  
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212  
Columbus, OH 43212

**TEASURER**  
Harry E. Allen  
The Ohio State University  
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212  
Columbus, OH 43212

**EDITOR - CRIMINOLOGY**  
James A. Inciardi  
Division of Criminal Justice  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19711

**EDITOR - THE CRIMINOLOGIST**  
Alvin W. Cohn  
15005 Westbury Road  
Rockville, MD 20853

**78 PROGRAM CHAIRPERSON**  
Paul J. Brantingham  
Department of Criminology  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby Mountain  
Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6  
CANADA

**EXECUTIVE COUNSELORS**  
Duncan Chappell  
Edith E. Flynn  
Paul Friday  
Brian Grosman  
James Hackler  
Elmer Johnson  
Sarnoff Mednick  
Barbara R. Price  
Charles Wellford

**ST PRESIDENTS**  
1977-William E. Amos  
1976-Gilbert Geis  
1975-Nicholas N. Kitzie  
1974-Edward Sagarin  
1973-John Ball  
1972-Charles L. Newman  
1971-Simon Dinitz  
1970-Albert Morris

1969-Bruno M. Cormier  
1968-Edward C. Mueller  
1967-E. Wolfgang  
1966-Walter C. Reckless  
1965-Donald F. J. MacNamara

Members Present: Harry E. Allen  
Ronald L. Akers  
Edith Flynn  
James Hackler  
James Inciardi  
C. Ray Jeffery

Elmer H. Johnson  
Barbara Raffel Price  
Edward Sagarin  
Joseph E. Scott  
Benjamin Ward  
Charles Wellford

Guests Present : Alvin W. Cohn  
Fred Montanino

President C. Ray Jeffery called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., Saturday, May 6, 1978. A motion was made by Elmer Johnson to approve the Executive Board minutes of February 18, 1978. Seconded by Charles Wellford; motion carried.

Proxies for Executive Board members not present at this meeting were given as follows:

- a) Edith Flynn has proxy for Frank Scarpitti.
- b) Charles Wellford has proxy for William Amos.
- c) Harry Allen has proxy for Paul Friday.
- d) C. Ray Jeffery has proxies for Sarnoff Mednick, Brian Grosman and Don Gottfredson.

### NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT (Attachment A)

President Jeffery informed the Board that Harry Allen had requested his name be withdrawn from the presidential-elect nominations by the Committee.

A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Edith Flynn to accept the names of Don Gottfredson and Marshall Clinard as presidential-elect candidates. There was a call for discussion.

James Hackler stated he would like to see a broader slate of nominations, and would also like to see Daniel Glaser as the third presidential-elect candidate. Hackler amended the motion to add the name of Daniel Glaser to that of Don Gottfredson and Marshall Clinard as presidential-elect candidates. Seconded by Barbara Price.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT (cont'd)

Edith Flynn reported that Daniel Glaser was reluctant to travel and there there was the strong likelihood that he would not be interested in becoming president of the Society. Wellford stated he had talked to Clinard after he had been contacted by the Nominations Committee regarding his candidacy and Wellford was under the impression that Clinard would accept. Ward stated that it might make sense to have two candidates and an alternate. Akers suggested that Glaser be contacted if either Gottfredson or Clinard declined the nomination.

Hackler amended his motion that Daniel Glaser be listed as an alternate presidential-elect candidate in the event that either Don Gottfredson or Marshall Clinard declined their candidacy. Seconded by Barbara Price. Motion carried. (Opposed: 1)

President Jeffery informed the Board that Brian Grosman had contacted him and requested that his name be withdrawn from the list of vice-president candidates. Edith Flynn nominated Harry Allen as a vice-president elect candidate. Jeffery reported that he had talked with both Gernard Mueller and Freda Adler and felt it was not an appropriate move for Freda to be on the nominations list since Gerhard was chair of the committee. Freda requested that her name be withdrawn if there were any opposition from the Board.

Charles Wellford endorsed the motion that the Board accept the Nominations Committee report and stated he would like to nominate Freda Adler to the list of vice-president elect candidates; seconded by Barbara Price. Edith Flynn nominated G. Thomas Gitchoff as a vice-president elect candidate. Akers stated he supported Wellford's sentiment on the grounds of avoiding the appearance of impropriety, Freda's name should be withdrawn from the list of candidates. Joseph Scott nominated Daniel Glaser as a vice-president elect candidate. Barbara Price nominated Benjamin Ward as a vice-president elect candidate, but Ward declined.

Scott pointed out that the Society was under a mandate to have a minimum of two candidates on the ballot, but was not limited to that number. Wellford stated that it was his understanding that one reason for nominating Freda was to have a woman in a position on the Board, but he stated there was not a great deal of support for her candidacy. He stated that if that were the case, the Board should think about nominating another woman. Wellford felt it would reflect poorly on the Board if they did not make an effort in this area. He suggested Edith Flynn be placed on the ballot, but Edith stated she was more interested in being nominated for the position of Executive Counselor, and that there was a problem in nominating a woman to run against a man. Edith also stated that Harry Allen had done yoeman's work for the Society and came within three votes of being elected president in last year's election; therefore, she looked upon it as a moral obligation that he be placed on the ticket. If he were to be paired against a woman, it might be a lopsided election, she felt.

Hackler stated he would make the same motion again, noting that we were sensitively pre-selecting the vice president. He agreed with Flynn's sentiments, but also noted that there was honor in being nominated to run; as well as in winning. He liked the idea of four candidates running rather than two. James Hackler made a motion that all four names appear on the slate of candidates for the office of vice-president elect: Harry Allen, Freda Adler, Daniel Glaser and G. Thomas Gitchoff. Seconded by Joseph E. Scott. In favor: 6; opposed 5. Allen suggested a closed ballot and Joseph Scott moved that the Board vote by secret ballot. In favor of four candidates: 8; opposed 5; abstained, 1. Motion carried.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT (cont'd)

Following a brief discussion among the Board, it was agreed that the names of John T. Monahan and Hans J. Schneider should be removed from the slate of executive counselor candidates. Joseph Scott nominated Ronald Huff as an executive counselor candidate; seconded by James Inciardi. James Hackler nominated Albert Reiss as an executive counselor candidate. Ronald Akers nominated Charles W. Thomas as an executive counselor candidate. Elmer Johnson commented that there should be a turn-over in the roles of executive counselor. Wellford stated he felt there was a necessity to keep the number of nominations in this category relatively small. By listing six or seven candidates for this position, a small clique in the Society could elect the people on the council. Barbara Price said she was in favor of supporting all seven on the slate for executive counselor: Marc Reidel, Benjamin Ward, Edith Flynn, Sue Titus Reid, Ronald Huff, Albert Reiss and Charles Thomas. She was certain that one person would withdraw and that a slate of six seemed reasonable.

Hackler stated he had talked with Albert Reiss who had shown an interest in becoming involved in the Society. Sagarin stated that in the past he had asked Reiss to help him on some small matters for the Society and Reiss had refused. Hackler stated the Society had been hesitant to run prestigious people on the Board but that it spoke well to occasionally run world renowned scholars.

James Hackler made a motion that all seven candidates be accepted to run for the office of executive counselor; seconded by Harry Allen. In favor: 3; opposed, 8; motion failed.

Joseph Scott spoke against running seven people for the office of executive counselor. He reiterated that with seven candidates a small clique could run the Society and that running four candidates offered a fair amount of choice. Therefore, he would like to encourage the vote against the motion before the Board. Edith Flynn stated she also would prefer four candidates. Barbara Price spoke in favor of the motion for seven, stating that probably only five would be running. Scott suggested that all seven candidates should be rank ordered so that if any of the four nominated were to decline, a replacement could be chosen.

Joseph Scott moved that a procedure for nominating executive counselors be adopted such that all seven names be submitted to the Board. Each Board member would have two votes and the four candidates with the most votes would be nominated for executive counselor. The other three would be rank ordered as alternates in the event that one candidate declined. Seconded by Elmer Johnson. In favor: 3, opposed, 8; motion fails.

Ronald Akers moved that the four names submitted by the Nominations Committee -- Marc Reidel, Benjamin Ward, Edith Flynn, and Sue Titus Reid be listed on the slate for executive counselor and that the committee vote to establish a ranking for the other three candidates -- Ron Huff, Albert Reiss and Charles Thomas as alternates. Seconded by Charles Wellford. In favor: 8, opposed; 5; motion carries.

Hackler stated he thought the vote would be individual as he would never vote for executive counselors running for a second time. A vote was then taken among the Board to determine the alternate to run for executive counselor. The vote was as follows: Ronald Huff - 10 votes; Charles Thomas - 3 votes; Albert Reiss - 2 votes.

Alvin Cohn requested that in his capacity as a guest at the meeting, he would like to comment on the annual spring rite on nominations. He noted the Society had denegraded the Nominations Committee by asking them to do a job and then playing games with their report. He strongly recommended that the Board take a look at its

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT (cont'd)

nominations procedure with an emphasis on how it should be organized and develop a policy on how to handle the process. Cohn suggested there be a committee to look at the nominating procedure in order to avoid going through this mess each year. Sagarin replied that the Board had endorsed the slate presented by the Nominations Committee. Jeffery stated that the report had been put together by the Committee with nominations from the Society members. Edith Flynn reported that the people that had been nominated by the Committee were on the slate for presentation to the membership. Cohn stated questions concerning how many should run and whether nominees should have worked in the Society, etc. should be considered by a committee and not each time by the Executive Board.

Joseph Scott will contact all nominees for office to confirm their acceptance or rejection:

President-Elect : Don Gottfredson and Marshall Clinard. (Daniel Glaser, Alt.)  
Vice-President Elect: Freda Adler, Harry Allen, Daniel Glaser, G. Thomas Gitchoff.  
Executive Counselor : Marc Reidel, Sue Titus Reid, Edith Flynn, Benjaïm Ward.  
 (Ronald Huff, Alt.)

AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT

Edward Sagarin made the report of the Awards Committee in the absence of its chair, Don Gottfredson. Sagarin reported that the Committee (Gottfredson, Sagarin and Simon Dinitz) met once via telephone conference.

For the Edwin Sutherland Award, the Committee nominated, in rank-order:

- 1) Seymour Halleck
- 2) Norval Morris

They listed the following nominees as alternates: Paul Gebhart, Rita Simon and Hans Zeisel. Sagarin stated that Gerhard Mueller was mentioned for the Sutherland Award but Gottfredson had wanted to consider Mueller for the Sellin-Glueck Award. The Sellin-Glueck Award is supposed to go to someone outside the United States, but Gottfredson thought it should go to someone doing international work, and would like this matter decided upon by the Board. Sagarin stated it would be in accordance with the spirit of the Committee to accept Mueller for the Sutherland Award.

Edith Flynn moved that Gerhard Mueller be accepted as the Sellin-Glueck nominee. Seconded by C. Ray Jeffery. Sagarin stated that personally he would like to support the issue that Mueller was not a proper candidate for this award. It wasn't a matter of an American doing international work. Jeffery replied that as chairman in the United Nations, Mueller does not work in the United States. This in effect made him international. Akers replied that the year Sagarin was President of the Society he was chairman of the Awards Committee and every year since then, he had raised objections that the description used for the Edwin Sutherland Award is not correct. He stated that the Herbert Block and Sellin-Glueck Awards were described accurately; the Sellin-Glueck award was described as being for people outside the United States. Wellford stated that in view of this description, Mueller's nomination would be out of order for the Sellin-Glueck Award.

A motion was made by James Inciardi and seconded by James Hackler that Gerhard Mueller was ineligible to be considered for the Sellin-Glueck Award. In favor: 9; opposed, 2. Motion carried.

AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT (cont'd)

Sagarin reported that although the names of Seymour Halleck and Norval Morris were given to the Board for consideration for the Edwin Sutherland Award, the name of Gerhard Mueller had also been suggested, but not voted on. Sagarin suggested that the Board have three unranked candidates: Seymour Halleck, Norval Morris and Gerhard Mueller. Harry Allen requested a synopsis of the Sutherland Award. Akers said that it was to go to someone who had made a major contribution to criminological research or theory in the areas of either theory of criminal justice or theory of criminology. It could be based on one major work or a lifetime of continued contribution. Jeffery stated it was always described as a scholarly or academic award.

James Hackler moved that the name of Albert Cohen be added to the list of nominees; seconded by Ronald Akers. Barbara Price moved that the names of Norval Morris, Gerhard Mueller and Seymour Halleck be placed before the Board for consideration of the Edwin Sutherland Award. Seconded by Harry Allen. Motion carried.

Following a rank-order vote by the Board, Seymour Halleck was declared the winner of the Edwin Sutherland Award.

Sagarin announced the nominees for the Sellin-Glueck Award were Nils Christie and Johannes Andeneas. He stated the Committee felt both men had made major contributions and made no preference in ranking. A vote was taken among the Board with the following results: Nils Christie - 8 votes; Johannes Andeneas - 2 votes.

Sagarin announced the nominees for the August Vollmer Award were Judge David Bazelon and Lady Barbara Wooton. The Committee again made no preference in ranking. Barbara Price nominated Sarah Hughes for the August Vollmer Award. A vote was taken among the Board with the following results: Judge David Bazelon - 10 votes; Lady Barbara Wooton - 4 votes.

Sagarin announced that the Committee had unanimously agreed that the Herbert Block Award should be given to Barbara Raffel Price. Charles Wellford moved the acceptance of the Committee's report; seconded by James Inciardi. Motion carried.

- Edwin Sutherland Award: Seymour Halleck
- Sellin-Glueck Award : Nils Christie
- August Vollmer Award : Judge David Bazelon
- Herbert Block Award : Barbara Raffel Price

Sagarin stated he had not come prepared to today's meeting with names for consideration to receive the Fellow awards. Harry Allen recommended William Parsonage for a Fellow award. Barbara Price stated she had forwarded the name of June Morrison to Don Gottfredson for consideration of a Fellow award. Sagarin stated he had not known that the Awards Committee was in charge of selecting Fellow recipients but would take it upon himself to have the committee give some suggestions to the Board for Fellow recipients within the next three weeks. Akers stated that he knew that one of the standards developed by the Executive Board for a Fellow recipient was that he/she should have been a member of the Society for at least five years. He suggested that next year's committee should have some further instructions and standards to follow in selecting Fellow recipients.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Harry Allen distributed copies of the April 1978 Cash Summary to the Board (Attachment B). He stated that if the Society met the membership drive total of 600 new members, he did not foresee any financial difficulty. Current rates of expenditure require that the Society meet its goal of 600 new members or there would be financial difficulty by next February, 1979. He stated the Executive Board expenses were probably the largest single item for the period. If the present trends continue, the Society's resources will be exhausted by the end of February 1979.

Alvin Cohn stated that he proposed in his 1979 Annual Meeting budget a \$5.00 student charge and suggested this be considered for this year's meeting in Dallas. Joe Scott stated that the first year the student joins the Society, it is a break-even process and he was opposed to a charge for the student to attend the meeting. He would prefer to encourage more students to join the Society. James Inciardi made a motion that the Society not charge a fee of \$5.00 for the students to attend the annual meeting in Dallas. Seconded by Charles Wellford; motion carried.

Allen stated that, hearing no objections from the Board, he would notify the April pending members that they had been accepted into the Society.

President Jeffery asked Akers and Cohn to notify the hotel that he was displeased with some of their arrangements, particularly restaurant accommodations on Saturday.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT

Harry Allen requested from the Board permission to distribute, at a price, upon request copies of the ASC Analysis of Membership. Seconded by James Hackler. Motion carried.

JOINT COMMISSION ON CRIMINOLOGY AND  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION AND STANDARDS

President Jeffery announced that the Commission is in operation and has been meeting regularly. Julius Debro has been appointed the Principal Investigator for the Commission, and he is making plans to bring two or three assistants to the Commission. They hope to be fully manned by June 1, and the Commission will then go forward. He stated the big issue emerging from the Commission is whether criminology is criminal justice. If not, should they have separate, distinct roles in the university system? The Commission is basically concerned with the Master's programs with one part-time instructor. Jeffery stated he was much more concerned with the Graduate programs. Akers inquired if the difference were a conceptual one where criteria or accreditation criteria might be applied differentially? Jeffery stated the issue concerning whether ASC should merge with ACJS was still before us, and that answers to this question would come out of our Task Force Report and our future negotiations with the Joint Commission. He saw the two societies as being necessary at this time, noting that ASC has to represent the academic side of criminology. Jeffery would be opposed to a merger at this point if it meant a return to a police science kind of education.

Flynn stated she found one part of the conversation at the Commission meeting interesting. Peter Lejins said the market was very good for the development of new Ph.D. criminal justice programs. She stated she had brought up the subject that

JOINT COMMISSION (cont'd)

there were so many Ph.D.'s unemployed in Sociology. Lejins had responded, she stated, that they needed retraining. Allen reported that at the end of the last Joint Commission meeting George Felkenes had asked for names of people from ASC to serve on an Accreditation Committee with ACJS. Jeffery stated he had received a letter from Felkenes to that effect. Flynn stated that ACJS is better organized and they are more involved in recruiting. There was a motion that no members of ASC should be actively representing ASC in serving on any accreditation committee until the Executive Board so authorized. Seconded by Barbara Price. Jeffery stated the Accreditation Council would serve as a decision-making body and was separate from the executive structure of the Academy. Allen moved that the Board go on record as not providing any names for this committee until after the Executive Board so gave its authorization. Allen stated he thought the Society was being co-opted and that at the last Business Meeting of the ASC, the Board had told its members that they were not going to let this happen. Now we are being asked to do it. He also suggested that there was a long range game plan that had been thought out, and he was simply reporting that there was a movement afoot.

Flynn noted that the Joint Commission was supposed to be looking at the feasibility of accreditation, but in the meantime they were going ahead and doing it.

Akers stated there were more appropriate stands. He felt we need to have input into the findings of the Joint Commission, and that nothing would be done until this was resolved. Wellford recalled the phrase used by Amos of "the Society putting its head in the sand." You have to keep in mind that ACJS has two ways of gaining accreditation power, he stated. One is through LEAA, and that was what the Joint Commission was about. The second way was through the Council on Postsecondary Education. He argued it didn't seem justifiable to join the Commission to protect our interest in accrediting criminal justice programs, but not to do the same thing on the Council. He felt it would be much easier to resign from the Council and have our representatives say there were moving in the wrong direction; withdraw and have a legal basis to go to COPA. He also noted we could go to LEAA and tell them that we felt we were going down the wrong path. Akers said this would be independent of the findings of the Joint Commission. Wellford stated ACJS had contended that from the beginning, and that in the business meetings they were going ahead with accreditation regardless of what the Commission did.

Allen stated they have asked us to nominate people from ASC for the site team. Sagarin stated he was against accreditation but was concerned that a group was going in that direction and that it would be very unfortunate for the only really scholarly non-practitioner group of people in the field to have been left out. He stated he was very unhappy to see any type of accreditation and that he personally was in favor of a free, academic scholarly conception. He also noted that there was a strong element in favor of criminology becoming "how well you can handle guns" and "how well you can investigate a homicide" and that was the group that would be doing accreditation if we left it up to ACJS. Ward stated he would like to second this. He noted that one of the schools in Albany was moving for accreditation. They were very unhappy with the Academy doing this. The academics were opposed because they were going to lose. Ward stated we had to be involved if we wanted to keep it at a higher level.

Jeffery stated the big issue was whether or not to join them. He stated his opposition was not to join, because we were not accrediting criminology. Akers said we should neither oppose without knowledge of what has been happening; nor should we go in blind and be co-opted. He said if we defined criminology as criminal justice and vice versa and accreditation came in, LEAA could say we would only hire

JOINT COMMISSION (cont'd)

people out of accredited programs. If only criminal justice were accredited, criminology would suffer. Jeffery stated if you became part of criminal justice and admitted it was what you should be doing, you had already lost the battle. Flynn stated she disagreed with the philosophy that people educated in other than criminal justice Ph.D. programs were not eligible to educate.

Wellford stated that when the issue first came up in July 1976, Gilbert Geis was then president. Geis asked Wellford to get in touch with the Council on Postsecondary Education. Their position then and as of a year ago was very simple. They would not approve ACJS as the accrediting body if there were a jurisdictional dispute. They were going to require two or three groups in this discipline come to COPA with a unified plan. In July 1976, ACJS stated they approached ASC and were told that they did not want to be a part of it. When they go with COPA they could go separately or let ASC go to COPA and tell them we have a dispute.

Jeffery stated they wanted one person to be on their site visitation accreditation council. Allen stated that that was not in accordance with the letter Felkenes had talked to him about. Felkenes had asked for a large number of names of people to serve on site visit teams that would be separate from the evaluation groups. Allen noted that we have told the membership that we are not going to be engaged in accreditation at the Business Meeting in Atlanta, and if we are going to change this we have to inform the membership.

Cohn suggested there was an inference of good versus bad guys. He felt the basic position was that most of us were not happy with what was going on with extremely poor instruction and curriculum. He noted that Price Foster was not in a position to order minimum standards in terms of either, and was looking to the field for advice. Cohn said that he agreed 100 percent with both of Wellford's positions, noting that our hands would not be clean if we went to COPA with a sour-grapes position stating we did not like the way they did things. He also suggested we were overstepping and over generalizing the final steps of accreditation. There was no way anyone was going to go to a sociology department and tell them what to teach. He noted our participation was absolutely essential in order to distinguish criminology from criminal justice, and that our withdrawal was a "head in the sand" issue. Cohn noted we had an obligation to sit on the council and voice our concerns and, if we are dissatisfied, to withdraw in protest. Allen reiterated that the Society had told the membership that they were not going to do this. Allen moved that the Board place before the membership a statement of the pros and cons of becoming actively involved on the ongoing accreditation movement and ask them to approve or disapprove the Society becoming involved in that effort. Seconded by Edith Flynn. Elmer Johnson inquired if the Board were moving too quickly and questioned whether they were asking us to participate in something that was being considered? Jeffery stated it was already in operation. He noted that we had emphasized that we were studying it, trying to understand what it meant, and trying to have an open mind on the thing. Jeffery noted we could not act until the point where we were able to present our membership what it meant. He felt we were over-reacting by going to the membership prematurely.

Cohn suggested that there were a number of unresolved issues and there appeared to be an inability on the part of the Board to come to grips with suggestion that the Chair appoint a three-person committee to meet with ACJS and Price Foster to sit down to deliberate dispute issues and concerns. He said there was a need for a statement of mutual understanding substantive issues so that if the Board chose to go to the membership it had a statement. He noted that at present we did not have a clear



JOINT COMMISSION (cont'd)

statement concerning where our conflicts lie, in order to understand exactly what the differences are.

Akers stated he was not sure what the Board would say to the membership. He said that if we were confused then the membership would also be confused. He felt the task force could decide if this were one of the directions of the Society or make recommendations concerning whether the Society should move in this direction.

Flynn noted the issue could be stated very clearly by describing what the Academy was doing in the area of accreditation. Hackler stated that going to the membership was not always a good strategy for complex issues. He suggested we ask people use our newsletter to spell out some of the dilemma and to encourage people that were interested, rather than going to a vote, because a vote tied our hands. He felt we should let them know what was going on and let them respond.

Jeffery said whether you view the Society as criminology or criminal justice was clear. Sagarin stated the membership consisted overwhelmingly of Ph.D.'s and academics, and they should be able to understand the vote or motion or accompanying statements that would be explaining and urging one way or the other. He argued against the idea that the membership would be confused, noting that competent people should draw up statements that would not confuse the membership. Cohn stated that we did not have all the facts and that ACJS had an obligation to us to present it in writing. Flynn stated they have their agenda, know exactly what they want, and therefore don't owe us any explanation. Price asked if the committee that was on the Commission could develop a statement for possible submission to the membership and first send it to the Executive Board for its reaction. This could be done by mail, using a statement that represented the entire Executive Board. Cohn stated the task force should deal with it and let it be a priority item. Johnson stated that we could point out to them that we could not have any one from our group to be on this group when accreditation had not yet been established. Akers stated the letter could be answered simply -- the task force or special committee was taking the matter under advisement. It was being considered by the appropriate committee and they would come up with an answer and their consideration. Scott stated it was strange to put it before the membership when the Board could not come to a consensus with considerable more information that we could possibly provide the membership on the issues. Jeffery stated the issue was whether criminal justice was accredited in the same manner as criminology. Flynn stated that people who digressed in areas other than crime were to be retooled. Cohn stated the matter should be referred to the task force.

Hackler stated the newsletter was a good vehicle for this sort of thing, for although it didn't poll the entire membership, it reached people who had concerns. Hackler said a poll could be sent out to see if the members approved or disapproved. Ward inquired whether the task force would take this on or if the matter required a motion. Akers replied that as of yet no task force had been formed but that the matter was critical enough that the task force should take it on. Sagarin wanted to know if an issue of the newsletter could be devoted entirely to this issue? An article on the pros and cons could be written and feedback requested for the next issue. Cohn stated the July issue's deadline was May 15 if someone were willing to write the article. Following a brief discussion, the decision was that the Board would look into the issue. The question was called and the motion failed for lack of a majority (6-6).

ISA STOCKHOLM MEETING

In the absence of Paul Friday, Joe Scott reported that the plans for the Stockholm meeting were pretty well set up. There would be four different panels with 8-1/2 hours devoted to each panel. The section on Crime Trends has representatives from 25 countries presenting papers on crime trends in the various parts of the world. Scott said "special flight arrangements (New York to Stockholm) have been made and this information can be obtained by writing directly to Paul Friday. Accommodations are somewhat reasonably priced given the prices in Sweden at this time." Hackler stated a notice would be sent to all Executive Board members within the next few days regarding the meeting.

Allen stated that when he talked to Friday today, Friday told him that the Scandinavian Research Council was preparing to send 20 people to the United States on tour. Primarily they were going to be at research institutes and universities. No money was involved, but some people will be asked to host the group. Sagarin stated he would be happy to host a meeting in New York. Scott indicated he would be happy to host a meeting at Ohio State University.

1979 ANNUAL MEETING - PHILADELPHIA

Akers announced that he had appointed Alvin Cohn as the program chair for the 1979 annual meeting and had selected two committees that had to be ratified by the Board. He had selected a Local Arrangements and Program Committee and had asked for and received the members' consent.

Program Committee: Travis Hirschi, Benjamin Ward, Barbara Price and Alvin Cohn.

Local Arrangements: Marilyn C. Slivka, Chair; Peter C. Buffum, Terence Thornberry, and Donald C. Engle.

He stated the composition of both the Local Arrangements Committee and Program Committee reflect the theme which is CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE: CONVERGENCES AND DIVERGENCES.

He stated in looking over the membership report that the Society is still predominately academic, but that we were a joint and dual organization. Therefore, every annual meeting had to try to accommodate the two groups. The Committee has divided up the responsibilities among its members in the following manner:

Travis Hirschi: Sessions having criminology theory and research.  
Benjamin Ward : Sessions having criminal justice practice and policies.  
Barbara Price : Sessions on evaluation and operations research.  
Alvin W. Cohn : Sessions in criminology and criminal justice education and other categories.

Jeffery inquired if any attention had been paid to discussion on issues from both sides? Akers replied that as soon as the award winners were known, it was hoped that they could be incorporated as plenary speakers. The Committee would wait to find out who the winners were before announcing any plenary speakers. He also stated each candidate should prepare a statement from their point of view re the differences of divergences over the years of criminology and criminal justice.

1979 ANNUAL MEETING (cont'd)

Akers stated they had had their first committee meeting yesterday, May 5th. He had encouraged each of these people to make the categories have separate participation. For papers, they tried to address the issues on one side and then the other. Cohn stated the present plan was to have the four members of the program meeting with two or three association members and divide the responsibilities among their categories. They were to select the papers and each would be responsible for about 20 panels. There would be a series of informal workshops on criminology and criminal justice. These would leave room for those who didn't fit into panels and needed to get on the program -- similar to Tucson. Akers noted that upwards of 300-350 people were technically on the program, and they were trying to settle down to about 70 panels.

Cohn distributed copies of the proposed 1979 Annual Meeting Budget to the Board for their consideration (Attachment C). He stated the budget was self-explanatory, with three things that could possibly change. There was a projected \$5.00 student charge at the meeting which the Board agreed could be decided upon after the Dallas meeting. The price of the exhibitors would be less because the space would not be charged by the hotel. An assumed cost of \$25.00 was projected for booth decoration. Also on the proposed budget was a \$1.00 per night rebate per registrant from the hotel which Cohn stated was legal and ethical as he understood it. Cohn noted he planned to stay with the same registration fees for the 1979 meeting as for Dallas this year -- \$30-35 members; \$40-45 non-members. He stated the expenses would not be more than \$15,000-16,000 which a conservative estimate of 450 registrants would cover with revenues.

Cohn noted they were planning for a Tuesday night arrival, Wednesday morning orientation with the president and chair welcoming the registrants to the meeting and detailing the program plans, and closing Friday evening with a dinner dance. Awards could be presented briefly. He stated unless the President of the United States were a speaker, the Committee was not planning a heavy program. They were hopeful to get a band to play for the dinner dance at a reasonable rate, and that a large amount of the rebate money from the hotel would go towards securing a band. Cohn requested that the members try to arrange for the billing of any hotel expenses which had Texas or Pennsylvania tax added. This money could go to a tax-exempt organization in that state and the Society could save \$300-500 on the total bill. He strongly suggested this idea for Dallas. Cohn stated if the Society were thinking of an annual report this should be put into the program with an overprint for the members that were not at the annual meeting as part of the printing costs, together with the agenda for the annual Business Meeting, treasurer's report, Membership Committee report, etc. Hackler inquired if the committee had considered a breakfast brain-storming? Cohn replied the panels would begin at 8:30 a.m. and that roundtables would be at the end of the afternoon around 4:15 or 4:45 p.m. Their present intent was to go through the list of luminaries in criminology and criminal justice and try to get them on the program so they would be available for the workshops. No one would be on the program more than once; you cannot present twice. Sagarin requested that the exception should be a co-author.

Harry Allen moved the approval of the 1979 Annual Meeting Budget dated May 3, 1978; seconded by Elmer Johnson. Motion carried.

THE CRIMINOLOGIST REPORT

Alvin Cohn reported that the newsletter was now going into its third year of publication. As usual, he stated, the Board had been remiss in sending materials to

THE CRIMINOLOGIST REPORT (cont'd)

him and on time. The July issue deadline is May 15. Please send any material to him by that time. Cohn stated he would give four or five pages in the July issue to ACJS comments if someone would prepare the article. He suggested that it be made as a letter to the editor so that it showed a personal opinion rather than a position of the Board of the Society. Cohn stated that \$800 a year was spent on mailings to the membership and that every other national organization used their newsletter as the source of information to their membership. It was noted that Sage Publications could not be relied upon to get the publications to the membership as many members were writing the executive office stating they had not received their publications. The consensus of the Board was that members did like to receive letters from the executive office. Most mailings to the membership are done at bulk-rate costs of 2-1/2¢ each. The monthly mailings going first-class are request for dues which is mandatory by the post office. Elmer Johnson inquired if a form could be placed in the newsletter requesting payment of dues. The executive office noted they would check with the post office to see if this were permissible.

1978 CONVENTION UPDATE

President Jeffery commented that the plans for the 1978 meeting in Dallas were well firmed up. He and Paul Brantingham visited the hotel two weeks ago, and on the surface, it looked like a good place. Over 70 sessions have been planned at this point, as well as some workshops.

Student Paper Competition: Edith Flynn reported that as of this date, she had received seven papers for the Student Paper Competition and all were excellent. She noted that Jamie Fox and Nicky Hahn were working with her. Jeffery stated he would look into the matter of having the student paper winners present their papers in some segment of the program at Dallas.

Visiting Foreign Criminologists: Joseph Scott reported that he had talked with Paul Friday and Gerhard Mueller and that Mueller would be providing names of foreign criminologists for possible invitation to the Dallas meeting. Scott reported that Stanislaus Frankowski of Poland had contacted several East Europeans regarding their interest in the meeting. They would try to set up special sessions on Eastern and foreign criminology. Fifty institutions have pledged \$150 to have the foreign criminologists present a seminar at their universities and will provide room and board. Letters will be sent out inviting them to attend the Dallas meeting. Sagarin reported that Sir Leon Radzinowicz would be at John Jay College for one year and that Scott might wish to invite him to the meeting. Scott stated that suggested itineraries would be planned for the criminologists. He would try to set up three or four visits for them that would provide approximately \$400-600 income to defray their expenses. It would be up to each individual criminologist to purchase his air fare from his country to the United States. Scott inquired if the Board had any suggestions for foreign criminologists to whom he could extend invitations. Hackler suggested Radzinsky; Allen suggested Said Hekmat, Iran; check with Emilio Viano re Varna Bulgaria meeting on Penal Law.

Allen reported that he had talked to Paul Brantingham this week and that Paul was in the process of sending out the abstracts to the session organizers with all information detailed.

1978 CONVENTION UPDATE (cont'd)

Committee Activities Report: Allen reported that ACJS had produced a report on the activities of its various committee for distribution to the membership. Allen had talked to Gottfredson about putting such a report together for ASC which would come out of the operating expenses of the offices. If there were no objection from the Board, the executive office would proceed in the preparation of this report.

FUTURE ASC ANNUAL MEETINGS

1980 San Francisco Contract: Copies of the proposed contract from the Sheraton-Palace Hotel had previously been distributed to the Board for their consideration. Allen recommended that the contract be approved following perusal by the Society's attorney. He also had received a proposed contract from the Capital Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C. for the 1981 meeting. If the Society could meet the first Wednesday after Election Day, the hotel will give the Society a considerable discount to hold the annual meeting at that time. Allen noted it was imperative that the Society secure the sites as early as possible, particularly 1980 and 1981.

Allen stated he had received a proposal from a San Juan hotel for the 1982 meeting, but that the contract had some problems and he would check into it further. Allen stated the Denver Hilton had asked the Society to meet there in 1983. It is similar to the Capital Hilton in Washington, D.C. If we could meet the second week in November, they would be willing to knock approximately 20 percent of their rates. Allen stated he would move forward in asking them to give the Society a firm proposal.

CRIMINOLOGY REPORT

Sagarin reported that the editorship under Sagarin and MacNamara was coming to its close. The May issue was on the press, and the August issue would be their last issue. Sagarin reported that with the May issue they attempted something different -- they deliberately generated conflicting points of view. He noted there was an article on Deterrence and they had sent it out to four people with different points of view. All consented to write a response and three of the four did. Three articles were generated on Violence and Southernness. He described the last issue as an invited issue in which the broad subject of criminology -- new concerns and new directions -- was discussed. Only former ASC presidents or recipients of the Sutherland and Vollmer Award were invited to write statements about what they were thinking about the present crime situation and where criminology stands. He received nine promises to write articles, but only had room for 8; so he dropped one out arbitrarily. Sagarin reported he would write a statement of his own which would accompany statements by Don Gottfredson, Marshall Clinard, Gilbert Geis, Donald Cressey, Simon Dinitz and C. Ray Jeffery. He noted the issue was now at Sage and had generated a great deal of interest. Sage was anxious to put it out as a book. They wanted to print extra copies at their own expense and sell the issue itself as well as the book. He stated they had come to the end of their term which had been a very difficult experience but a fruitful one.

Inciardi reported that the first issue under his editorship was to have been a specialized issue but Sage was reluctant to have specialized issues back-to-back. He reported the second issue was pretty well squared away and was devoted to Radical Criminology: Pros and Cons. Contributors to that issue are Ronald Akers, Austin Turk, Jackson Toby, and Richard Quinney. He reported there had been an overwhelming response to that issue and he had a proposal in to Sage to expand that issue into a

CRIMINOLOGY REPORT (cont'd)

book, Symposium on Radical Criminology in the United States, to include some of the overflow papers. It would be published probably six months after the appearance of that particular issue of the journal. He reported that submissions were coming in about the same rate that they were at the last meeting and that there was still a 92-94 percent rejection rate.

Akers stated that the Board owed the outgoing editors, Edward Sagarin and Donal E.J. MacNamara, a vote of thanks and wished the incoming editor, James Inciardi, the best. Seconded by Barbara Price. Motion carried.

Inciardi reported that the five volume proceedings for 1977 (Atlanta) were scheduled on:

- 1) Violence - James Inciardi and Anne Pottieger
- 2) Policy Issues - John Conrad
- 3) Qualitative Research and Criminology - Charles Wellford
- 4) Theory - Ronald Akers and Marvin Krohn
- 5) Discretion in the Criminal Justice System - Peter Lejins.

Sage could get four of the five volumes in print for the Dallas meeting if they received them by early June. One volume was ready to go out next week and all looked like they would be ready for the submission June date.

President Jeffery reported he had received a bill in the amount of \$259.00 from Praeger Publishers for the defunct Police Attitudes book by Wilson and Grosman. Praeger wanted to know how the Society wished to pay the bill -- directly or take from the royalty account? The breakdown was \$192 for copy editing, \$18 photo copying and \$49 staff time. Sagarin reported that it looked like a legitimate bill, but he would be willing to attempt to negotiate with Praeger, if the Board so desired. The Board agreed and Sagarin will be in contact with President Jeffery within a week regarding the outcome.

ERA AMENDMENT

Scott reported that the ERA Amendment mailed previously to the Board for their approval would be modified to include on the ballot return: (1) Yes, I favor the Society endorsing the Equal Rights Amendment; (2) No, I favor the Society not endorsing the Equal Rights Amendment, and (3) The Society should not endorse any political activity.

INTERIM STEERING COMMITTEE

President Jeffery stated an ad hoc committee should be formed in the event that any emergencies should arise between now and the next scheduled Board meeting in November. A motion was made by Edith Flynn and seconded by Harry Allen that the President, President-Elect, Vice President, Vice-President Elect and Treasurer be authorized to act in the absence of the Executive Board in an emergency situation. Motion carried.

TASK FORCE ON FUTURE GOALS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE ASC

Akers reported he was responding to a specific charge that was directed to him at the San Diego meeting and that copies of his March 14 memo had been distributed previously to the Executive Board. He stated he had received letters from Charles Wellford and Harry Allen regarding this charge and with some of his own ideas felt that the task force should be two groups rather than one. He felt that the items discussed at today's meeting -- site visits and accreditation -- should be added to the list of charges proposed for Task Force A. Task Force B would be oriented to a more immediate task of considering the feasibility of establishing a fuller, permanent staff of ASC. The desirability of both these groups was evidenced, he stated.

Task Force B: It was noted that the Society was rapidly approaching a critical point. It was not large enough to establish a permanent office with a paid executive officer. At the same time, he stated, the Society was critically in need of that. He stated the Society had used Harry Allen until they had almost used him out. In thinking of how we could find someone else to fill all those roles, he reported he came up blank. It would be hard to find and duplicate this volunteer type of service. We had to at least consider the feasibility and that was what Task Force B would do. An office that would include Sarah, a professional or semi-professional staff of an executive secretary or director -- a paid administrator. Some interim arrangement might be made. Without trying to predetermine or tie anybody's hands, Akers had Al Cohn check on locations in Washington, D.C. He stated he did not prejudge the issue. "It could be the worst place in the world to have an executive office," he commented. Cohn called Nicholas Kittrie at the American University and said basically that ASC didn't know what was going to happen but if we decided to have an office in Washington, D.C., he wanted to know if Kittrie would be willing to make space available to the Society at the Institute. He stated that Kittrie had replied yes, at no rental charge. Only the phone service would be charged, although nothing was mentioned regarding office furniture or equipment.

Akers stated he recommended a composition for both task forces and had not suggested that anyone be a chair.

Task Force A: Charles Wellford -- much of the task and call charge comes from his memo.  
Gilbert Geis -- as a past president and someone that has a global view of the organization.  
Paul Friday -- his continuing interest in the international aspects and to get him back into the national role.  
Edward Sagarin -- viewed him as having a global viewpoint of the system and has through the years very good ideas about the management of the Society and its goals.

He stated he had not approached any of them individually as he did not see that as his role; they were merely his suggestions.

Task Force B: Harry E. Allen -- couldn't do it without Allen being on the force.  
Alvin W. Cohn -- his very good administrative skills and contacts. Submitted memo and talked about the feasibility and prospects of office.  
Barbara Price -- served in this kind of volunteer capacity in the p  
William E. Amos -- as a past president; has some good ties in Washington and elsewhere. Has a good view of what it takes to run an office.

TASK FORCE (cont'd)

Hackler stated there was a fifth point that might be added to Task Force A -- the leadership future of the organization. More dilemmas would become apparent as the organization increased in size. He noted there was also a price one paid as it got broader. The size of the Board, and we are probably getting to the limit of the size to have meaningful discussions, he stated. The other problem was how to get new talent into the Society without pushing some people out. He made two suggestions: (1) was there some way of having an extended board versus a nuclear board? The extended board could meet at the annual meeting and the nuclear board could meet in between? (2) Was there some way we could have people circulate through the organization and then clearly move out? Should we say to the past president, join us for the first meeting past your term and then that is all? The physical presence at meetings tended to bring problems. Wellford reported that when Akers was in Washington, they had had a chance to meet with Price Foster and George Datesman. They did put into their plan for both this years' funding and next years' some of the ideas listed in Task Force A. He noted we should be aware that there was some chance that ASC could get funding in the not-too-distant future in Task Force A. Akers reported that in the biennium request, they listed some items which reflected the same issues of Task A.

Allen stated that the costs associated with a move of this nature -- an office of an executive director, administrative assistant, two secretaries placed in Washington, D.C. etc. -- would be looking three years down the road. Under the present dues structure of the Society, Allen reported, the Society would have to have 10,000 members to move to Washington, D.C. If we received a large number of grants to help maintain these operations, the Society would turn into a soft-money operation like ACA, Rand Corp., or ASA and there would be a fairly large budget.

Akers stated he desired down-to-earth figures that they could work with. How much would it cost? how many staff? what was the timetable? what would the office look like? He felt the Board needed to have some pretty swift action on this. Hackler inquired if point five -- the future of the leadership of ASC could be included? Allen suggested that Don Gottfredson be added to the list of members on Task Force A. Jeffery stated he would like to have more input from the Council. Flynn suggested that considering the Academy issue was the most urgent one, one person from the Commission should be on Task Force A but she declined. Akers suggested that Frank Scarpitti be placed on Task Force A. Jeffery suggested that the president-elect also be a member of Task Force A, but in the event that Gottfredson were elected, he would already be on the Task Force. Allen stated that June 1 was the last possible date for paying dues and that by May 15 the executive office could go out with a statement to the membership requesting write-in nominations. Hackler stated he thought it would be more important that the president-elect be a member of Task Force A.

Akers suggested that both Task Force A and B be prepared by the November Executive Board meeting for a more-or-less final report, and he would be happy to appoint a chair for each task force. Akers suggested Wellford as chair of Task Force A and Allen chair of Task Force B. Allen stated he would like to add someone else to Task Force B who was not part of the current Board, but was not prepared at this time to give a name. Akers inquired if there were a strong feeling that he should be a member of Task Force A or simply after preparing the current work, step out. The Board agreed that his own position as president at the time the report was submitted would be less compromised. Johnson stated it would give an objective stance to this and whatever the report came out with, Akers would not be involved in its decision. With those modifications of the report, Allen was designated as chair



TASK FORCE (cont'd)

of Task Force B with one more member to be added, which will make it a 5-member team, by the chair of that group. Wellford will be listed as chair of Task Force A. Scott stated that there were two people cut from the original council to ACJS who could contribute substantially to the two task forces--Charles Newman and Donal E.J. MacNamara--and suggested assigning one man to each task force. Akers stated this should not be used to assuage hard feelings. Wellford stated that due to the financial status of the Society, the members of the Task Force should look at covering their own expenses. Johnson inquired whether when the report is received, if it would go to the Executive Board or membership? Akers replied it would be initially a Board report at Dallas, and then it was up to the Board to decide where to go from there. Once a decision was made by the Board, then the Board should go to the membership with a plan and recommendation. Scott moved that the proposal be accepted as amended. Motion carried. It was accepted only as a Task Force.

NEW BUSINESS

Akers reported that regarding the timing problems with regards to nominations and elections, he would like authorization to present names to the Board for a Nominations Committee before the Dallas meeting so that notices could go out to the membership to get closing nominations by the February meeting of the Board. He indicated he would follow these guidelines: there should be at least five members; they should name their own chair; should be knowledgeable about who had made contributions to the field of criminology, and has a vision of contributions to the Society; some contributions to the field and Society for president and vice president. For elected Board members there are other things that come into play. Akers would like to receive authorization today to pass to the Board in the mail the names of people he would like to recommend for these committees -- Nominations and Publications.

Hackler stated he was aware the characteristics would be excellent for a portion of the committee and a mixture might be better; geographical representation might come in here. He stated he would name at least one person who would be in the category outside the visible leadership structure. People were needed that had vision of the field and organization. Hackler suggested an interim chairman. The people should be appointed so they can do their work in Dallas or before, then they could have their first meeting in Dallas. There could be a committee report at the February meeting. Barbara Price moved Akers have authorization to appoint Nominations and Publications Committee; seconded by James Inciardi; motion carried.

Akers stated that some of the members on the Publications Committee must be members of the Executive Board. He noted the situation we had right now was that the editor of the journal was also chair of the Publications Committee which was an undue burden. He felt this represented a conflict of interest. He said he would like authorization to suggest today the name of a chair and offer another soft tradition and send in the mail to the Board the names of committee members. Akers stated that the year he was elected vice president he didn't know what he was to do beside sit on the Board. He would like to see the vice president have some specific job and that he suggested that the vice president automatically be considered as the prime candidate for the chair of the Publications Committee during the year he is in office. Frank Scarpitti would be the chair of the Publications Committee under Akers' term of office. Jeffery reported that the vice president was chair of the Committee on Committees which would automatically put him on the Publications Committee.

Akers moved that Frank Scarpitti be designated to chair the Publications Committee and Akers will transit in writing to the Board further names of the Publications Committee. Seconded by James Inciardi; motion carried.

NEXT SCHEDULED EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

President Jeffery announced that the next Executive Board meeting would be November 8, 1978, 3:00 p.m., Sheraton-Dallas Hotel, Dalls, Texas.

He stated he would plan to have some kind of informal cocktail gathering at 6:00 p.m., before the first session of the program at 7:30 or 8:00 p.m.

There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Charles Wellford to adjourn the business meeting at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph E. Scott  
Executive Secretary