

To: ASC Board  
From: Chris Eskridge  
Date: November 4, 2003  
Re: Executive Director Annual Report

This has been a very busy six months to say the least. The bottom line is that we are financially healthy, and we remain a vibrant, healthy, active professional society. There is much going on in many spheres in our organization.

*1. ASC Financial Status*

As noted above, we continue to be a financially stable and sound organization. As of September 30, 2003 our total assets were \$1,120,000. To put this in some perspective, realize that our total assets as of December 31, 1997 were \$573,000. Our income continues to flow from four primary sources, interest and dividends from our investments, CRIMINOLOGY library sales, meeting registration fees, and membership dues. Hopefully we can add library sales from CRIMINOLOGY & PUBLIC POLICY to our list of significant revenue sources in the future, but at present, we have less than 100 library subscriptions to CPP.

I have attached three financial reports which articulate our financial position in more detail:

- A. *2003 Profit and Loss Statement (3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report)* - We have realized a \$36,700 profit to date, but this figure does warrant some discussion. We usually are at a loss at this point in the year. By point of comparison, our 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter loss last year at this point was \$28,500. We are a year-end fiscally loaded organization. The bulk of the annual meeting registrations have yet to come in, as have our CRIMINOLOGY library subscriptions. In addition, the bulk of our investment income is not accrued until the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter. The reason that we are in the black at present is due to the fact that we have yet to print several issues of CRIMINOLOGY. We are poised to see a positive economic flow, but given the substantial printing costs yet to be I will provide the Board with the bottom line figure for 2003 in late January.
- B. *2003 Balance Sheet (3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report)* - As noted above, our total paper assets continue to hover in the \$1.1 million range though our actual market value has certainly dropped. We are conservatively invested in mutual funds and bonds. Our plan at present is to continue to take any excess funds that may accrue in our checking account and move them into bank certificates of deposit.
- C. *2003 Budget Comparison (3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report)* - We had budgeted \$808,000 for our expenses in the year 2003, and have spent 56 percent of that (\$452,400) through the third quarter. We had anticipated \$808,000 in income for the year and have realized \$489,000 or 60 percent of this to date.

## *2. Division Financial Status*

The following financial information has been given to the Division Chairs:

Corrections and Sentencing Division: funds as of 9/30/03 - \$7,473; current membership 286.

Critical Division: funds as of 9/30/03 - \$12,249; current membership 306.

International Division: funds as of 9/30/03 - \$4,496; current membership 411.

People of Color and Crime: funds as of 9/30/03 - \$145; current membership 181.

Women and Crime: funds as of 9/30/03 - \$7,729; current membership 375.

## *3. Proposed 2004 Budget (attached)*

We are quite a dynamic entity, as the proposed budget would suggest. As detailed, we are projecting \$780,000 in income and have balanced that with \$780,000 in expected expenses. Two significant expenditures on the horizon should cause us some concern - CPP as of September 2004 when the NIJ grant runs out, and the Undergraduate Minority Fellowship Program, though the nature of this initiative, as of this writing, is still somewhat up in the air.

## *4. Web Page*

We continue to update our web page, and have spent considerable time maintaining and updating with the membership directory. We have also spent a fair amount of resources on maintaining the area of expertise page. We have also added a number of archival/historical items to the web page such as a list of all former ASC officers as far back as our records take us (by year and by office), a list of all meeting sites, themes and program chairs, and pictures of most of our former presidents.

## *5. CRIMINOLOGY & PUBLIC POLICY, and CRIMINOLOGY*

As I believe you are all aware, we formally received funding for a third year of funding for CPP (\$105,440). We are now in the process of seeking external support for CPP and hope to have some concrete commitments to share with the Board by the Mid-Year Meeting.

As you are also aware, the publication of Criminology has been somewhat delayed. I met with Bob and Jennifer in St. Louis in late October, and John Laub was on the phone with us. We considered the status of each manuscript as well as each of the next three remaining issues (May, August, November), and developed a plan of action. I also met with Rick Rosenfeld who offered substantial UMSL assistance. We all feel good about the meeting and the plan that has been developed. Consequently, the following announcement was posted in three different places on the ASC web page:

The publication of *Criminology* has been delayed due to serious illness. We are diligently seeking to get back on schedule. At this point, we are targeting the May issue to be mailed by November 15, the mailing of the August issue is targeted for December 15, and the November issue will be mailed by January 15. This will put us back on schedule. The Editorial Staff deeply regrets any inconvenience that may have been caused by this delay.

Bob Bursik  
Jennifer Bursik

#### 6. *Policy and Procedures Manual*

We have updated the Policy and Procedures manual as per the decisions made by the Board at the Mid-year meetings. We have the revised version in hard copy form, as well as on the web.

#### 7. *Personnel*

- A. Sue Beelman, our bookkeeper is currently paid \$32,238 per year for a contractual 32 hour work week. Sue is very task oriented and goes the extra mile to complete what needs to be done regardless of the clock. Her work has been complicated of late with the addition of a new journal and all of the accounting requirements involved in managing the fiscal aspects of our NIJ grant. Sue receives very high marks from our auditor, who regularly comments on her precision and attention to detail. She provides me with any piece of financial information that I need in a most timely fashion, and is an invaluable part of our central office team. I recommend a 3 percent pay raise. This would increase her salary to \$33,205.
- B. Sarah begins her 28<sup>th</sup> year with us in January. As we all know, she is deeply devoted to ASC and I shudder to think where this profession would be without her. As I travel, I find that some folks, due to the nature of their teaching and research activities, may have heard of Laub, and others Cullen or Sherman, but everyone, and I mean EVERYONE in this discipline, knows Sarah Hall. She continues to perform far above and beyond the call of duty. I wish to particularly point out that she has continued to work with the CMS program and has made a number of valuable improvements in this software program. She is currently paid \$61,238. I recommend a 3 percent pay raise. This would increase her salary to \$63,075.
- C. Please be aware that we hire Rita Hollingshead on a part-time basis to help us in Columbus during high workload periods (stuff meeting packets, newsletter mailings, etc). Rita will be helping out at registration in Denver this year. We also use the services of Lindsey Jackson and Suchi Sharma in the Lincoln office to help primarily with web page items (membership directory, area of expertise, journal abstracts). Ms. Jackson is an accounting major and will be helping with the financial aspects of the SOC meeting as well, and she will be assisting with

registration logistics in Denver.

#### 8. *Site Selection Issues*

We are set through the year 2012 and are considering the Atlanta Marriott for 2013. At this juncture I am not planning on any site visits for a while, and will probably not focus on this matter again until next fall. Meeting sites for the coming years are as follows:

2004 - Nashville  
2005 - Toronto  
2006 - Los Angeles  
2007 - Atlanta  
2008 - St. Louis  
2009 - Philadelphia  
2010 - San Francisco  
2011 - Washington, D.C.  
2012 - Chicago

#### 9. *Annual Meeting Preparations*

- A. Denver (2003) - John, his Program Co-Chairs Sally Simpson and Denise Gottfredson, Sarah and I visited Denver in the spring. We worked out the final details regarding room usage, made audio-visual arrangements, got the music equipment ordered for the dance, meet with the drayage folks and went over the exhibit hall set-up and logistics, discussed freight/shipping logistics, etc., etc., etc. We have sufficient meeting and sleeping rooms and have mapped out what will be a great meeting. Do remember to come to the Ice Cream Social which will be held on Thursday from 2:00 to 3:30 in the Exhibit Hall. As usual, you are asked to serve ice cream to the members. We have an apron and chefs hat for each current member of the Board.
- B. Nashville (2004) - Program Co-Chairs Melissa Moon and Bonnie Fisher, and I visited Nashville last spring. We had a very constructive visit and made excellent progress. As you are aware, the Mid-Year Board Meeting will be held in Nashville on April 16 - 17. The program team will be arriving a day early next April to do a second walk-thru. A proposed budget for the Nashville meeting is attached, based on a conservative attendance estimate of 2,350.
- C. Toronto (2005) - Julie Horney and her program chair(s) and I will be traveling to Toronto in the spring to do a first cut for this meeting. We have met at the Royal York Hotel before, so we have a good sense of what the property has to offer. Returning to the same property has some real benefits in terms of meeting planning.

#### 10. *Sellin Glueck Award Criteria Changes*

The Board voted at the Mid-Year Meeting to adjust the criteria for the Sellin Glueck Award. The proposed new criteria and the current criteria are noted below. We need to vote on this change at the Tuesday meeting. If we once again vote to affirm this change, the new criteria will become the criteria for the 2004 award.

Current Terminology:

....given to those who reside outside North America.

Proposed Terminology

....given to those who reside outside the United States.

### *11. Columbus Visit*

Lindsey Jackson and I visited Columbus in September and worked with Sarah and Sue.

Lindsey spent some time learning how to use our accounting program (again, she will be handling the books for the Paris SOC meetings), dealt with annual meeting program matters, organized the storerooms (an on-going effort as we store and catalog the over-runs of our journals and newsletter), and spent considerable time digging into our boxes of archival material and filing it in a more user-friendly manner. We will continue to work on the archives. On a personal note, I have found the material to be most fascinating. I have come across letters, memos and other documents as old as 1949. There are 3 boxes of very old materials that I have not even opened yet and look forward to peering into them when I go to Columbus in January.

### *12. Past and Future Travel*

Along with several representatives from the ASC Division on International Criminology, I attended the meeting of the United Nations Economic and Social Council in May. This meeting was held in Vienna. Among other ventures, I distributed a significant amount of ASC literature to the delegates and spent time visiting with them about ASC, and generally explaining who we are and discussing what we can offer. Several representatives from the UN will be coming to the Denver meetings, and I can report that our UN outreach efforts have proven to be quite successful. We are now working with them on a number of projects, including some significant involvement with their 2005 criminology meetings in Bangkok, setting the agenda for the 2004 Economic and Social Council meetings, and working as partners (but no financial commitment on our part) in a movie documentary on the history and development of criminology.

I attended the European Society of Criminology meetings in Helsinki in August. We set up a booth at the ESC meetings and distributed ASC materials at those meetings, and also sponsored an Ice Cream Social. I also assisted the ESC folks with exhibit hall and registration logistics, and have been asked to do so again next year in Amsterdam. I spent considerable time with their 2004 meeting program chairs, discussing meeting organizational matters and have continued this exchange since returning home. I represented us at the Western Society of Criminology in February (using both ASC and University of Nebraska funding), and conducted the Vancouver site visit at the same time.

Using other funds, I traveled to Venezuela in October and gave a series of lectures at the School of Criminology at the University of the Andes, representing not only the U. of Nebraska, but ASC as well. A special meeting of the dormant Venezuelan Society of Criminology was held, and I offered \$500 of ASC funds as seed money to revive and jump start this once-active organization.

I traveled to Paris in May and made a presentation at the French Ministry of Justice. A special Board Meeting of the French Society of Criminology was called, and I had the opportunity to address that body. I visited at some length with a European Union affiliate, Penal Reform International, and have established a strong relationship with them. A representative will be attending our Denver meetings, and they plan on a more significant presence at future ASC meetings. I also conducted a site visit of the Renaissance Hotel, the location of the SOC meetings in May.

Candace Kruttchnitt represented us at the British Society of Criminology meetings, and Henry Pontell represented us at the Australia/New Zealand Society of Criminology meetings this year.

I propose that Julie Horney represent us at the BSC meetings next year, that Frank Cullen represent us at the ESC meetings in Amsterdam in August, and that our incoming Vice President Bob Meier represent us at the ANZSOC meetings in October. I am planning on representing us at the Western Society of Criminology meetings in February, the ACJS meetings in Las Vegas in March, will be part of our delegation to the United Nations Economic and Social Council meetings in Vienna in May, and will also attend the ESC meetings in August. I will also, of course, be traveling to Paris to run the SOC meetings in May, and will visit Columbus in January and probably sometime this summer as well. Please be aware that partial financial support for some of these travels will come from the University of Nebraska.

As a point of information, I have been invited to give a series of lectures at the University of Carlos III in Spain, and will also be returning to Venezuela to work with faculty as well as officials from the Venezuelan Society of Criminology within the next year. None of the expenses for these trips will come out of ASC funds, but I would like the Board to be aware of these activities where I will be certainly representing ASC in various ways.

### *13. Growth of International Criminology*

There has been a decided increase in my international correspondence of late. In fact, it has been remarkable. I scrolled back through my emails as I prepared this report, and since the first of September (beginning of the school year), I have had correspondence with folks from more than 20 countries (and I not counting the \$20 million in a bank in Nigeria that I want to send to you@ stuff!). This is obviously due in part to the upcoming SOC meeting, but it is also due to what I see as a very

significant increase in international interest in criminology. In fact, the Division of International Criminology is now the largest of the ASC Divisions.

We do a reasonably decent job, I would argue, in integrating our field within the United States (see the by-lines in most criminal justice journals of late - multiple authors/multiple institutional affiliations). We are now in need of enhancing the level of exchange and interaction in a global context. Not to insult your intelligence, but science grows through exchange, not isolation. I am not sure how we/ASC can Arachet up our exchange quotient,@ but I am certainly exploring options. The SOC meeting is obviously one forum for such multi-national exchange, and it is my plan to continue with this very exciting venture. I am in communication with Harry Dammer, who has recently been awarded an NIJ grant to examine this very issue. I will also be making a presentation to the American Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice on this same topic and asking them for ideas. Our work with the United Nations Economic and Social Council is another forum where we need to become quite active. This is a very exciting time for criminology, and I believe ASC needs to be a major player as academic criminology begins to spread its wings and move in a global context.

#### *14. Duncan/Lott Debate*

You were all sent a memo regarding a sensitive issue with respect to allegations of data fabrication. For your convenience, a copy of the memo is attached.

#### *15. Hindelang Award Recommendations*

Tom Bernard, the Chair of the 2003 Hindelang Award Committee, has approached me and asked that the Board consider two items with respect to this said award:

- A. Date Specific - The award says that books are eligible if they were "published in the last two or three years." I think the Board should define eligibility precisely. I suggest that eligibility be defined as a publication date within a specific number of years of the award date. If, for example, books are eligible if published within three years of the award date, then this year we would have considered books with publication dates of 2000 or later (i.e., within three years of 2003 Hindelang award). In fact, that was the way I interpreted the eligibility criteria, so I refused to accept nominations for books with publication dates prior to 2000.
- B. Outstanding Book v. Impact on Research - This award goes to the book that has had "the most influence on criminology research." In the past, however, the award seems to be have been given more as a "Outstanding Book" award. If this is a "Outstanding Book" award, then I think the description of the award should say so explicitly rather than referring to the influence on research. If the Board decides to define the Hindelang Award as an "Outstanding Book" Award, then restricting eligibility to publication within the previous two or three years would be fine. If the Board retains the idea that the Hindelang Award given to a book that

has "the most influence on criminology research," then I would lengthen eligibility to books with publication dates within five years of the award date. Some books achieve influence on research over time, and several very meritorious books that were nominated this year have had little or no influence on criminological research because they were just published. At the same time, we did not consider books which which have had considerable influence on criminological research but which had publication dates prior to 2000.

#### *16. Joint Meeting Progress*

As of this writing, we have 21 partners in the SOC meeting. We even have several paid registrations. I sensed considerable interest in this meeting while visiting with folks in Helsinki during the ESC meetings. We have opened a separate bank account so as not to co-mingle ASC and SOC funds. Lindsey Jackson, who is an accounting major, will be handling the books. We have reviewed our personnel and language needs and have made arrangements for assistance in that regard. The hotel is working with us with respect to AV and food logistics. In short, we are on schedule to make this a successful meeting.

This is a bold experiment on our part, working along the good-faith premise that if we build it, people will come. I will work diligently to do all I can to make this as smooth and as professional a meeting as possible. I truly expect the meetings to be an academic and financial success, and hope to be able to plan another for the last spring of 2006.



**PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE  
2004 NASHVILLE ASC MEETINGS**

**Income:**

Program Book Sales	200.00
Registration Income	199,800.00
<b>Total Income:</b>	<b>\$200,000.00</b>

**Expenses:**

Audio Visual	15,000.00
Drayage	9,000.00
Extra Help/Wages	4,000.00
Meals (Staff and Registration Help)	1,000.00
Postage	7,000.00
Printing	10,000.00
Programs and Meeting Packets	30,000.00
Program Committee Luncheon	2,000.00
Receptions	
Opening	21,000.00
Presidential	27,000.00
Shipping	4,000.00
Site Visit Travel	3,000.00
Supplies	14,000.00
Telephone	500.00
Travel	2,500.00
<b>Total Expenses:</b>	<b>\$150,000.00</b>

**PROPOSED ASC BUDGET  
2004**

*INCOME:*

Advertising/Marketing	\$ 45,000
Annual Meeting	200,000
<i>Criminologist</i>	25,000
<i>Criminology</i>	150,000
<i>Criminology &amp; Public Policy</i>	120,000
Dues	190,000
Employment Exchange	5,000
Investment Income	30,000
Minority Fellowship	6,000
Reprints	1,000
Royalties	8,000

**TOTAL**

---

\$780,000

*EXPENSES:*

Advertising/Marketing	\$ 5,000
Affiliations	8,000
Annual Meeting	150,000
Awards	3,000
Committees	2,000
<i>Criminologist</i>	38,000
<i>Criminology</i>	115,000
<i>Criminology &amp; Public Policy</i>	105,000
Employment Exchange	3,000
Equipment Expense	15,000
Executive Board	10,000
Executive Director Office	70,000
International Initiatives	13,000
Minority Fellowship-Grad	21,000
Minority Fellowship-Undergrad	20,000
Misc. Expenses	10,000
Office Expenses	42,000
Personnel - Columbus	125,000
Personnel - Lincoln	10,000
President Secretary Support	2,000
Professional Fees	3,000

Site Selection	2,000
Taxes	8,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<hr/> \$780,000

The Matter of the Debate Between  
 Professor Otis Dudley Duncan and Dr. John R. Lott, Jr.  
 Regarding Articles Authored by these Respective Individuals that Appeared in the  
 January/February 2000 and September/October 2000 Issues of *The Criminologist*

prepared by  
 Chris Eskridge, Executive Director  
 American Society of Criminology  
 October 2, 2003

*Preliminary Observations*

Before delving into the substantive issues of the Duncan/Lott debate, I have several preliminary observations:

1. This is clearly a classic confrontation that started in the academic realm, but has moved into the acrimonious. Both Professor Duncan and Dr. Lott seem somewhat strident in their respective positions, and I am not sure that anyone or anything is going to move them off dead center. Consequently, I am concerned that any substantive ASC involvement in this affair will not shed further light and knowledge on the matter, but may result in our being pulled into the proverbial quagmire from which we never may be able to cleanly extricate ourselves.
2. I am somewhat concerned with Professor Duncan=s use of threats. The following is a quote from Professor Duncan=s email to Professor John Laub (current ASC President), dated September 18, 2003:

Alf I attempt to publish another communication on this subject, it will be directed to Science magazine, in view of its relevance to the controversy in which that magazine is now involved and in view of its editorial about the Lott case some time ago. I will level serious charges at *The Criminologist* for being irresponsible in regard to its mistake and at the profession of criminology for remaining silent about that.@

This type of threat is inappropriate, and rather than contributing to a resolution, will drive this already somewhat inflammatory matter further outside the arena of healthy exchange.

3. I am concerned that both individuals may seek to utilize ASC=s publication outlets merely as a public platform in their individual attempts to prove the other

wrong, rather than as a forum to enhance understanding regarding the topic at hand. ASC is not and cannot get into the business of deciding who is right or wrong in the present or any other academically-based dispute of this nature. We can provide a medium for healthy exchange, but then must leave it to the collective market place of ideas to ultimately decide.

#### *Substantive Observations and Responses*

I have read the Duncan and Lott authored articles that appeared in the January/February 2000 and the September/October 2000 issues of *The Criminologist*. I have read the email exchange between Professor John Laub and Professor Duncan. I have examined the publications Professor Duncan has called into question. As I read Professor Duncan's email to Professor Laub of September 18, 2003, I culled-out five points:

#### *Point #1*

Duncan Observation - "...Lott asserts that >the *Business Week* piece was a book review.= This is false. I ask that you designate a third party to examine the issue of *Business Week* that I cited and verify that the passage I quoted was taken from a letter that appears on p. 10.@"

Eskridge Response - I obtained a copy of the September 6, 1999 issue of *Business Week*, and examined page 10 (the page in question). The Dr. Lott assertion that the *Business Week* piece is a book review is incorrect. Professor Duncan quoted from a letter to the editor (written by a Mr. Jim Gahar of Mesa, Arizona) that appeared under the heading "Readers Report," on page 10 of the September 6, 1999 issue of *Business Week* magazine. While Professor Duncan is correct in his assertion, this is an innocuous matter and its= substantive frivolity warrants no further comment here, nor in the pages of *The Criminologist*.

#### *Point #2*

Duncan Observation - "I ask that a third party examine the article in the *Los Angeles Times* that I cite in #(6) in my array of quotations of Lott and verify that Lott's article does not mention that Kleck is responsible for the 2.5 million estimate.@"

Eskridge Response - I obtained a copy of the December 1, 1998 issue of the *Los Angeles Times*, and examined page B7 (the page in question). Dr. Lott does state in paragraph four of this newspaper article that "Americans also use guns defensively about 2.5 million times a year,....". There is no attribution to Kleck and Gertz given for this 2.5 million figure, as per Professor Duncan's claim. By the same token, while Kleck and Gertz are not noted, Lott does not take credit for deriving this figure either. He simply presents a number...2.5 million. It should be stressed that this is a newspaper article and not a professional, refereed journal. Had this been a journal article, then certainly some citation would have been in order to support the 2.5 million figure. But this is a newspaper article where numbers and figures are routinely presented with no source or citation. Most importantly it is not assumed nor implied in any way in the article narrative that Dr. Lott personally came up with this 2.5 million figure. The fact that

no citation was given in the *Los Angeles Times* article in support of the 2.5 million figure is an innocuous issue that warrants no further comment here, nor in the pages of *The Criminologist*.

#### *Point #3*

Duncan Observation - I ask that a third party examine the table in Kleck and Gertz's original article that summarized results from polls other than their own survey (the same table is reproduced in Kleck's *Targeting Guns* with some modifications) and verify that Lott is in error in stating that "If national surveys are correct, 98 percent of the time that people use guns defensively, they merely have to brandish a weapon to break of an attack."

Eskridge Response - I obtained a copy of Kleck and Gertz, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol 86, 1995, pp. 150 - 187, and examined the table in question. I cannot unequivocally verify that Dr. Lott is in error. As we are all well aware, two individuals can examine the same set of data and draw remarkably different conclusions. Professor Duncan apparently views these data in a different light than does Dr. Lott. Allow them both to make their respective arguments in the market place, and let the reader decide.

#### *Point #4*

Duncan Observation - "...it is incumbent upon Lott to concede that the figures cited make it obvious that the 98% claim (which implies 2% firing) cannot be supported as a valid statistical estimate." Professor Duncan, in his email to Professor Laub, then provides a narrative that outlines his arguments as to why the numbers proposed by Dr. Lott are in error.

Eskridge Response - While Professor Duncan has examined the material and has provided very solid and convincing reasoning, Dr. Lott should have the opportunity to respond and provide his perspective. Contrary to Professor Duncan's position, it is certainly not "incumbent upon Lott to concede" anything, and it follows that we (The American Society of Criminology) certainly cannot force Dr. Lott to concede anything.

#### *Point #5*

Duncan Observation - "...the claim that the 98% figure came from the 1997 survey is a fabrication." Dr. Lott claims that he undertook a survey in 1997 that examined the issue of gun control. Professor Duncan, in this comment and in other contexts and settings, has claimed that Dr. Lott did not undertake a survey in 1997 dealing with gun control issues, and that he has fabricated data.

Eskridge Response - This is clearly the most significant allegation, and the core of the entire matter. The fact that Dr. Lott claims all his data were lost in a computer crash, and that he has subsequently failed to produce any type of evidence to substantiate the claim that he undertook a survey in 1997 that examined gun control issues is a prima facie cause of concern. Dr. Lott should be allowed, and frankly encouraged, to respond to this rather serious allegation in a substantial, substantive fashion.

### *Conclusions*

As I consider the merits (and demerits) of this case, I would propose a two-staged course of action:

#### STAGE 1:

- A. Would the interests of ASC be served by prolonging this quasi-academic debate within the pages of *The Criminologist*? Vigorous academic debate is obviously of value, but this debate has taken on a life of its own that treads outside the lines of healthy exchange. In points #3 and #4 above, I suggested that Dr. Lott be allowed to make his case in the market place. But since this debate has moved past the healthy stage, I suggest that he make his case, within an ASC context, in an alternative vehicle to *The Criminologist*. I suggest that we set up a chat room on our (ASC) web page, publicize the fact that there is an ongoing debate between these two individuals (and others) regarding the said articles and the said topic, and let debate take place there, somewhat out of the spotlight. In this way, we would be setting a stage for discussion and discourse, but stepping aside from any formal role in the matter.
  
- B. Dr. Lott has had an affiliation with the Yale Law School and the University of Chicago Law School. His present position is that of Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Were Dr. Lott affiliated with a university, and there was an allegation of data fabrication on his part, there would most certainly be an internal investigation conducted by his home university officials. In this case, since he has no university affiliation, the American Society of Criminology should send an official correspondence to his employer, the American Enterprise Institute, and articulate the fact that there is some question regarding the existence of a survey that Dr. Lott referenced in an article that appeared in an American Society of Criminology publication. In this letter, we would ask the American Enterprise Institute to consider conducting an internal review of the matter. In as much as the outcome of this investigation may call into question the validity of an article that appeared in an official ASC publication, we would ask the American Enterprise Institute to inform us as to the results and conclusion of their review.

STAGE 2: To be undertaken only in the event that the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research chooses not to undertake a review of the data fabrication allegation.

It is my position that ASC should not get into the business of deciding who is right or wrong in academic debates. It is my position that we can provide a forum for healthy exchange, and then must leave it to the collective market place to ultimately decide. Yet, after having fashioned these fundamental assertions, I find myself extremely unsettled by the prima facie evidence to the effect that Dr. Lott may have fabricated data - an egregious error. Consequently, despite my *hands off* proclamation per above, I cautiously conclude that the matter of fabricated data is so central to the core integrity of not just our profession, but of scholarly pursuit and science itself, that some

action on our part is warranted in this particular matter. I specifically propose that the Editor of *The Criminologist* send a certified letter to Dr. Lott, asking him to provide some type of tangible, creditable evidence to the effect that the survey in question, and to which he made reference in the page of *The Criminologist*, was undertaken. This evidence might be a survey instrument, names and contact information of those who helped with the interviews, phone bills from 1997 showing significant phone activity (my understanding is that this was a phone survey), tally sheets completed during the interviews, drafts of statistical tables, printouts of statistical reviews. I propose that Dr. Lott be given a more than generous time-frame in which to respond (ie., 2 months, 3 months), and that we even offer to send a representative of our Publications Committee to his offices to examine the material if he is reluctant to mail it to us. If nothing comes forward from Dr. Lott in the proposed time-frame, a note should be published in *The Criminologist* to that effect. If Dr. Lott agrees to produce data, documents, and/or supportive materials, and our ASC representative examines the said material and is convinced of their contextual validity, a note should be published in *The Criminologist* to that effect.

Beyond the three ventures proposed in Stages 1 and 2 above, I most strongly recommend that ASC not get any deeper into this rather embroiled matter.