

Interview with Marvin Wolfgang

2/27/79

The first question is how did you first become interested in criminology. This is very easy for me to answer because when I came to the University of Pennsylvania in 1948 as a graduate student the first course that I had was with Thorsten Sellin, who was the world-renowned criminologist, and he developed a criminology program here at the University of Pennsylvania single-handedly by first teaching courses in the 1920's. Although I had several other courses in the first year no professor impressed me with such erudition and scholarship and gentle qualities as did Thorsten Sellin and the work that I did with him seemed to elevate my own intellectuality in a way that other work that I was doing failed. ~~And~~ Therefore I became very interested in what Sellin was doing. I had no specific attraction to criminology as an undergraduate, although I had a course, and so I must say that my coming into this field is a result of the influence of this one man.

*wrong!* [After I received my PhD he asked me to stay on as a member of the faculty but I went to Lebanon Valley College. As a matter of fact it was at Lebanon Valley College during my work toward the doctorate and I taught there for close to five years before I finally accepted the invitation to come to the University of Pennsylvania full-time. ~~And~~ When I did and received a PhD, ~~then~~ Thorsten and I became not just mentor and student but became colleagues and friends. That was in 1952. So I've been here, now -- I just received this past year my little button from the University of Pennsylvania welcoming me into the 25-year club. I'm one of the few stable academes around because so many ~~of them~~ are constantly moving from one campus to the other. *until*

*since!* Another question that Walter asked is whether I wrote my dissertation here at Penn and what the subject was. Yes, the dissertation was written here, under the supervision of Sellin and the title was Patterns in Criminal Homicide, which was immediately published by the University of Pennsylvania Press and has been reissued in paperback and hardback by several other publishers. ~~since~~. I've been amazed at the

extent to which that book, which was first published in 1958, has continued to be of service to colleagues in the field and is still very much alive after twenty years. Apparently the style in which I collected the data and analyzed the data provided a model for a lot of other studies in different subjects, like robbery and rape and burglary.

When did you become director of the Center for Studies in Criminology and Criminal Law at Penn? This takes a circuitous route to answer. It was in 1959 that Thorsten and I received our first major large-scale grant from the Ford Foundation. Up until that time Thorsten, although ~~he was~~ doing his individual research work, much of which was historical, he had never sought -- or if he had sought he had never received -- any research funds from external agencies, but we were approached by the Ford Foundation to submit a proposal and together we did. And at that time, in 1959, \$150,000 was a lot of money, much more than it is today. ~~And that helped~~ to launch us ~~into~~ a congealed research center. We had to hire staff -- and the staff has always been graduate students. I hire no other external people, so that the Center ~~in~~ Criminology becomes a training ground for graduates and a research organization for the production of scholarship. We created the Center then, and with the permission of the University established the first ~~the~~ Masters of Arts degree in criminology, which we have had ever since.

the  
 Thorsten and I were co-directors and when he retired in 1970, ~~I believe it was~~, I became the sole director but then I sought additional funds from the Ford Foundation and from Russell Sage Foundation, having already received funds from other public agencies, like the National Institute of Mental Health, ~~and~~ with an elaborate proposal for the continuation of the Center and changing its name slightly to include criminal law, Professor Anthony Amsterdam, who was then a young scholar in the law school at Penn, and I joined forces and we became co-directors. The reason why I added criminal law to the title is that Tony Amsterdam and I had been doing, since 1965, <sup>a</sup> considerable amount of research together -- social legal research ~~for~~ purposes of providing new empirical data for the NAACP legal defense fund in New York in litigation of many of its cases in Southern states regarding what appeared to be discriminatory judicial sentencing practices of sentencing blacks to death

in all of the capital punishment states. At that time all of the southern states had the death penalty for rape as well as for murder and the legal defense fund was taking class actions through the Federal District Courts in several of the states in the South and wanted to have a statistical basis for affirming what they were rhetorically announcing -- namely that more blacks are sentenced to death than whites and they wanted to know <sup>if</sup> this <sup>is</sup> racial discrimination.

*whether* | The work that Tony Amsterdam and I did covered eleven states in the South -- random samples of counties and we sent thirty law students to these southern courts to collect data over a twenty-year period. Twenty years is the time that the Supreme Court has often said constitutes a custom and therefore we used that period of time to try to show the courts that there had been systematic and customary discriminatory sentencing practices that proportionately caused more blacks to be executed than whites, even though the nature of the offense, the prior record of the offender, and all the other characteristics that we could possibly accumulate, which included 28 different variables, showed that there were no significant differences between blacks and whites -- with the one exception that if a black raped a white he had a high probability of being sentenced to death. This is an extralegal non-constitutional basis for having such sentences and we argued this as firmly as we could in the courts and some of our work that Tony Amsterdam and I did became part of the briefs and the records the Supreme Court has used in decision-making. This <sup>is</sup> always ~~for me~~ <sup>been</sup> one of the most rewarding kinds of research that I've done because it was more than basic and abstract and intellectual research -- it had some very practical <sup>also</sup> applications and not only helped to save some lives but ~~has~~ helped to establish a principle against the death penalty with scientific research as well as <sup>with</sup> the ethical and moral reasons that we may be opposed to.

We were doing this work between 1965 and '69.

Walter asked have you been particularly interested in Philadelphia in your studies of criminology? Yes, I have been particularly interested in Philadelphia because it is a large urban community, has all of the elaborate machinery of a criminal justice system that is found in large metropolitan areas, ~~and~~ <sup>whether</sup> Philadelphia is representative of the rest of the country might be questionable, but the excellent record-keeping system that Philadelphia has had ever since the Clark and Dilworth administrations has made it possible for researchers like myself to use the official data with a sense of comfort about the reliability and validity of

the materials. I have been one of the most severe critics of criminal statistics in this country, ~~among my colleagues,~~ having published a rather ascerbic article in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review as long ago as 1963, causing J. Edgar Hoover to put me on his blacklist. ~~And he~~ tried -- having gotten hold of the copy of the manuscript before it was published -- ~~he~~ tried to submit a rebuttal to my article because I was critical of the Uniform Crime Reporting system that is collected by the FBI. The Law Review editors, however, found that a statement that was sent up by personal messenger from J. Edgar Hoover was not sufficiently scholarly to be included in the issue. So I was never friends with J. Edgar after that. Fortunately, the FBI ~~hasn't since the passage of Hoover~~ -- has been much more friendly to me and has accepted my criticisms and as a matter of fact they have made some of the corrections that I suggested in the collection of national police statistics. So friendly have they become, as a matter of fact, that now when I ask for records from the FBI they generously give whatever I ask.

But getting back to the original question -- Philadelphia is a good case study, not only for political and economic purposes but certainly for crime and criminal justice purposes. ~~And the~~ work that I and my colleagues have done -- research work -- has to a great extent used the Philadelphia scene. I refer ~~first to the~~ ~~the~~ homicide study was based upon five years of homicides in Philadelphia between 1948 and '52 and I had complete access -- worked for three years with the homicide squad. ~~I~~ ~~and~~ became very close to them and had complete access to all of those files. After that, Sellin and I published that Ford Foundation research and it was called the Measurement of Delinquency. It was an effort to provide new ways of collecting criminal statistics. We were focusing originally on juvenile delinquency but the kinds of material we put together for the creation of a new crime index system was borne out of our analysis of the Philadelphia statistics. ~~And then~~ perhaps most importantly a large-scale research project that seems never to be finished is the collection of what we call the birth cohort, and in 1972 the University of Chicago press published our book called Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. We used the term "cohort" from population studies and demography. It simply means a group that usually in the case of demography is a group born in the same year and pass through life at the same ages. ~~and~~ here we had access to the Board of Education files. Very generously they allowed us to use all of their

records for a birth cohort of males born in 1948. We wanted to follow them up until their 18th year. ~~And~~ the Board of Education allowed us to use their files. The archdiocese of Philadelphia was very cooperative in allowing us to go into all of the parochial schools and look at the records of the 1948 births and then all the private schools, too. The public school records are ~~all~~ centralized at the Board of Education, which made our task very easy. But there is no centralization of the parochial or private schools, so this meant that a dozen of my graduate students had to travel all over the city of Philadelphia to get these. But the cooperation was just enormous. ~~Then~~ we also had the cooperation of the police in taking the names of each one of these boys and checking ~~them out~~ in the Juvenile Aid Division of the police department. This is called a longitudinal study and my colleagues tell me that it is the first one of this sort that has been done in criminology; ~~and~~ that's why they have paid a lot of attention to it.

We wanted to answer a simple question that no one had an answer ~~to~~ ~~to~~ what is the probability of ever having an arrest record before reaching age 18? Now this is a question that can only be answered by tracing individuals through life, up to age 18. That's why we took a birth cohort. You cannot answer it by what is called cross-sectional data. That is, we can look at the Philadelphia Police Department files for a given year and ask how many kids have been arrested who are ten years old and so forth, but that does not tell ~~you~~ the chances of ever having an arrest, of ever being caught by the police and being labeled a delinquent. The answer, by the way, was 35%. Thirty-five percent of the boys born in Philadelphia -- we had 10,000 boys in our study. The chances of ever being arrested by the police before age 18 was .35, which was much higher than any of us had anticipated. Moreover, when we broke that down by race we were appalled with the fact that slightly over 50% of all black boys born in 1948 who lived in Philadelphia from age ten to 18 were arrested at least once by the police. Now that means that each black boy living in Philadelphia -- slightly over half are going to have their names in the police files.

I back-track one bit on the use of Philadelphia. I said that all of the schools cooperated. It is interesting to me that all the schools cooperated except the one that resisted being desegregated -- that is Girard College. That was the only school that would not cooperate with us. But that didn't really hurt us very much and I was able to get names elsewhere. It was interesting at that time because they were under attack by the courts and being required to desegregate.

*Comment*

I'll finish this relative to the utilization of Philadelphia by saying that I have had at least a dozen graduate students make use of the Philadelphia police files. ~~And here is where~~ I will comment on the fact that the Philadelphia police, for as long as I've been in Philadelphia, ~~and that new is~~ *which* over 25 years, has always been cooperative in all of our research efforts and have given us access to their files. They do not give access to their files in many cases -- in most cases. ~~And increasingly~~ over the years it has become more difficult to have access to any of the criminal justice system files for research purposes. ~~And partly~~ because many of these agencies feel threatened in the first place -- they are afraid people will come in and muckrake them. ~~And~~ Secondly, they now can fall back on the privacy act and feel very justified in not giving anybody files, even for research purposes, on the grounds that they are protecting the confidentiality of that subject.

We now have a new birth cohort study, a ~~kind of~~ replication of the first one, ~~going on and~~ we have females in it this ~~one~~ *one*, ~~time --~~ using 1958 as the birth year. ~~Did I say '48 the~~ first time? I meant 1945. ~~This first birth cohort is 1945.~~ Once again Philadelphia in all of its agencies has been cooperative in our collection of data for this new birth cohort. We have approximately *34000* 40,000 persons, males and females, who are included in this project. ~~So again~~ that required the cooperation of the Board of Education and the parochial and private schools and the Philadelphia police. It is essentially the same study -- we will be able to include some additional factors we hadn't before. ~~This might be~~ the propitious time to mention that after we had collected all of the data on the first birth cohort born in 1945 the Criminology Center was located in what was known as the Normandy Hotel at 36th and Chestnut. The Normandy Hotel was at time in 1968, when we were housed on the first floor of that building while we were waiting ~~for the~~ construction of McNeil building, where we are now housed. The Normandy Hotel had been converted into a retirement club residence. *the* Not a nursing home, ~~but~~ people would rent space and ~~as~~ *it was an* elderly population. It was an 8-story building and on Jan. 8, 1968 a fire broke out in one of the rooms, and eventually it was a nine-alarm fire and the whole building was totally destroyed. It is one of the major fires at the Philadelphia Fire Museum. ~~And~~ it was a very dramatic situation because the traffic reporter for one of the radio stations was travelling over West Philadelphia in his helicopter and saw flames and smoke and landed on the roof of the Normandy Hotel early in the morning and got out and started to get people awake, ~~and~~ he helped to save the lives of everybody in that building. I remember vividly shaving in the morning



and having the radio on and hearing that there was a three-alarm fire at the old Normandy Hotel. I immediately ran out of my house with my face half-shaved and saw my building going up in flames. We lost practically all of our research materials. I was able to run into the building and save one box. But fortunately many of the data that we had on the birth cohort study were already on computer tape at the computer center so that the study was saved but a lot of the records were destroyed that we had accumulated and many variables that we would have included in the study we could not because they were not yet put on tape. That was a disaster for us. Fortunately, the University at that time was covered by insurance with the Insurance Company of North America. Ever since that fire the university is self-insured. Nobody will take it. ~~And~~ It was at that time, during the year of 1968, that I negotiated with the INA and it was a very revealing and interesting experience, ~~and~~ at the end they finally gave all the money that I had requested ~~as~~ -- to cover the expenses of the loss of that fire. They were very generous. ~~And~~ They found it difficult, they said, to evaluate the worth of research not only in its current state but in its future state as well. What extent did that have a depressive effect on the reputation of the Center and the University and on our personal reputations, etc. INA had covered the Titanic and they said that was much easier.

From the Criminology Center's point of view the funds that we got from INA were designated for the Criminology Center but fortunately I have been able to get additional research funds regularly since 1968 and have not had to draw upon the capital of the INA funds. I affectionately call it my Fire Fund and I remind the University administration regularly that I want to have at least 50% of the interest they are accumulating on the money being stored there.

Let me move to some of the questions -- the question asks as you have been on the board of the Pennsylvania Prison Society for many years please tell of its role in Philadelphia -- what sorts of reform did they advocate and what success have they had? The Pennsylvania Prison Society is the oldest secular organization of its kind in the world. It goes back to 1787 and was founded by Bishop White and the early Quaker fathers in Philadelphia to alleviate the miseries

of persons in the public prisons. I was President for eight years of the Prison Society ~~and~~ as well as being on the board and have always found it a very rewarding activity. The Prison Society, when I was a successor to Professor Negly Teeters, from Temple University, had mostly been involved in individual case work and counselling of individual prisoners in the county prisons of Holmesburg and the House of Corrections and the state prison at the Eastern State Penitentiary and at Graterford, but when Richard Bacon, who was the Executive Director of the Prison Society during my experience of being President, a fine gentleman and a man of great compassion, -- Dick Bacon saw the need to change the focus of the Prison Society by becoming more community organizationally involved, by playing more of an advocate role for convicted offenders and prisoners and ex-prisoners before City Council and before the State Legislature. So during the 1960's a considerable shift did take place and the Prison Society began to reduce the amount of individual casework and hoped that much of that would be continued by the public agencies and by social workers and that the Prison Society would take on more of a broad governmental advocacy role, which it did. ~~And~~ that has been the role of the Prison Society up to the present time. It's not that the Society doesn't continue to work with individual offenders and sometimes they come in off the street to the Prison Society and we do help to make referrals and help them to find jobs and things of that sort, but most of the budget of the Society, which comes from the United Fund, is spent in broader activities and I think it has been successful. It's very difficult to say how successful. The Prison Society was very intimately involved in the recommendation of a new house of detention back in the early '60's. That house of detention now has many faults to it but it was a necessary construction to separate the untried offenders in jail waiting trial from those who had been convicted and sentenced by the courts. It sounds like a reform that should have taken place a long time ago but it was a reform necessary in the early '60's and we are still having trouble with it today.

(WMP: Are the problems financial?)

Mostly financial, yes. The Prison Society has been in favor of the abolition of the death penalty and a lot of the efforts of the Prison Society have gone into that activity as well. We thought after the Furman decision in 1972 by the Supreme Court that we were out of the death penalty business and could stop our efforts, but, as you know, over thirty states have established new death penalty legislation.

U.S.  
Supreme Court



~~So~~ Rendell Davis, who is now Dick Bacon's successor at the Prison Society, has to spend a good deal of his time writing, speaking, and talking to legislators about that issue -- the death penalty.

~~Also,~~ <sup>†</sup> the Prison Society has consistently been opposed to new elaborate prison construction and has advocated that as much as possible the use of alternatives to imprisonment -- community treatment programs under the general principle that prisons are bad places to go, they don't reform, and that we can in very high proportions of the persons who are convicted offenders who are not dangerous to the community, we can punish and treat more humanely outside of prisons. The Prison Society has a general principle against any more prison construction in the state.

(WMP: Is that a United Fund agency?)

A little over 60% of the budget is from the United Fund.

When the so-called reform government of Joe Clark came into power in Philadelphia there was an amazing transformation in the ways in which the police managed themselves and collected their criminal statistics. Now for me criminal statistics are an important part of my professional activity. Philadelphia had been viewed by the FBI, which was the central collecting agency for about 14,000 jurisdictions in the United States, and when they find that there ~~is an~~ suspicions about the ways in which the police crime reports are collected they will delete that city or that jurisdiction from its annual collection till corrections are made. Philadelphia had been one of those before the Clark administration and with the new administration Philadelphia was if not the first was certainly in the vanguard of putting their crime reports on computer and providing a whole new system of crime reporting and criminal statistics collection. Until that time, for example, even this might sound trivial from one point of view, it is very important from another, whenever a citizen complained to the police, he would call in and complain to the local district, and there were no special forms for recording the complaint. As often as not the seargent at the desk would write it down and throw it away. If it was very unlikely that the police would ever be able to find anybody -- a housewife would call in to say that she came down to the kitchen in the morning and found that there had been a burglary in the house and the silver was gone -- the police usually did nothing about it and they didn't even record it because one of the marks

of efficiency that the police used is what is called 'cleared by arrest.' That is, out of 100 crimes that are reported how many result in the apprehension of the suspect. And they used that as a basis for judging the efficiency of their operation. So it was to the police benefit to keep low the number of offenses that had a low probability of resulting in arrest. You couldn't do this with murder -- it was a little difficult. ~~But in most of the property offenses they had done that.~~

The new administration introduced the centralized system so that every complaint that came in was immediately tape-recorded on two different tapes and immediately assigned a pre-assigned number on an IBM card, went marching down a conveyer belt, had to be checked out within a 24-hour period, and a whole system of internal checks from quality control was established with random periodic checks on the thousands of cases that were handled so that there were checkers working on checkers. And this system of quality control that was introduced by that administration became a model for many other cities.

(WMP: This was under Tom Gibbon?)

Yes. Gibbon was the police commissioner at that time. I have good words to say about most of the police commissioners that I have experienced. Even the one that became mayor because again from my professional point of view -- we have always enjoyed their cooperation and their friendship for our professional purposes. ~~And~~ Mayor Rizzo, while he was Police Commissioner, was generous, if not more generous than the other commissioners ~~in~~ not only giving us access but also even doing some work for us in the collection of data. After all, we're collecting 10,000 cases here, and 10,000 cases there -- we have a lot of data collection -- and he was very very helpful and he continued to be supportive when he became mayor. And the present police commissioner is no exception to the cooperation we've had. A comment of that sort says nothing about our ~~my~~ political evaluation of the mayor's administration. I feel much more competent to talk about my criminological experience than I do about his politics. I have always found him not only generous and cooperative but fair, also, in the handling of any of these more sensitive problems of the collection of crime statistics. I think that Mayor Rizzo would disagree with me on this -- I think that Howard Leary was a good police commissioner and particularly during the critical times when we had the Philadelphia riot on Columbia Avenue -- I think that Howard Leary handled that with the proper control

and did not exercise the kind of excessive use of force that characterized the Chicago Police riot in 1968 and other cities. It would be probably stretching the point to say that the administration of Howard Leary was responsible for our not having significant urban riots in Philadelphia but surely there is some contribution that his more gentle liberal administration had to keeping Philadelphia from becoming one of the burning cities of the 1960's.

The question is how is the crime rate measured and to what extent is it possible to compare the incidence of crime between the major cities in the United States? In general would you say that American cities are more crime-ridden than cities in Europe and other parts of the world? The latter question I shall answer first. Yes. American cities are more crime-ridden than cities in Europe and other parts of the Western world and in general the industrialized world. It is very difficult to make comparisons of crime in general or even specific crimes cross-nationally. ~~And this can be partly because it is difficult to get the statistics.~~ *It* can be done most readily with the more serious crimes like homicides and robberies in particular, but after you move from those rather serious crimes then the variations and the statutes in the penal codes make comparisons difficult. In general, cities in the United States have crimes of violence rates per population unit, rates per 100,000 is the way we measure it, and crime in American cities, crimes of violence in particular, are anywhere from four to ten times higher than cities of Europe. These differences are real differences, not differences due to artifacts of collection of criminal statistics. One of the most dramatic ways I have of expressing this is to point out that in New York City alone, which is a population roughly of 10 million, that there are more homicides each year in that one city, and New York is not the murder capital of America -- it's Houston, right now -- but if you take the absolute number of homicides in New York City, which is close to around 1500 a year, that is more murders and voluntary manslaughters than all of England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and the Scandinavian countries combined. More homicides in one city, New York, than all of Japan, which has 100 million population. Japan has one of the lowest crimes of violence of any industrialized country in the world. It is so low that criminologists have become very fascinated with Japan because we are trying to explain why is it so low.

I've indicated a little bit about how the crime rate is measured. ~~It~~ *It* is usually in terms of a rate per 100,000, but the interesting thing about it is that we have what is known as the *uniform* crime reporting system, which in this country goes back to 1930. Before 1930 we had no national

statistics -- and after an experimental year by the International Association of Chiefs of Police in 1929 the Department of Justice, the Attorney General's office, decided to take on this kind of data collection as part of their formal function. The way in which we estimate the amount of crime and whether crime is going up or down or make comparisons from one city to another is through only seven offenses -- and this is called now the crime index. The crime index is analagous to an index of productivity, a consumer price index, in the sense that not all consumer items are included. A crime index is a list of offenses that are presumed to have high degrees of reportability and that will reflect the larger universe of all crimes committed in a community or particular jurisdiction. These seven offenses are criminal homicide, forcible rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, larceny, and automobile theft. The number of those offenses is called offenses known to the police -- these are reports that come in. Because an offense is reported to the police does not mean that an arrest will occur and consequently the other kind of statistic that is used is called the "clearance by arrest rate." That is the proportion of offenses that result in somebody's being taken into custody and being made available for prosecution. Now out of those seven offenses -- out of every 100 of those seven offenses -- approximately 18 to 20 each year result in the arrest of someone. Which means that over 80% of offenses, and these are the so-called serious offenses, the major crimes, 80% of them never result in anyone's being apprehended. So it is a small proportion of arrests.

The question is what is your attitude about gun control? My attitude is that I would be in favor of the most restrictive gun control legislation that we can possibly pass through Congress. I would like it to be on a national and federal basis. Having individual state legislatures pass gun control legislation has not been terribly successful in reducing the number of guns that get into the hands of criminals. This is a very volatile issue but I am convinced through several recent public opinion polls that the public in general is in favor of some gun control legislation and just how restrictive is another issue. But I think that the political climate now is such that a Senator Joe Clark would not lose an election if he announced that he was in favor of gun control, or Senator Tidings who did in Maryland as well. I think the public attitudes have changed -- partly as a result of the assassinations that we continually see. I hope that it is also due to a better information that the public is getting about the importance of gun control. The other countries of the West and Japan have very strict gun control legislation which I think has been

effective and partially responsible for the low number of homicides. In the United States currently about two-thirds of all homicides involve a gun. And it doesn't take much empirical research to point out, although there has been some good precise empirical research, that if two more people get into a fight in a bar, which is a very common locus of our homicides, if they are fighting with their fists or even with knives, the probability of one of them dying is much ~~much~~ less than if a gun is pulled. And we also know that the higher the caliber of the bullet the greater the probability of dying. We have 20,000 homicides in the United States each year -- two-thirds of those involve a gun. I'm not able to say that if we were able to get rid of all guns or had very very strict control of guns that the homicide rate would decline to that of England or of Sweden, but most of us who have been involved in any of this kind of research are pretty well convinced that it would have a significant effect in reducing homicides.

The question is whether there is any national lobbying organization for gun control. The answer is that there is an organization known as the National Council to Control Hand Guns and they put out brochures and pamphlets and they are an active organization to convince congressmen not to be afraid to vote for gun control. There is also a Center for Research on Hand Gun Control and I happen to be a board member on that and Milton Eisenhower is the president and chairman ~~of that~~ and he and some other members of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence that was created by President Johnson in 1968 are members of this Board to do research. It is a non-lobbying and tax-exempt organization. It is really more on paper than anything else but we are incorporated in Delaware. And we have encouraged some research and have been able to raise some funds. The research that is done is designed to provide that kind of scientific and empirical support for the advocates of hand gun control. Instead of simply saying hand guns are bad, the research is designed to investigate various aspects of how bad it is. I was about to say earlier on that we have 2500 to 3000 sheer accidents with guns every year that kill people and a high proportion of these are children who find guns in the home and play with them.

And some of the earlier research that we did on the Violence Commission we published a task force report on firearms and violence and tried to answer the question to what extent are any guns useful in the home for protection against criminals and the solid answer that we got is there

is practically no protection. As a matter of fact, the likelihood of being killed or injured by having a gun in ~~your~~ home and having it taken away ~~from you~~ is fairly high, and people who had guns in their homes for protection are more likely to be injured than people who don't have guns. We've tried to take up a lot of the different kinds of arguments for possession of guns. As I've said, it is a very volatile issue, and while I was working as Research Director on Milton Eisenhower's National Commission on Violence, we found that the most nasty and ascerbic letters were from people protective of owning their guns. They called us all kinds of terrible names and thought that we were out to destroy the second amendment of the Constitution.

As President of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, would you tell something about the contributions that the Academy has made to the literature of urban government? My response is that the American Academy of Political and Social Science, which was founded in 1889 has been publishing the journal called the Annals since 1890 and it is currently a bi-monthly publication with considerable respect around the world and is meant as a basis for dissemination of social science to intelligent citizens interested in the various economic and political and sociological issues and also for distribution to public figures, including state legislators and city councilmen, and congressmen. We have over the years published quite a few issues that have been devoted to local and state government and I can draw attention to some of these specific Annals issues that were directly concerned with the urban government -- various aspects of urban government, going back, for example, as far as 1914. We had a January issue devoted to housing and town planning. Earlier, in 1913, we had a special issue in May on county government and if I skip through the years I can come up to more recent times -- in 1967 we had a very important and as I recall widely distributed issue in May of 1967 called Governing Urban Society -- New Scientific Approaches. That is one of the few issues over the years that has been out of stock for a long time; it was so widely distributed. I think at that time something close to 30,000 copies of that issue <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ distributed and we'd like to think that it had some impact. Back in 1964 the May issue was on city bosses and political machines. In that same year, in March <sup>we had</sup> "Urban Revival, Goals and Standards." And ~~at~~ most recent issue in September, 1978, was on "Urban Black Politics." I mention these as indications of the concern that the Academy



has had with urban government and we like to think that as we have had approximately twelve to fifteen people in each issue specialize in different sub-topics that their comments and analyses have been of some use to the administrations. We really don't know the extent to which that is true. But if we can judge by the sales of those particular issues I'd say that the response has been quite good.

The American Academy of Political and Social Science remains as one of those few organizations that seeks to be multi-disciplinary and is not devoted to one particular professional discipline but cuts across these boundaries and provides for a wider dissemination of analyses on the social and political issues than one finds in the more esoteric journals.