

Caroline Hodges Persell: Good afternoon and welcome to the Presidential and Awards Ceremony of the American Sociological Association in its Centennial Year. If you are coming in the doors, I will ask those of you who have seats next to you to raise your hand please, a trick I just learned from our President Troy Duster. So come on in and have a seat and welcome. I am Caroline Persell. I am the Vice President of the Association and the first thing we are going to do is take a moment of remembrance for those of our colleagues who have died in the past year and their names will be on the screen and we will remember them in silence. Thank you. (Screen shot of names 00:00:46 to 00:01:30). Okay. Thank you. It gives me great pleasure now to introduce a distinguished international visitor who is going to present a plaque to our President, Troy Duster. Professor Roberto Capriani, Presidente Associazione Italiana Sociologia will come up and give a presentation to our President Troy Duster.

Roberto Capriani: Mr. President, colleagues. The Founder of the American Sociological Society, Lester Ward learned many languages and traveled a lot and it was his ideas to summon European scholars. The spirit of our Founders, our sponsors, must be preserved, notwithstanding the differences from a historical point of view. When the American Journal of Sociology began in Italy, we had *Revista Italiana Sociologia* – The Italian Review of Sociology. Afterwards, Vilfredo Pareto left our country and our fascist government prevented any development of sociological studies. Now, our Association, founded in 1984 is a good sending, thanks to one thousand members. We want to increase our international links and we want to thank you for the previous cooperation. It is a pleasure to present our gift to celebrate the Centennial Year of the American Sociological Association, see you as many times, I do hope so. (Presentation).

President Troy Duster: On behalf of the ASA let me say thank you for a gracious gesture. I have now seen this plaque, it has such Italian flair. Sally will find a place, a permanent place, on the walls of the ASA in the entry. It is an extraordinary piece of work. Thank you.

Caroline Persell: And now it gives me great pleasure to introduce Professor Esther Chow from American University who is the Chair of the Awards Committee. Esther.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: Thank you. President Troy, colleagues, friends and guests. Today, we gather here to celebrate the Centennial Anniversary of our Professional Association in Sociology as well as to celebrate the success of some of our colleagues who are about to receive awards. What is success anyway? Someone once said that 80% of success is showing up. You all did today, didn't you? Your attendance on this special occasion reflects your own professional successes and in turn the success of the discipline in building a professional community which is truly our own. In the initial level, success is nothing that we wait for. It is something that we work for. John Longfellow remarks that "the talents of success is nothing more than doing what you do well and doing well whatever you do." Today we have a special group of colleagues who have made their marks and now can enjoy a moment of recognition for their success, their excellence each in different award categories, enumerates their labor over a lifetime in the discipline which we all treasure. Great work performed not by accident, or by chance, but by the wisdom, diligence, perseverance and enduring courage, the push our intellectual horizons furthermore. The awards ceremony signifies a rich tradition of publicly recognizing outstanding work in our disciplines. So it is time for looking back with pride and looking ahead with joy.

Let us start with, I am honored to be part of this special moment, let us start this ceremony with the Dissertation Awards. This year the Dissertation Awards have two winners. The Dissertation Award honors the best Ph.D. dissertation for a calendar year from among those submitted by the Advisors, Mentors in the disciplines. The first recipient is Ann Morning for her dissertation; the title is *The Nature of Race, Teaching and Learning about Human Difference*. The second one is Amelie Quesnel-Valle for *Pathways from Status Attainment to Adult Health - The contribution of Health Insurance to Sociological Inequality in Health in the United States*. Ann Morning is from New York University and the nature of race of accumulation of Ann Morning's longstanding interest and work on the origin and meaning of racial classification. Rather than simply accept the premise that race is socially constructed, Morning sought to identify how race is socially, understand racial differences and how scientific knowledge about racial differences is disseminated to lay people. The nature of race promises to open new lines of debates and research and that will reshape this cause about race relations and the meaning of race. Another co-winner, Amelie Quesnel-Valle is from McGill University. Her dissertation, *The Pathway from Status Attainment to Adult Health*, she examines the impact of adult financial resources on human and health outcomes. The United States is an exception among industrial society in its lack of universal health insurance coverage. We all know that, right? And Quesnel-Valle demonstrated there is accumulative but diminishing effects of financial resources on adult health outcomes. She further found that access to health insurance is a key mechanism that links adult socio-economic outcomes to health. Her dissertation is an important accomplishment that has both theoretical and policy significance. I would like to invite both awardees to the stage to receive their awards. (00:10:55 to 00:11:44 award presentation). Each of the awardees will have one minute to make a remark.

Ann Morning: I am indebted to many people in institutions, but unfortunately I only have time to mention very few here. But first and foremost I would like to thank the wonderful Committee of Faculty at Princeton University who guided my dissertation research. My Committee was Chaired by Marta Tienda and it included Michelle Lamont now of Harvard University and Elizabeth M. Armstrong. I am also very grateful to the ASA Dissertation Award Committee and I would like to thank them for the hard work that they put into making their selections. Among the institutions that have supported my work, I particularly would like to recognize the Ford, Spencer and National Science Foundation's. Finally, I would like to thank the many faculty students and staff, both at Princeton University and at my new home New York University for their encouragement. And in that connection I owe a very special thanks to my NYU colleague and our ASAP President Troy Duster who has been both a mentor to me and an inspiration. Thank you.

Amelie Quesnel-Valle: It will come as no surprise to you that I am incredibly grateful to the Selection Committee for their award. First because it allows me for this wonderful opportunity to formally and publicly, very publicly thank all my colleagues and mentors from the Department of Sociology at the Duke University. Thanks to them my dissertation was a wonderful, most enjoyable experience. I also want to thank the Fulbright Foundation and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada which also helped make my doctoral experience a wonderful experience. I am also immensely grateful to my Dissertation Committee members, Linda George, Philip Morgan, Angio Rand and Ann Lynn and particularly the Chair of my Committee Tom Dupreet who is now at Columbia. Thanks to his, I believe it is

thanks to his treating me like a colleague and holding my research to these highest levels of excellence that I am up here tonight. I can only hope that I will bring to McGill my McGill students, the same level of mentorship. Finally, I want to thank again the Selection Committee. I think it is an amazing honor to have my research recognized by such a distinguished group of scholars, but perhaps most importantly, and I believe and I think as my research shows, lack of insurance is an attainable and one that is avoidable inequity so I am grateful for this recognition and I hope it will advance perhaps ever so likely the cause of universal coverage in the States. Thank you.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: The second award is CSC Bernard Award. The nature of this award is given annually in recognition of the body of sociological work and scholarly work that has engaged and enlarged the horizon of sociology to encompass fully the role of women in society. This year, the recipient of the award is Evelyn Nakano Glenn. She is from the University of California – Berkley. Evelyn Nakano Glenn's work has been instrumental in the development of the analysis of the intersection of race, class and gender. Her work on Japanese-American women, domestic worker, as immigrants, as war brides, is groundbreaking. Her most recent publication on the impact of race and gender on American citizenship and labor fills an important void in literature of gender and work. Glenn's work is forcing us to be reexamine the sexual division of labor through a racial lens. Evelyn Nakano Glenn is truly a scholar whose career embodies the spirits of Jesse Bernard.

Evelyn Nakano Glenn: I understand that because of my seniority I actually get 90 seconds instead of 60 seconds. I would like to first of all thank the ASA and the Jesse Bernard Selection Committee and also thank those who nominated me – Rick Beldose, Joyce Chanin, Maggie Anderson, Cheryl Jilks, Barry Thorne and Mary Romero. Now over the past 30 years or so, feminist scholars and scholars of colors have transformed sociology as well as a number of traditional disciplines and they have also helped to found important interdisciplinary fields including ethnic studies, women's studies, sexuality studies. I am fortunate that my career has overlapped with these series of movements, intellectual movements and I am grateful for the intellectual and personal comradeship of many men and women who have been involved in these movements. I should say Aloha first of all, I have this wonderful lei from my friends in Hawaii so I just wanted to mention that I spent the most wonderful nine months of my life in Hawaii learning Hawaiian Aloha and it was a very productive year. I started doing work on Hawaii and also had a child who is here in the audience, my youngest, Patrick, so I think they were surprised to see a visiting professor arrive in such a state as I was in and I only missed two classes you know because I was trying to live up to the example of the Japanese-American women in the fields who had their babies and went right back to the field. So I went right back to the lecture hall. My students however, did not seem to notice that I looked any different. But anyway I would like to mention two groups in particular that have been important in terms of my own intellectual and personal growth. First is the women in work group that has met for almost two decades in New York and over the course of that time, we have been able to present very early drafts of our work and to receive support of comment and criticism. And almost all of my work has appeared in the very rough forms with that group. A second was the group associated with the University of Memphis's Center for Research on Women directed by Bonnie Thornton Dill which provided a venue for us sharing comparative research on Latina's; African Americans and Asian American women. I would like to thank my colleagues in sociology at Florida State

University, University of Binghamton and Gender and Women's Studies at Berkley for their personal generosity and interest in my work. I wanted to mention in particular my colleague Barry Thorn who has been an incredibly generous friend and colleague and she is also my office mate; Mayra Ferry who has read and critiqued almost everything that I have ever written; Elsa Barkley Brown who gave me the courage and belief that I could write meaningfully about the experiences of African-American women. Finally I would like to thank my partner of 43 years, I should mention I was a child bride, who has edited and read everything that I have ever written at least three times. He is living proof that a gentle Anglo-Saxon white male can be an appropriate companion for an angry radical feminist woman of color. Thank you.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: Our next award is Public Understanding of Sociology Award. The award is given annually to a person or persons who have made exemplary contributions to advance the public understanding of sociology, sociological research and scholarship among the general public. The award may recognize a contribution in the preceding year or a longer career of such contributions. This year the recipient of this award will go to Pepper Schwartz from the University of Washington. Pepper Schwartz flew hundreds of appearances on television and radio. Through scores of articles in popular magazines and newspapers has discussed and explained sociological research insight about relationships, family, gender and sexuality. Her work with the press demonstrated sociologists can present research about the most essential aspect of social existence in ways that are understandable and engaging while not betraying the underlying mythological and substantive realities. Pepper Schwartz is a model of what sociologists can do to enhance the discipline and help society. Pepper Schwartz.

Pepper Schwartz: I am taking those 90 seconds too. I am extremely touched and pleased to be given this year's prestigious and welcome award from the American Sociological Association. I want to thank the association for picking me. Years ago, I was told that studying sexuality, intimacy, gender would marginalize me and that my inclination to talk about my work in the press and other kinds of media would trivialize my training and open me up to criticism. Well, there has been criticism of course, but there has also been appreciation and I have never, ever regretted my decision to go this course. However, I could not say before now that my principle's were understood as well by my discipline as I would have liked, and about how important it was to speak about sexuality in society, how people's relationships and the social policy about that relationship was at the heart of maintaining a civil society. Without our entry as sociologists into these debates and the debates about the social construction of gayness, the social construction of marriage, HIV, heterosexual co-habitation, abstinence programs and even the right to love who we want to love and the way we want to do it, we would just be left with the government's unfettered moralisms directing policy and law. Our entry into the public, legal and legislative discourse has made a huge difference in individual lives at the political level and at the judicial level. And by giving me this award, the ASA has said to me, and to so many others, that what we do and what we say to the public and to these other bodies of governance, is extremely important and an appropriate venue for sociologists and that direct dialogue with the public is worthy and valid and will be appreciated by our Association. So thank you, thank you very much for myself, and all of those other sociologists who study sexualities, the world of intimacy and related topics and to include all of you out there, whatever you are studying, I would like to say that this is a small, but I hope inspiring example that if you have a passionate intellectual and personal interest that you should persevere no matter what lack of

encouragement you get when you first pick what you are interested in. Thank you. I think you will find over a lifetime as I have that it was a very satisfying thing to do and your efforts may someday be honored and validated even if it does not look like that at the very beginning of your journey. Thank you.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: Our next award is Distinguished Career Award for the Practice of Sociology. This award has a long description. This annual award honors outstanding contribution in sociological practice. The award may recognize work that has facilitated or served as a model for the work of others. Work that has significantly advanced the utility of one or more specialty areas in sociology and by so doing has elevated the professional status and public image of the field as a whole or work that has been honored or widely recognized outside the disciplines for its significant impacts particularly in advancing human welfare. This year the recipient award is William Kornblum. He is from Graduate Center for City University of New York. William Kornblum has spent more than 30 years at the City University of New York applying his sociological insights to communities and labor issues. In report preparing for the general public rather than academic specialist. Kornblum has examined New Yorkers relationship to Central Park, the bright light of the West 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, Harlem's teenager's life aspiration and struggles and more recently the effects of the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attack on airline workers. Since 1997, he has chaired the Board of the Grand Central Neighborhood Agency – an agency serving the homeless in the Midtown Manhattan. Kornblum's multifaceted work that uses sociology to tackle urban problems have over the year's inference hundreds of his students to become similarly engaged in their communities. Bill.

William Kornblum: So, I finally have something I can help explain my kids what it is I do. Mom, this award is owed a lot to you as New York City English teacher for 25 years, you worked ceaselessly to teach me how to write complete sentences and coherent paragraphs. As a sociologist with limited ability in abstract theory or in statistics, these are skills that have been of inestimable value in my line of work with the public. You are out there in the ethos some place and I know you are appreciating this moment. On a more serious note it is a great honor to be here in receiving this award on the watch of Troy Duster whose work exemplifies all the best of pure and applied sociology and I also of course have to thank the Awards Committee for the incredible wisdom and perceptiveness of their choice in my case. My mentor at the University of Chicago whose names to be invoked in this was Morris Januwicz and he taught me the enduring value of applying sociological ideas and methods to institution building in the urban world. But two sociologists in particular have served me as models throughout my career and they are - the two well known white guys – William F. White, Bill White of Cornell and William H. White, Holly White of New York City. In Bill White's case, he read my dissertation and advocated the publication and led me on a path towards labor study, labor and community studies. Holly White has created an enduring legacy in the study, empirical study of urban public space. We cannot say enough about their contributions. Most of all of course I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my colleagues and my students, present and past, many of whom are here today and I am deeply, deeply touched by that at the City University of New York. The City University of New York is the third largest university system in the United States, but it is all in one City, five boroughs, 12 four year campuses, nine two year campuses and the most incredible array of students you would ever want to meet. If I have ever done anything that is of worth in New York City and elsewhere it is because of the work they did with me and the things we

accomplished together. I cannot say enough to thank all of them. Finally I have to thank two young colleagues, Diva Pager and Nicole Marwell who told me that I only had 90 seconds and the hook would come if I went over that, so thank you so much, thank you very much I am history.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: Our next award is Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award. This award is given annually to honor outstanding contributions to the undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and learning of sociology that improves the quality of teaching. The award may recognize either a career contribution or a specific product. This year the recipient of the award is Caroline Persell, our Vice President from New York University. Caroline Hodges Persell has made an extraordinary impact on many aspects of the teaching of sociology including her skill as a teacher of both undergraduate and graduate sociology students. As a mentor to colleagues and in her sociological and scholarly contributions concerning teaching and learning in our disciplines. Persell has been a leader in thinking about computer assisted teaching. She was elected as the Carnegie Foundation Fellow in Teaching to work on this particular topic. She has led the ASA Task Force on the Advanced Placement Course in Sociology and has written outstanding teaching materials for the high school teachers. As a member of the American Sociological Association Departmental Resources Group, she has worked with many departments to enhance their curriculum and teaching effectiveness. Carol Persell.

Caroline Hodges Persell: Thank you Esther. Thank you very much Esther. I really am very honored to receive this award. I am very pleased the Association has such an award. I think that as research is part of a collective tradition so is scholarship of teaching and learning. We all need each other, we all share with each other, the grandmothers and grandfathers of our field have helped us and extended the helping hand and we are continuing to share it. I want to thank also very much my students at New York University who have taught me almost everything I know about teaching, they are a wonderful group and a wonderfully responsive group to learning about teaching as well as excited about intellectual ideas and research. Lastly I would like to thank my husband Charles Persell who is here tonight. After 38 years of marriage and supporting me in this endeavor, many varied ways, the flame lives on and he is here to celebrate the Centennial with all of us. So thank you all very much.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: The next award is the Distinguished Scholar Publication Award. This award is presented annually for a single book or monograph published in three preceding calendar years. The recipient this year is Beverly J. Silver from Johns Hopkins University. In recent decades, workers movement has significantly declined in wealthy countries. *Forces of Labor: Workers' Movements and Globalization since 1870* that is the title of her book. Beverly Silver broadened the geography for understanding labor struggles and traced the recurring rises and decline of the world labor movement. Silver's world historical analysis of the labor movement uses carefully gathered data to show how waves of labor unrest have been related to capital mobility, warfare, product cycles and waves of globalization since the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. *Forces of Labor* points out what is local about the contemporary global crisis of labor movements and explores the likely form that emerges, the emerging labor movement will take in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Beverly Silver.

Beverly Silver: Thank you very much. I wanted to start by thanking the Award Committee because I know that these committees are a lot of work and these awards could not exist without the willingness of people to serve and to the work involved. I would also like to thank those who nominated my book, I am not entirely sure who you are, but clearly I would not be standing here if you did not take the time and initiative to put my book forward for consideration by the Committee. All our intellectual endeavors are collective, but *Forces of Labor* is collective in several specific senses. The initial roots of the book lie in the collective work of a group of faculty and graduate students interested in the intertwined dynamics of labor movements and global social change who met regularly in the mid 1980's at Binghamton University. We called ourselves the World Labor Research Working Group and I believe there are three of the original members are actually out in the audience; Jamie Dengler, Patricio Corsene which I do not see and Giovanni Arrighi. The World Labor Group was part of an exciting and fertile, although often contentious and exasperating environment in Binghamton in the 1980's where a large number of such collective research groups existed and interacted prospering at sites of intellectual production and exchange. One person deserves special mention as the Father and especially, really the Mother of the unique intellectual environment: Terrence Hopkins went to Binghamton in the late 1970's from Columbia to found a new Sociology Ph.D. Program that was to attract faculty and graduate students from all over the world who were concerned to understand the deep inequalities of wealth, welfare and power that characterize the contemporary world in which we live. Terrence Hopkins pedagogical strategy was one that entailed extremely high risks but potentially very high rewards for the kinds of projects that were undertaken, including many Ph.D. dissertations, did not meet any conventional criteria for "feasible research design", but were driven by the crucial insight that by widening the temporal and geographical scope of our analyses, to encompass capitalism as a historical global and I should add conflict laden system that new knowledge could be produced to which more circumscribe studies would not have access. Terrence died in 1997 so he did not get to see the high reward gotten from this particular high risk project but I think he would have been very, very happy if he were here today. Over the past 13 years, I have been at Johns Hopkins University where I have had the great luck of being surrounded by extremely supportive faculty colleagues as well as successive cohorts of committed graduate students, some of whom are there, from whose questions, criticisms and own work I have learned an enormous amount. I would like to end by acknowledging my most profound intellectual debt to Giovanni Arrighi. Anyone familiar with Giovanni and his work will be able to see his deep intellectual and I would also say moral influence on *Forces of Labor* and on my scholarship as a whole. This imprint is the outcome of what is now almost 25 years of ongoing intellectual exchange. So Giovanni finally let me simply say thank you. Thank you to everybody.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: Well we have almost come to the finale of the Awards Ceremony. Last but not least category for the award is Career of Distinguished Scholarship Award. This annual award honors a scholar who has shown outstanding commitment to the profession of sociology and whose accumulative work has contributed in important ways to the advancement of the disciplines. The body of lifetime work may include theoretical and/or mythological contributions. Particularly work that substantially reoriented the field in general or in a particular field. This year, the award has two recipients. They are no stranger to us, they are well known colleagues and Charles Tilly from Columbia University and also Charles Willy from Harvard University. Charles Tilly's scholarship has transformed our understanding of politics,

contestations and social change from his influential early work on urbanization and industrial conflicts. Through his agenda setting, research on collective action, revolution and state formation to his more recent emphasis on social relations, identity and culture. Tilly has been consistently ahead of the curve asking basic questions of the disciplines and always coming up with fresh and provocative answers. If these are single unifying themes recurring through Tilly's expansive writings, it is his effort to locate thinking, creative social actors at the center of an unfolding sociological drama in which the script is continuously being rewritten by the past. It is this irreversible historical perspectives that has not only influenced sociology, but also several laboring disciplines. Charles Tilly.

Charles Tilly: When you mention my work I hope you meant expansive and not expensive. Is Randy Collins in the audience? Oh Randy, its Philadelphia and you are not here. Randy and I disagree about a number of things but we agree very strongly on one point. That is that intellectual distinction never really belongs to individuals, but to networks. The network of which I have been a member has moved from Harvard to Toronto to Michigan to the new school to Columbia accumulating I suppose like a dragnet members and debris all along one portion of the network occupies half a robe back here, we call it the Perry School Mafia from Michigan days. It is that group of people, especially the graduate students who would not be satisfied with pat answers that the American Sociological Association is honoring today. It is a good thing because it would be terrible for people like Chuck Willy and me in the prime of life beginning our careers to have to admit that we are washed up, finished. In fact, the award reminds me of a P.T. Barnum story. Barnum was a clever impresario and he noticed that the side shows at his great circus were becoming clogged with visitors who spent too long looking at the strange animals, the freaks, the acrobats and the other exhibitions. He solved that problem by putting up a sign adjacent to the exotic animal's exhibit - to the egress. It cleared the hall as this award clears me from this stage.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: The co-recipient of this award is Charles Willy from Harvard University. Charles V. Willy has dedicated his professional life to solving social problems. Willy's research interest covers such topics as areas of research includes the segregation, higher education, public health, racial relations, urban community problems and family life. He is author of nearly two dozen books and over a hundred journal articles. Willy has been an expert witness in several school desegregation cases and in 1974 in Philadelphia he participated as a lay preacher in the ordination for the first 11 women priests in the Episcopal Church of the United States, an act which led the *Ms. Magazine* to name him a male hero for his courageous action on behalf of women. Charles Willy.

Charles Willy: As I look at these panels about history of ASA I suppose this session will go down in history as a time when ASA was given the Tilly's and the Willy's. I am profoundly grateful to receive this award. I see it as a keystone that locks together the many different experiences in my professional career that began more than a half century ago in 1952 as an instructor of Sociology at Syracuse University and that continues into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century as the Charles William Elliott Professor of Education Emeritus at Harvard University. I am especially pleased that the American Sociological Association is honoring the career of a person who took the road less traveled. As an applied sociologist this who has taught sociology in a faculty of arts and sciences also in two medical schools, one school of education and a theological seminary,



my research has been guided by theories and methods that contribute both to discovery and the application of knowledge. As I rapidly approach the 78<sup>th</sup> anniversary of my birth, it is a wonderful experience to hear from one's colleagues who say well done, good and faithful servant. And for me, your gracious gift of this award reinforces my belief and I invite you to have this as your belief that if you live long enough something will happen.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow: This is the end of the Awards Ceremony. Thank you for your patience and support.

Caroline Hodges Persell: Thank you Esther. I would like to thank all of the Committee Award Members for their hard work in making these awards possible and congratulate the winners. I would also like to invite everyone here to a reception at the Marriott Hotel in the Grand Salon E/F after the plenary and our Presidential Address to mingle and greet or to congratulate the winners and President Troy Duster. It is now my great pleasure to introduce to you the new President of the, United States, don't I wish (laughter). Last year at the annual ASA meeting, Michael Burovoid laid out his fourfold typology of the field of sociology, professional sociology, policy sociology, critical sociology and public sociology. In the person of Troy Duster, you see someone who flourishes in all the four cells of that typology and then some. He is a prolific scholar with a fascinating life history who encompasses antinomies. Troy Duster's publications are not only numerous, but they span an astonishing number of fields including science; medicine; knowledge production; race; law; criminology and higher education. His many articles have appeared in a wide range of places including: contexts, Hasting Center report, ethnicity, social problems, the chronicle of higher education this very week, the *American Sociologist* *Crime and Delinquency*, *Le Temp Moderne*, *The Black Scholar*, *The Japanese Journal of Science* and *Science* as well as in scores of edited volumes. Some of his recent books include: cultural perspectives on biological knowledge co-edited with Karen Garret, *Backdoor to Eugenics and Whitewashing Race the Myth of a Color Blind Society* with Brown and others. His complete CV is available on the web otherwise you would not get to hear his speech. Such prodigious and wide ranging scholarship was not the result of being born with a silver spoon in his mouth. Far from it. His father died when he was nine and Troy was raised in poverty on the Chicago Southside by his mother, a community organizer. From her he learned modesty and the importance of getting a good education and of contributing to the community. According to the wonderful biography of Troy in the August, 2004 issue of *Footnotes* by Harry Levin and Craig Reirmen, available on the ASA website. In his high school Troy became editor of the school newspaper, graduated first in his class and won an academic scholarship to Northwestern where he studied journalism and sociology and was mentored by Raymond Mack. Troy began his graduate education at UCLA where he studied ethno-methodology with Harold Garfinkle and methodology with W.S. Robinson before returning to earn his Ph.D. at Northwestern in 1962, five years after completing his B.A. He has been a professor at the University of California – Riverside; University of California – Berkley and New York University. Along the way he chaired the Berkley Department, directed the Center for the Study of Social Change and served on numerous national advisory and policy committees. He is currently Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute for the History of the Production of Knowledge at New York University and also holds a courtesy appointment as Chancellor's Professor at the University of California – Berkley. He and his work have received numerous honors, including the Hatfield Scholars Award in 2002, the Devoice Johnson Fraser Award in 2001, Guggenheim Fellowship

and an Honorary Doctorate from Williams College. In his scholarship career and life Troy Duster encompasses antinomies; he defines categorization as he transcends fields and roles within sociology and beyond bringing together seemingly contradictory ideas and positions. You can see this in the theme of this Centennial meeting, co-imperative perspectives, competing explanations. He is extraordinarily able to mediate differences and forge intellectual and interpersonal syntheses that leave everyone feeling respected. I have observed this quality both at ASA Council Meeting and Departmental discussions. For instance I remember a departmental controversy over whether training for teaching would be a required part of the graduate curriculum for everyone. In addition to many other requirements graduate students and departmental administrators were at a bit of an impasse. As a member of the faculty/student sub-committee charged with addressing the issue, Troy invited the faculty and student members to his office where he proceeded to produce six wine glasses and a lovely bottle of wine. As participants sipped the wine they articulated their hopes and concerns about learning to teach and how to address that goal in the graduate program. After listening carefully and encouraging others to do so, Troy in his inimitable style pulled together the themes and issues thereby helping to create a resolution that reflected the concerns of all. Troy Duster is professionally prolific, highly relevant, gently but deeply critical, multifaceted, far ranging in his impact and a masterful integrator. For all of these reasons and more, it gives me great pleasure to present to you my highly esteemed colleague and friend, President of the American Sociological Association in its Centennial Year, Troy Duster.

Troy Duster: Thank you. Well thank you for a wonderful introduction. The Program Committee had a task. Our task was to plan a Centennial and we gave the task of the 22 sessions to Caroline Persell, pages 8 to about 14 indicate her remarkable success in coordinating all 22 Centennial sessions. I would like to take the opportunity for a round of applause to Caroline. Now a Centennial is an appropriate place to step way back, way back, and take the long view. Beginning of the picture of Lester Ward in 1905/1906, if you came to the Association's plenary on Friday evening; you would have seen a picture of the first report of the newspaper article, of the first American Sociological Society meeting, courtesy of Gail Largey, here is a picture of that first 1906 newspaper report. You will not be able to read the context. Big Gathering of Specialized Brains. What you cannot see there is that sociology was a break away, it was once part of the American Economic Association and we broke away in 1905/1906 to form an Association of our own. Ninety-nine years later, here is a headline from last year's meeting. (laughter). We challenge the stranglehold of a field we broke away from 99, it is about time. Sociology itself of course created its internal differences and at mid-century, 1950/1960, early 1970's we also created breakaways. If the Economic Association was too narrowly constrictive for us in 1904/1905, by 1950 those of us who wanted to be more engaged in an exchange with the Society broke away to become Association for the Study of Social Problems. Those who wanted more of an engagement with issues of race became the Association of Black Sociologists. Those who wanted more of an engagement on interaction became The Interaction Society, SWS – Women in Society formed. So, this notion that people have a hard time staying under one roof, I think is kind of a natural thing and it produces the notion that comparative perspectives on the same phenomenon are routine feature of our lives. Indeed we all have the experience of going to a movie or to the theater, sometimes with a very close friend or spouse. We will sit there, the event thinking that we are the same spot and when we leave the theater or the film, the same celluloid and we find out the person we were sitting next to, had a totally

different experience. Now that can be the source of rich engagement, it can be the source of extraordinary difficult relationship that ensues. It does depend, but the point is there is, I am going to turn to the theorist Alfred Schutz, for a way of framing my concern about comparative perspectives. Schutz is a remarkable social theorist and he had a phrase which I like, he said that “fundamental domain assumption of human exchange with those who are close to you”, is that I assume and I assume that my fellow human assumes that if they stood next to me they would see what I see. Now Schutz a phenomenologist later on he would influence the work of ethnomethodologists like Harold Garfinkle. Of course understood that this was the domain assumption that was routinely disrupted and in the course of experience you often came across people who had different experiences even though the same phenomena. Ethnomethodology talks about using this as the moment for either continuous repair of disruption of this assumption – you act as if it did not happen or it is not important. But sometimes you cannot just push it under the rug, you have to breakaway. Now the obvious difference of interpretation what we see at the theater or at the movie, is what we bring through our experience, very different perspectives, different personal histories, sexual orientations, religious views. Nothing unusual or strange about that. This idea of social position, determining what one sees is a rather old one in sociology. Whether you call it the positionality, social location, whether you think of it in terms of modern, pre-modern or post-modern the insight has been there for a long time. Now let me turn to a specific example that I think will resonate with this audience. Several years ago, I was invited to sit on a panel at the National Academy of Sciences, the panel last for over a year, it was composed of members of very different disciplines, different orientations, different perspectives. All had some experience with what were called mind altering substances. That ranged from drugs at the time I had just written a book on the history of drugs, cigarettes, alcohol, eating disorders, there were about five or six in the category. At a certain point the topic turned to alcohol. The question was why is the rate of alcoholism so high among Native Americans, Aborigines in Australia, and what they call in Canada – First Nations people. Now the rates at that time were astronomically high, sometimes six, seven, eight times of the general populations. So I thought the answer was rather straightforward, I mean it seemed to me that what these three broad groups experienced in common across two centuries of being displaced from their native soil, shunted to another part of the geography, of the land, destroyed the economies, family structures disrupted, diets changed, work circumstances altered and given easy access to cheap alcohol. I figured you know, that could drive you to drink. Now to my shock on this panel, my colleagues who I otherwise have lots of respect for and they kept insisting no, no that there was a very different way of thinking about this problem – Aborigines, Native Americans and First Nations people. What they were looking for in common across all these three groups with thousands and thousands of miles apart, we were looking for a polymorphism, a genetic, a little frequency variation that would put together the number of Native Americans that are over 380 of these different tribes in the United States, different linguistic backgrounds, different parts of the world, add that to what happened across the Bering Straits and Australian Aborigine’s and they were looking commonalities that would explain the high rates of alcoholism in these three groups. We were watching the same movie, but whoa. You know you return to Alfred Schutz’s insight if you could see what I see, of course you would agree with me. Well, not really. I want to define my remarks into three segments. I want to first describe the problem of what I see as expectancies, explanations which are competing. Second I want to turn to what I see as a growing challenge to sociology. What might be called the shifting tide of competing explanations and the increasing appeal of those alternative frames. Finally I

will conclude with some suggestions about how sociologists might rethink the challenge which I think is coming fast. So first in context, let me start by describing an experience I had about 10 – 12 years ago. This was held in Washington, the NIH, every year or two decide to look at a whole portfolio of some particular phenomena and it could be breast cancer. What do they do, they call the Directors and they say well give us all the research on breast cancer and we will see whether or not there are some gaps, there are some areas we need to do more funding in. It is called an initiative of breast cancer research. So, every year or two years, they decided on some topic. It could be hypertension or heart disease, you name it. Well that particular year, 1991, during the Administration of George Bush the first we had what was called violence initiative. So, the task was to put together a review and come to a conclusion about what kind of research on violence should be done. There is pseudo controversy of rather substantial proportion. I am not going to take the time now, I do not have the time to detail that controversy, but I will tell you about an outcome of the controversy. It got so hot and heavy that they put together a special committee and I was invited to be on it. I joined the special panel to review the entire NIH portfolio on violence. Every bit of research on violence was put into these different piles. It did not matter what it was called, perhaps aggressive behavior, anti-social behavior; any category that can possibly be about violence is in this huge portfolio of over 450 studies that we were reviewing. Now, of course, we already knew as a group, there were over 30 of us, different fields of inquiry, we already knew that violence occurs in some groups more than others and some communities more than others. For example in that period we had statistics showing that homicide rates among African-Americans are about twelve times that among Whites in selected jurisdictions. So we had this information and despite this, the great bulk of the portfolio, over 85% of the studies dealt with individuals, at the end of an analysis or smaller units. That is parenteral transmission, biochemical issues around cell life, genetic explanations. Now what some of us pointed out that this was an imbalance of some proportion given what we knew about where violence was occurring, these homicide rates. There was a chorus of responses from the other half, we split into two panels. We split into two groups, and one group kept talking the talk I was just describing to you, namely how about more studies on something called The Community or the interaction between persons that might explain violence or the political economic social forces that might explain violence. The other group kept saying over and over again, well, you may have a point, there may be variations out there, but we are interested here at the NIH in basic processes, basic processes. I kept wondering what was that? Well, it turns out that almost anything that is inside the body, that could be explained or studied was called a basic process. Anything outside the body was called policy, politics, a kind of soft humanistic understanding of the human experience. Inside the body was science, outside that is another department. Now that theme is recurrent. It occurs for example it explains what I began with, mainly if you go back to my notion about what happened with alcohol, they said things like, polymorphisms, the study of leptin frequencies that is an important basic process. We understand that we understand alcoholism. But the thing about displacement from the soil, disrupting economies, disruptive families, genocide, that is anything but politics and policy. You see the slide here on the two frames. Okay, the distinction appears to be crude and it is, but it repeats itself over and over again, let us take cancer research. Prostate cancer rate among African American men is twice that among White men. Well the basic processes approach says let us get a panel of a thousand fifty African-American males and look at their gene structures for AnKA gene, candidate genes for cancer. So what about looking at the processes outside the body where maybe living near a toxic waste dump, living with a certain kind of style of life with diets. Well

that is outside the framework of the notion of what we are going to call Anka gene research for prostate cancer, hypertension, heart disease. Inside the body, we look for nitric oxide deficiency outside those are social stressors, that is that soft humanistic stuff that police profiling those kinds of things, we cannot get a handle on that. That is outside of our department. So once again, we found ourselves in this huge split. I could go on and on but I will stop there because I want to get to my major points two and three. So part two, what is happening in what I will call the increasing challenge to sociology. The challenge of the emergence of new kinds of databases inside the body, the most important of which I am going to talk about, increasing databases around the world respect to DNA, genetic databases. Why should sociologists care? Why should any of you care about this development? Well I am going to give you three quick slides, three quick reasons and you will see where I am headed. The first one is this one. "Illnesses that seem identical in terms of symptoms may actually have different gene pathways, this would explain why Blacks have higher rates of mortality for diabetes, cancer and stroke". That is from the CEO of Nitromed, the relevance of which becomes transparent in a moment. Now here is the quote "Until now, these have been attributed to racism, the American context, but now we can attribute it to nitric oxide deficiency. That is a paradigmatic fight that is a fight of some concern to those interested in this topic and seeing it through a different frame of what might explain. Number two: earlier this year, why might sociologists be interested? An article appeared in the *Vanguard Journal of Human Genetics*. And it said cluster analysis of the macro-satellite markers produce clusters that have near perfect correspondence to self-reported data on racial categories. And here is how the report was played out in the Stanford Medical School Journal. These new data they said challenge the widely held belief that race is only socially constructed, its genetic. Okay. Number three: now for a long time people have been trying to make an argument about I.Q. and genetics. At least a century. So here comes the old wine in new bottles. Now what has happened in the last three to five years is that they are able to go inside the body, so here is the work of Robert Plomin and his associates and what they have done is let us say you take two groups of, he took two groups of students, 50 students who had very high I.Q.'s average of about 130 to 135; 50 students who had only average I.Q.'s, took DNA samples from the two groups of students, turned on the computer and claimed to find that there were differences between these children that could be explained by going to a particular bilillick frequency in the DNA. Actually language will make little sense to you, but here it is for those of you who want to pursue this, DNA marker on the insulin like growth factor it is there, but it turns out upon closer examination that it only explained the 5% of the variance. *New York Times* had a headline, I.Q. Gene Discovered. So, that is why I want to at least entertain the possibility that sociologists could profit from looking more closely and caring about these developments. So now I apologize for those of you who know this material, but it is important that I put it up and show you where this is headed. Okay, if you are going to your web browser, type in ancestrybydna, you will be told that for \$158 or something, I think it is a little bit more now, you can send in, send in your money, they will send you back a kit and on the kit, you can put a swab of your saliva and this little computer chip, send it back in and they will send you back proportion of your ancestry that is African, European, Asian or Native-American. It sounds like recreational work, I mean no one would take that seriously you think at first glance, but then things did get serious about two years ago. When you have a rapist/murdered loose four to five victims, cannot identify the person, you are looking for someone who is described at the crime scene as being White and then someone says well wait a minute, if you give us his DNA, maybe we can tell you more about him, about his ethnicity or race. Give us his DNA and we will try to find his racial taxonomy.

That is what happened. The dragnet turned up no White's. It says in March the police contact Tony Frudakis and his group there doing ancestral informative markers, come back with a conclusion. This person they say is not White, the DNA tells us he is colored, he has 85%. Well it goes on and how do they know? Well that is part of what I want to tell you about. How do they know? Is this smoke and mirrors? Is this hard and real science inside the body? What do we have here? So here is the point where I use my apology. I apologize too fast. That part I did not need an apology for, this I do. This is the next three to five minutes is about the double helix. I am going to make this painless. But in order to get to the point I want to get to, I have to go through this, so the apology is you have seen this before, this is a graphic representation of the double helix. You will notice at the end of it it is cut open. Literally cut open. Now that is a graphic, but they can do it. They cut it open they can put it on a slide and then they can put that slide in the computer. Now those are the four nucleotides – CGTA over and over again. Kind of boring, nothing in there of interest. Indeed, in this room, any two people chosen at random if I took your DNA sample, cut it open, put it on a slide at that particular point in the DNA on the chromosome, it would be complete and total overlap, all those nucleotides would be exactly in the same place for about one thousand three hundred points. Exactly the same for any two people in this room indeed in the whole world. And so, the human genome project had their rationale in the first eight years. Anybody's genome will do for the map in the sequence. We could take a Laplander an Aboriginal, we could take a White, a Black, an Asian, it did not matter whose DNA we took, we are all so much alike. It goes like this, those nucleotides overlap at every point for a thousand three hundred points and then there is a single nucleotide where there is a difference. It is called a single nucleotide, polymorphism. For the next thousand points, exact same overlap. And then, a single nucleotide, polymorphism difference throughout the whole genome of every human being. That is the figure, 99.9% alike at the DNA level. We are all alike. So Craig Venter and Francis Collins had a news conference at the White House in 2000 and they say what one thing we can tell you at the DNA level is no such thing as race and everyone applauded. Here is an actual picture of what happens when you cut up one of those DNA and put it on a slide. Here is a picture of the actual polymorphism structure, it is called a SNP profile and just to reiterate the point, anybody's DNA in this room at that point in the genome will fit exactly the same sequence except at those three points. Now, most of the genome does not single any information to cause a change, but some parts of the genome about 10%, tell the protein, tell the cell, the proteins what to do. If one of those "differences" misspellings it is called, occurs at a critical point in the genome, let us take the example to tell the blood to clot or not. If there is a misspelling at that point, then the person who is victimized will have hemophilia. So a single point of difference could make a huge difference in your life. The rationale therefore for the mapping and sequencing of the whole genome. Okay. But remember the notion that we are all so much alike at a genetic level, we are all so much alike, that anybody's genome would do. Five years ago there was what I call the turned difference. We are all alike, true enough, throughout the whole three billion base payers of all those nucleotides, we are all alike but now with the super computer turns out there are three million points of difference between any two people in this room. Let me repeat that. Any two people in this room, have three million points of difference. Well, things changed rapidly. IBM announces the super computer to go into the DNA and with this kind of technology in the very short time, they can search the claims 7.5 trillion per second calculations to find differences. This language will amuse you the notion that there is a petaflop—a quadrillion 'floating-points' per second on the DNA. These machines are operating all the time. So what starts off as a language of we are all

the same in the last five years has turned to the language of not only are we all different, the differences can be understood for grouping people, we are going to infer ethnic origins from these short tandem repeats in the DNA. We are going to find out whether or not you come from Group A, B, C or D based upon this configuration of nucleotides. Inferring ethnic origin, now the titles of ethnic origin but upon closer inspection we are talking about race and here is the language of the article. "The purpose of the paper is to report a method for inferring the ethnic origins with these short tandem repeats at these loci". "Information regarding ethnicity of an unknown offender may assist in targeting investigations for mass screening." Looking at the six tandem repeats and discuss an inference can be used as intelligent information to reduce the number of people interviewed to resolve a forensic case. Not only do I want you to pay attention to the taxonomic system – the categories. We are saying the essence of the method is to profile these five British groups. And you know with only with one exception, it looks like the taxonomy of Carlos Linnaeus 1735 Linnaeus' Systema Naturae. This is about race not ethnicity. I am going to increase and extend our databases in the next few years and we are going to find more and more ethnic markers and we are going to find out a way to have a more powerful tool for inferring ethnicity. Okay. The British, the U.K. has pioneered this technology as you might have learned from that last slide. And before July 7<sup>th</sup>, before the attack in the subway, the British police have convinced the British government to go for a strategy of including a quarter of the population in its DNA National Database. You can imagine in post-July 7·2005, attitudinal issues; it is going to go up. Well, the Portuguese are even ahead, April, the Portuguese have decided that everybody goes in, every inhabitant, every resident, everybody who crosses their border is going to be in the genetic database. And why should Americans be concerned? Well we are not too far behind. Ten years ago, we authorized the FBI to establish the combined DNA Index System called CODIS. It permits States to share and compare data and was started off 15/20 years ago as only sex offenders now has a very different kind of profile. We now have even misdemeanors. California passed the proposition back in November of last year and it mandates that we will join Louisiana, Virginia and a few other States in collecting DNA on even those who are arrested, misdemeanors, those who are indicted and so forth, that is California. H.R. 3214 expansion of the combined system. Samples from all States; all persons convicted and so forth. Here is the language "...in just three years the database went from a total of a little over 10,000 offender profiles" and as you can see those data. Okay. We are uploading all these data, we are trying to figure out how to analyze them. Of course my question is, what does this have to do with sociology? Remember my early distinction between inside the body, outside the body. This is fairly what we call inside the body. Well let me now tell you what is happening outside the body with data collection. US Commission on Civil Rights purges on vital statistics from its website including a briefing regarding race, data collection on civil rights. They purged Native-American health care data and they purged among the 18 other files briefing on this particular topic. In other words, what we are seeing, I am witnessing and I am not alone here, is a kind of remarkable imbalancing act where they are purging certain kinds of data, the Department of Labor, missing information about women's lives from the National Council, it says here that five or six years ago you knew about these data but they mysteriously disappeared in the Bush Administration. Now I have colleagues in Washington who tell me that this is happening a lot. A kind of remarkable development of purging the data about the social. It is being prevented, it is being undermined, less research going in that direction. Meanwhile expanding the databases inside the body. Okay. Now I want to move to where I think sociologist can make a difference and make some concluding remarks. It is in part two with the summary before I get to my

conclusions. We are seeing increasing pressure for national databases inside the body; the destruction of more and more databases about social categories and in the wings an agenda for research that is going to increasingly talk about these kinds of internal forces in the body and ignore the external. So part three was what sociologists can do to meet the coming challenge. Well we can stand on the sidelines and shout as the parade goes by, it is all socially constructed. It is true, it is profoundly true, it is socially constructed, but that will not be good enough to rain on this parade. The call from my Loberg this is the FDA ethnic racial drug, by the way, many of you know this drug was approved by the FDA Committee in June of this year making it the first racial drug in the United States. That is the first, there will be a second. Number two is my prediction is Erisa. Erisa is a late stage lung cancer drug and same history as BiDil. What happened was the same with BiDil, big clinical trial, did not work except on Asians, late stage lung cancer, the drug comes out and they decide okay well we will just change our market and move it to Korea, Japan and China. So BiDil was the first racial drug but Erisa will be the second. Okay so now what can sociologists think about and do about this? Well I want to draw an analogy. Maybe I will do this quickly and abandon my notes and let us get to the party. There was a period in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century which theorizing about social deviants was really rather much focus the work of students at Columbia, that whole anime structure and all those kinds of works began with the assumption that one can theorize from the already collected datasets. That you go to the FBI, Uniform Crime Reports, you go to the State reports, take those data, that reflects the reality of crime and you theorize about crime and delinquency and law and order and that is what for the most part, the Columbia tradition was all about. That takes for granted the assumptions about the nature of the system-manifestations of the reality behind it. Then a breakaway happened. One of the breakaways was those sociologists like Egon Bittner and Aaron Cicourel and Joe Gussfield decided to ride around in police cars and to watch the police in their use of discretion in who they arrested and who they did not. They found certain patterns which were sociological which would reflect the ways in which people were arrested or not. So it turns out a thousand burglaries probably less than 700 would come to the police attention of those 300 maybe cleared by arrest, 180 would go to trial, those 120 maybe the old plea bargain, only 75 are going to go to prison. So you have a thousand burglaries, huge fall away on the arrests and then we get people in these catchment areas called prisons to do research on. But if you are only looking at a very small percentage of those in the whole catchment, then you are going to find interesting phenomenon. So Cicourel, rides around in police cars, many years ago and finds different kinds of things. I am going to skip through this I am going to come to the point. Police organizational imperative is a clear by arrest. So when you justify the police budget, you go to City Hall every year, you want to show that you are effective. If you have a big number of people, a large number of people who claim that they have been burglarized but there is no arrest, it looks like ineffective policing. So there is an imperative for the police to say that they have not unsolved crimes, but that they have cleared these crimes by arrest. Now, if you are in the business of looking closely at how arrest figures rates are constructed, you will find that out. For example, 30 unsolved burglaries can be solved suddenly when you get one person who seemed to fit the bill of committing maybe two or three and you say click, 30 crimes have been solved by arrest. The City Council says, good, we appreciate your good work as policemen, but the rate construction was rather drive by social forces. If we take the statistics given make the error that lots of people pardon me, lots of crime is committed by only a few people, then your intellectual task is to find that small population committing all those crimes. The bad apples. Agendas research on violence at the NIH that I began with had that kind of etiology. Let us look



for those peculiar individuals who commit lots of crimes, a whole kind of industry of criminal investigation is based upon this notion. Okay. Summary. What I see is an increasing focus on these databases inside the body. Evidence of the purging, blocking, preventing data collection, deemphasizing, really the social categories and social forces. My view is what sociologists need to do is to go to the actual side of production in the same way that Irving Gothen ventured into mental hospitals and the wards to see the pathway by which intake rates and decisions were made. Then which Irving Zola went and listened to the language doctors heard symptoms from different “ethnic groups” Jewish, Italian and Irish and began to understand that rate construction at the site of knowledge production was key to understanding what is going on. So in Cicourel and Bittner riding around in those police cars observing and recording how the statistics are gathered, they graze the most fundamental question about knowledge construction. The contemporary version of this is to go to those various places where the claim is being made and we can do ancestral informative markers about race. Here I would use as a model the work of Dwayne F. Wiley anthropologist who has been working the laboratories on both coasts showing how these issues are framed about is race real? What he discovers of course is that they are beginning with the phenotype, they are beginning with the thousand who say or appear to be White or appear to be Black, then they are theorizing back into the DNA from these computer programs. So let me give you the quick answer to the question which I am sure you are going to ask me – what is it about these forces that play? Are they really able to predict race? Well here is what they are doing. They can take a thousand people who look White, a thousand who look Black and then go into the super computer that I talked about and tell the computer find differences, find differences with three million points of difference in any two people, grouped this way, the computer will find differences. So that is what has happened. That gene cluster analysis I showed you where it says perfect overlap, that begins with the phenotype and then says find me some differences. Well they found differences; this group has the frequencies of SNP patterns, A, B, C. This group has X, Y, Z. These people are White, these people are Black, we found something. Now notice, they did not begin with the DNA. They did not start and say from the DNA we can predict whether or not you are in a category. What they can do is the following: this is what happened with the ancestral informative markers - to make the point of divide the room in half here and anybody in this group we will call A, this group we will call B. If I tell the super computer to look at your DNA on this side find differences leptin frequencies, microsatellites, that are in this group and that group. After some days of whoring around the computer will find a difference between Group A and Group B and it will be true for any group in the world that is what computers can do with this petaflop technology. You would say that is trivial research if it is just Group A and Group B, but supposed Group A was all White and Group B was all Black and I produce a result in a medical journal, genetics journal, I say I found microsatellite differences between Groups A and B and they are Black and they are White. Ancestral informative markers are based upon the notion that you can do this arbitrarily find Group A, White, Group B Asian, Group C and so forth, take the computer, go into it and tell it to find differences. Having established that, that is your 100%. Now anybody off the street sends in their DNA and if they match up to a certain point they are called 85% Black, 14% so if you remember a few weeks ago, there was an article in the *New York Times* sociology professor, I think it was at Penn State told his students to send in their DNA to this website. They send it in and the article talked about how they came back with the results and the students said, I did not know I was 48% Black, epistemological crisis, I did not know I was 12% Asian, I mean this is fascinating. In other words, they came to believe these are sociology undergraduates who came

to believe this technological miracle that they are witnessing aptly reflects the empirical bases of racial reality when all we have is statistical fiction of a super computer that can find microsatellite markers with this kind of frequency. When, in conclusion, when sociologists are able to do what Irving Gothen did in the mental hospitals that Cicourel in police cars, Zola, collect the data at the site of production. Then you can challenge this monolith, you can then say, we quip to talk about how social forces, economic forces are shaping biotechnology to push in a direction to get drugs on the market for Black people. At that point you can say I understand what it means to have the social construction of reality, you can say I understand what it means at the production of the site where these things happen, you can then be appropriately critical and join what I see as an increasing challenge to sociology. Thank you and happy Centennial. There is I believe Caroline announced that there is a party next door at the Marriott and you are all welcome. Thank you.