MARGARET ANDERSEN: Welcome. Welcome to the awards ceremony and presidential address of this year's American Sociological Association annual meeting. I am Margaret Andersen from the University of Delaware, and it has been my great pleasure to serve this year as the ASA Vice President. In our usual tradition, we will take a minute to remember those who departed from us this year, and I would ask that you remain silent as their names scroll on the screens before you.

Thank you. I am now turning the podium over to Rubén Rumbaut, who will begin the awards ceremony.

RUBEN RUMBAUT: Thank you Maggie. Good afternoon. I am Rubén Rumbaut of the University of California at Irvine and the presider for this afternoon's program. We just noticed that the program lists Mark Schneiberg as presider, but I am not Mark, although we both have advanced receding hairlines. Mark instead will be next year's presider. But today, it is my pleasure to welcome you to the awards ceremony. As a Californian by choice and adoption, I have been asked to say a few words about San Francisco before introducing the nine ASA Awards that we will shortly announce and celebrate.

This city, known in earlier incarnations as the "Paris of the West" and "Baghdad by the Bay" is a vibrant marvel of a global village wrapped in irony and paradox. If you weren't a sociologist it would lure you into becoming one. If you weren't already charmed by its beauty and its hills and its awesome bay, if not by its earthquake faults, and its fog, and the clever ditty wrongly attributed to Mark Twain that "The coldest winter I ever spent was a summer in San Francisco."

Born as a Spanish mission in the same year the Declaration of Independence was signed in Philadelphia, becoming part of Mexico in 1821, and of the U.S. after the war that ended in '48, and of the world after fortune seekers rushed in from everywhere when gold was discovered nearby a year later, San Francisco was once the largest city on the West Coast. It was reborn after being obliterated by the 1906 earthquake and fire just a year after the ASA was formed. And then, it was transformed again during and after WWII and ever since. San Francisco today is only the fourth most populous city in California, after Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Jose, and the thirteenth most populous in the country with a population of just over 800,000. But, it is the second most densely populated major city in the U.S. and the heart of the Bay Area, with more than seven million people.

San Francisco is a minority-majority city, as is the entire state of California for that matter. Asian Americans make up a third of its population and San Francisco's Chinatown is the oldest and largest in North America. More than a third of city residents were born outside the United States and, more remarkably, more than half of all the children, teenagers, and adults under 50 in the entire Bay Area are today of immigrant stock, either first or second generation. Disparities abound here.

San Francisco ranks eighth among all major cities worldwide in the number of billionaires known to be living within city limits, but the city also has the highest number of homeless people per capita of any major U.S. city. A corporate power center and, for decades a Republican city, by the 1960s San Francisco had turned Democratic.

In the 70s, it became a center of the gay rights movement with emergence of The Castro as an urban gay village. Today, it has the highest percentage of gays and lesbians of any of the largest U.S. cities and the Bay Area has the highest concentration of same-sex households of any metropolitan area. So, welcome to San Francisco. Perhaps you have already gone on this year's local tours of the Mission District's mural, The Longshore Strike, or Angel Island this morning or will be going on tomorrow morning's tours of Manilatown and The Castro. There is enough here to keep all 45 ASA sections busy indefinitely. But right now, we have other business at hand.

This is the ASA's Annual awards ceremony: an important ritual in which we collectively recognize and honor outstanding sociological careers, scholarship, teaching, practice, and public service, exceptional achievements, which enrich us all. In honoring these individuals for the excellence of their work, we also define and validate the discipline and our profession's collective story.

The first award to be presented today is the ASA Dissertation Award, which honors the best Ph.D. dissertation from among those submitted by advisors and mentors in the discipline.

Please welcome Robert Crosnoe as he highlights the award and the dynamic work of this year's recipient.

ROBERT CROSNOE: Thank you. The winner of this year's award for best dissertation is "The Bio-Politics of HIV/AIDS in Post-Apartheid South Africa" by Claire Decoteau, who wrote this as a graduate student at the University of Michigan and is now an assistant professor of sociology at the University of Illinois at Chicago. This is a 2-year ethnography that elegantly links the HIV pandemic and the political and economic restructuring of post-apartheid South Africa as a way of elucidating the many different ways that individuals can try and navigate the tricky relationship between indigenous healing practices and westernized medicine. In short, in today's South Africa, many blacks go back and forth between indigenous and biomedical forms of healing, and Claire argues that this results from a hybrid identity in which a colonized population attempts to navigate the many obstacles put in its path by the false dichotomy between ideas of modern and traditional. It is also, interestingly enough, a way of extending a longstanding tradition into the post-apartheid era of using indigenous healing practices as a form of resistance against the dominant power structure. Now, some of the adjectives that the committee members used to describe this dissertation were, "provocative," "groundbreaking," "amazingly astute," and "compassionate," which was my favorite one. I think that is why we decided collectively that Claire's dissertation really exemplified the spirit of this award and it is also why we predict that about 30 years from now she will be up here to receive another award for distinguished career contributions, but probably not from me.

So, congratulations Claire.

CLAIRE LAURIER DECOTEAU: When Rob first called me to tell me that I had received this award I was actually conducting further research in South Africa. I do research with HIV-infected residents of extremely impoverished squatter camps outside of Johannesburg. So, it was very important for me to be able to tell the people with whom I work, who have largely been mostly abandoned by their state, the healthcare system, and the world at large, that their story had been recognized in this important way.

So, the first people that I would like to thank are Pheello Limapo, Thulani Skhosana for introducing me into their communities and for sharing their experiences of living with, and, dying of HIV and AIDS. I also have to thank my amazing interpreter and research assistant Torong Ramela. I want to of course thank Robert Crosnoe and the entire awards selection committee for choosing my project for this tremendous honor. I would like to thank the graduate students and the faculty at the University of Michigan for all of their support and encouragement over the years. I would like to thank my entire dissertation committee and in particular my chair George P. Steinmetz, who has always been a tremendous source of both support and inspiration, and I would like to end by of course thanking my partner, Andy Clarno. Thank you very much.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: The Jessie Bernard Award is given annually in recognition of a body of scholarly work that has enlarged the horizons of sociology to encompass fully the role of women in society. If you missed it, the current issue of *Footnotes* has an excellent article on the significance of the Jessie Bernard Award by Patricia Yancey Martin. Please welcome Nancy Naples and Nikki C. Raeburn as they present this year's recipient.

NIKKI C. RAEBURN: Nancy and I are thrilled to co-present as co-chairs of the selection committee Cecilia Ridgeway with the Jessie Bernard Award. "Professor Ridgeway is Stanford University's Lucie Stern Professor of Social Sciences, and she has furthered our understanding of gender inequality as much as or more than anyone else during the last half of the 20th century," said one of her nominators. Making rare micro/macro links, she transformed scholarly thinking by illuminating how interactional processes preserve gender hierarchies. A path-breaking social psychologist, her status construction theory powerfully explains how a nominal characteristic like gender acquires status value and thus reproduces inequality. From her eloquent theoretical work, thoroughly convincing experimental studies, and steadfast mentoring, teaching, and professional service, to her social justice-minded contributions to the work place and legal arena, Professor Ridgeway has brought gender front and center, not only to basic theoretical concerns in the sociological discipline, but also to concrete policy considerations in the social world at large. Please join me in congratulating Cecilia Ridgeway.

CECILIA RIDGEWAY: I know I can't live up to that. Nevertheless, I am beyond honored by this award. I never expected it and I can't express how appreciative I am of receiving it, but I do want to say that how society is organized by gender and gender inequality is one of the great sociological questions, as Jessie Bernard made clear to us. I started my career in the 1970s, so I had the privilege of investigating this great question in the company of a brilliant cohort of gender scholars.

I also had the privilege of investigating this question during a time when everything was changing in the American gender system, so that its inner workings were revealed for analysis. What a thrilling challenge that has been. It is a great honor. Thank you.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: The Public Understanding of Sociology 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. Please welcome Jan Thomas as she presents this year's recipient.

JAN THOMAS: Thank you. This year's winner of the Public Understanding of Sociology Award is Jack Levin, the Brudnick Professor of Sociology and Criminology and Co-director of The Center on Violence and Conflict at Northeastern University in Boston. Professor Levin's work on hate crimes, mass murder, serial killers, and prejudice has made him one of the most widely recognized and quoted sociologists in the public sector. He has published over 100 op-ed columns in major newspapers, 30 books, many directed at the lay public and/or policymakers, and he appears frequently on national TV programs. For over 25 years, Professor Levin has used a sociological perspective to contexualize sensational media stories, dispel myths, influence public policy, and change how people think about violence and hate crimes. Please join me in congratulating Professor Jack Levin.

JACK LEVIN: Thank you. Thank you very much Jan. Thank you. It is a thrill to be here and to accept this award, especially because it helps give legitimacy, not only to my work, but also to the work of all of those sociologists who have taken their mission beyond the college campus in order to affect public opinion and public policy. Now, I realize that some social scientists are convinced that dealing with the public and the media represent activities that fall outside of the legitimate role as professionals and scholars, but in my view it is extremely important to educate the public as to what sociologists do and how sociologists approach the study of human behavior.

Some years ago, I was a guest on a popular morning talk show in the Detroit, Michigan area. The TV Guide identified me as "socialist Jack Levin." Now, putting aside the question of whether the magazine had accurately depicted my political leanings, it is important to note that the word "socialist" registered in their minds long before they thought I might be a sociologist. I doubt that psychologists are ever mistakenly referred to as "psychotics" or "psychopaths," even if they deserve to be. Now, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the members of this year's Award Selection Committee and to my outstanding colleagues in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology at Northeastern University who have always encouraged my work, even if it included being interviewed by Geraldo Rivera.

I am grateful for the inspiration given to me by the late Robert Bohlke at American International College and the Late Earle Barcus at Boston University.

I want also to acknowledge having benefited a great deal from collaborative work with my colleagues Arnie Arluke, Gordana Rabrenovic, Jack McDevitt, and Jamie Fox - the criminologist, not the entertainer. Jamie and I have worked closely together in the area of public sociology for more than 25 years.

In the past, when some high-visibility case had captured the attention of the media for a couple of days, reporters would start calling our home at 3:00 AM and continue all day and all evening until midnight. Well, I want to thank my wonderful wife Flea, who amazingly still lives with me. Thank you Flea for your tremendous patience with me all these years. Without your loving support my sociology would have been much more private. Thank you very much.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: Today, I have the added pleasure of not only introducing, but of presenting the Cox-Johnson-Frazier Award. This annual award honors the intellectual tradition of Oliver Cox, Charles S. Johnson, and E. Franklin Frazier - African-American sociologists who exemplified engaged scholarship. They challenged racism and sought to engage and enhance the understanding, status, and well being of African-American communities and individuals. This award recognizes an outstanding sociologist whose lifetime of research, teaching, and service to the community continues the tradition of these namesakes. Dr. Aldon D. Morris powerfully embodies this living tradition. We commend Professor Morris for his longstanding service to multiple communities within and beyond the academy, his influential body of classic and continuing research on the origins and multi-generational influences of the black protest movement, and his leadership challenging social injustice and the exclusion and under-recognition of scholars of color. Please join me in welcoming Aldon Morris.

ALDON MORRIS: Thank you so much. First of all, I want to congratulate Patricia Hill-Collins as our president and say that she has made history and so has ASA. Following in the footsteps of W.E.B. Du Bois, pioneering black sociologists Charles Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, and Oliver Cox created original and innovative sociology. They did so during the years of legal racial segregation and when the lynching of blacks was routine. While trained at the University of Chicago during the heyday of the Chicago School, these black scholars for no other reason than their race were denied professorships at the top white universities in the nation. But what is amazing, and bears deep study, is that Johnson, Cox, and Frazier rose above the poverty of their institutions and the excruciating racism that they encountered, and rather than cave in to these wretched conditions these sociologists produced stellar scholarship and students who have stood the test of time.

Now, regarding the originality of these scholars, let me just use one example to make the point. Oliver Cox broke from the intellectual conservatism of his day and presented a bodacious Marxist analysis to explain race and class conflict. He argued that racism was rooted in class domination and emerged on the development of worldwide capitalism, characterized by center-periphery relations. Cox thus laid the theoretical and empirical foundation on which Wallerstein was to build his world-systems perspective.

So, I am very pleased that the Association has honored me, as continuing the great tradition of these pioneering black scholars. By institutionalizing the Cox-Johnson-Frazier Award, the Association honors itself by recognizing the contribution of these ebony sociologists whose sophisticated corpus of work rose from the segregated and barely-funded halls of Atlanta, Howard, Fisk, and Lincoln Universities. I thank you.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: The reward for Excellence in the Reporting of Social Issues honors individuals for their promotion of sociological findings and a broader vision of sociology. Please welcome Barbara Risman as she presents this year's outstanding recipient.

BARBARA RISMAN: I just wanted to take it lower, not down. Barbara Ehrenreich really needs no introduction to a room full of sociologists. Yet it is my great pleasure to do just that introduction. Barbara Ehrenreich was trained as a cell biologist. She published two books in 1969: a scientific monograph and a commentary on the student movement. Luckily for us, she was more interested in social activism and social issues than a scientific career, and has since published another 18 books, many of which many of us use in our classrooms. Her books have been influential in sociology, including *The Hearts of Men* and *Nickled and Dimed*. She regularly writes for *Time Magazine*, *The Progressive*, *The New York Times*, *The New Republic*, and many other sources. In a fascinating session today where she spoke, the room unanimously and spontaneously awarded her an honorary doctorate in sociology. So, join me in a round of applause for Dr. Barbara Ehrenreich.

BARBARA EHRENREICH: Thank you very much, Barbara. And I thank the room full of sociologists who earlier gave me the honorary degree in sociology, which I understand will lead to a really lucrative and secure career compared to journalism. Anyway, I just thank you and thank the awards committee. I thank so many of you individually who have played a big role in my intellectual, moral, and political development, and I will simply mention one, and that is a past ASA President Frances Fox Piven, who is also a very close friend. Where is she? Anyway - oh, there she is. Okay. Thank you, all of you, I could not do my work if I did not have you doing your work and if you weren't willing to pick up your phone or answer the emails sometimes, which if you haven't gotten it yet, you will get from me - saying, "Please explain such and such and, you know, tell me how to make sense of this to the public." So, thank you, all of you.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: The Distinguished Career Award for the Practice of Sociology honors outstanding contributions to sociological practice through work that has facilitated or served as a model for the work of others, work that had significantly advanced the utility of one or more specialty areas in sociology and by so doing had elevated the professional status or public image of the field as a whole or work that has been honored or widely recognized outside the discipline for significant impacts, particularly in advancing human welfare. Please welcome Kathy Shepherd Stolley and Karen E. Walker as they present this year's recipient.

KATHY SHEPHERD STOLLEY: Good afternoon. Karen and I are absolutely delighted to present The Distinguished Career Award for the Practice of Sociology to S.M. Mike Miller. This is a career award, and what a challenge it was to highlight Mike's many, many accomplishments and contributions in the short time we have. His career exemplifies the outstanding contributions to sociological practice recognized by the description of the award you just heard. Throughout six decades Miller has crisscrossed the boundaries of social science, policy, and activism, and his perspectives have informed audiences ranging from activists to public officials, foundations, and the general public.

He has been active in some of the most important efforts to improve civil rights and economic inequality in the second half of the 20th century. He also has a notable history in service that demonstrates his able leadership and deep commitment to sociology. Not least, his writings have contributed greatly to sociological knowledge. For Mike, one of his most significant activities was his support to the work of his wife, the late feminist psychiatrist Jean Baker Miller. For weaving together a life and career that includes a commitment to sociological practice and social action that has resulted in these and many, many more outstanding contributions we recognize S.M. Mike Miller with the 2009 American Sociological Association Distinguished Career Award for the Practice of Sociology. Congratulations.

MIKE MILLER: It's a great pleasure to be here. I want to particularly note that my observations, as a participant observer of the meetings today, is the enormous growth over the years of the number of participants of racial and ethnic backgrounds who weren't represented 60 years ago to the extent that they are now. There has really been great advance in sociology and in the ASA over these many years.

I want to start by establishing my sociological credentials, and so I will quote Émile Durkheim who said, "Why strive for knowledge of reality if this knowledge cannot serve us in life?" Obviously, people like Max Weber had similar thoughts, the early founders of sociology in Chicago like Park and Small who had similar notions of using sociology and making sociology an effective force in the world. But I also want to establish my credentials as an activist and I quote here, Frederick Douglass. I slightly modified what Douglass said, "People are worked on by what they work on. People are worked on by what they work on." I think that is a very telling kind of statement. What I want to convey is the importance for all of us of leaving a mark on the world and of having a sense of being an actor, not just acted upon in the world. That is part of the notion of actualization, not just internally but externally as well. Being able to have some feeling of effectiveness and some obligation to do good in the world. It may not be a tremendous step, but it could be a significant step over the years for somebody.

Mostly though, it is important to recognize that being active can be a very enjoyable activity, it isn't just all stuffing envelopes and doing things like that. One can have an effect in very unexpected ways. For example, I had a big effect in Ireland because I asked the simple question, which changed the way this project operated, I didn't have the answer in mind; I just asked the question. It led people to begin to think in a different way. So, we have that capacity to raise questions about this.

Secondly, I want to get across the notion that it can enhance your career. It's not, being involved in the world is not something necessarily in opposition to advancing professionally. You can do that by developing new perspectives, being concerned about issues that have not come to the fore yet, begin to understand problems through your participation in ways that simple research would not do. Frequently, it helps you lead on to vital, interesting, important research projects and stimulates new ways of thinking about sociological issues and what are the implications for its actions for research, for theory.

That clearly has been true in many different realms and it certainly has been true about race, gender, class, organizations, politics, that people who've been involved in these realms have been able to deepen and expand sociological thinking as a result of the kinds of experiences and analyses that they have had through involvement. So it's not a question of either/or - either you're a sociologist or you're an activist, but it's an interactive process, which can be mutually beneficial.

Third, there is a great enjoyment in diversity and in knowing people. You've got to meet people you wouldn't ordinarily meet in everyday life, frequently. For example, Barbara Ehrenreich and I first met in the 1960s in a group that was called HealthPac an advocacy group of various kinds. I met Michael Harrington because of involvements and going to the other side of the political stage, Irving Kristol “the dean of the neoconservative thought.” So it's being involved that opens up a whole new set of activities, which can really make a big difference in your life.

In many ways, the most contrasting experience I had along these lines was in France, where I used go to meetings at OECD, the Organization of European Cooperation and Development. Meetings were held in the classical palace in the 16th district. I would then go after that to the bidonvilles, shanty towns, outside of Paris. So, I had the luxury of the mansions and the felt life experience of what it meant to be poor in a country that didn't recognize that people were poor. So it really gives you a sense of diversity that many other experiences don't. And during the course of it, you may also discover things about yourself. As you are cast in different kinds of milieux and different kinds of issues and you may discover things about your life and the way you think that you would not have recognized before. That certainly has been my important experience. So my message is take a chance and try to do good. It may even lengthen your productive life. It certainly has mine. Thank you.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: - In listening to Mike Miller quote Frederick Douglass and thinking about this next award, I was just thinking about whether it might not make sense to reverse what Douglass said,“That people work on by what they are worked on.” The Distinguished Contribution to Teaching Award is given to honor outstanding contributions to the undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and learning of sociology that improved the quality of teaching. Please welcome Susan Ferguson as she presents this year's outstanding recipient, someone who is been a very close friend to many of us at ASA for many years. Susan...

SUSAN FERGUSON: Good evening. It is a great honor for me to be presenting the ASA distinguished contributions to teaching award to a person who was my mentor, my colleague, and my dear friend, Carla B. Howery. I also am sad to be presenting this award because Carla is not here to accept it. She died earlier this year. Knowing of the advanced stage of her cancer, I called Carla early last fall to tell her of the committee's decision and she was thrilled to hear the news. The committee voted to give Carla this award because she devoted her entire career to advancing teaching and faculty development within the discipline. More than 30 sociologists wrote letters of support for her nomination for this award and this brief award statement does not even begin to describe all of the things Carla did to promote pedagogy, to build stronger departments, and to help individual sociologists.

For those few of you who did not know Carla, she worked for the American

Sociological Association in a number of capacities from 1981 until her retirement in 2007. Carla's last official title was ASA Deputy Executive Officer and Director of the Academic and Professional Affairs Program.

Carla was dedicated to the promotion of teaching and learning in sociology, and to the professional development and training of new and experienced faculty. She was passionate about sociology and about improving the quality of teaching that goes on in sociology classrooms at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. She made significant and specific contributions to the ASA curricular resources on teaching, to the scholarship on teaching and learning, to the consulting work of the ASA Department Resources Group, to the quality of instruction around the country via numerous workshops, lectures, and consultations, and the advancement of sociology through public speaking and advocating policy changes, and by serving on numerous committees, task forces, boards, and panels that support quality teaching.

At 8:00 PM this evening, there will be a memorial to celebrate Carla's life. You are all invited and it is in Plaza A of the Hilton lobby. Accepting the award in her honor are her two sons, Andrew and Kevin Fremming.

ANDREW & KEVIN: Thank you. I'm just going to hold it like this. About a year ago my mother asked me to join her in San Francisco because she was receiving a prestigious award. It wasn't until recently that I discovered what the award was and I immediately began to think of the endless contributions that she has made, not only to teaching, but to the world. From being one of the founders of Transitional Housing Corporation in Washington to volunteering to participate in medical trials for the benefit of future cancer patients, she has touched countless lives with her acts of kindness and consideration for others. My brother and I have been truly blessed to have her as a mother and it is our utmost honor to accept this award for her. I brought some bookmarks to share with everyone at the memorial and on the bookmark it reads a quote from the great Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. that I believe best captures her spirit in one single phrase. It reads, "The surest way to be happy is to seek happiness for others." Thank you.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: The next to last award. The Distinguished Book Award is presented annually for a single book or monograph published in the three preceding calendar years. Please welcome Douglas Downey as he presents this year's outstanding recipient.

DOUGLAS DOWNEY: On behalf of the book award committee, it is a real pleasure to present this year's award to Steve Epstein for *Inclusion: The Politics of Difference in Medical Research*. On its surface, the movement in the 1980s that resulted in institutional changes requiring medical researchers to include multiple racial ethnic groups and women in their research, suggests a victory for diversity, but what begins as a simple story grows in complexity in Steve Epstein's book *Inclusion*.

Epstein documents the wide range of advocacy groups that successfully led to reforms requiring medical researchers to diversify their potential subjects for clinical research. The arguments for inclusion were that racial ethnic minorities, women, and, to a lesser extent, children and the elderly, were insufficiently represented in past research. As a result, the health needs of these historically disadvantaged groups were being compromised. Epstein considers how this policy change has mattered, acknowledging the benefits, but persuasively arguing that inclusion has been a double-edged sword. On one hand, racial and ethnic minorities and women have become routinely included in clinical trials. On the other hand, biologically based arguments for differences have gained prominence at the same time. Indeed, Epstein contends that the new paradigm of inclusion and difference has tended to divert attention away from potentially important environmental sources for group differences in health.

A largely unintended consequence of the inclusion and difference thinking is that the reason it is important to expand beyond studying white males is because there really is something essentially biologically different about these other groups. Requiring medical researchers to study traditionally underserved populations has therefore had complex consequences.

Epstein weaves literatures that span medical sociology, social movements, sociology of knowledge, political sociology, racial and ethnic studies, and gender and sexuality studies into a compelling description of the complex relationship among science, the state, and society. With each additional layer of information, Epstein's argument becomes more compelling. The book also has appeal outside of sociology. Indeed, anyone interested in health, and that's all of us, will appreciate Epstein's contribution. Join me in congratulating Steve Epstein for a terrific book.

STEVE EPSTEIN: Thank you Douglas. It's a truly humbling honor. I'm also very pleased to be able to share the stage today with among others my Northwestern colleague, Aldon Morris, and with the winner of the Dissertation Award, Claire, about HIV/AIDS, a topic that concerns me greatly, and with Barbara Ehrenreich, whose work on health and class structure and gender I first encountered as an undergraduate when I was beginning to think seriously about such issues.

I want to give my very sincere thanks to the selection committee and I am aware of the huge amount of work that goes into serving on book prize committees. I'm especially pleased that the committee saw fit to honor work that develops in part out of science studies, because that field does not receive the recognition to the degree that I think it should within sociology for its contributions to the study of the social and the natural world, including the topics of health, activism, race, and sex that I take up in *Inclusion*.

As I make the transition to a new job and a new institution I want to say that the University of California San Diego was a wonderful home to me as I carried out this work and I'm grateful to my colleagues there. I owe also a special debt to my graduate students from whom I have learned so much. There are so many people who have been supportive to me over the years and I wish I could thank them all.

I do want to thank my editor, the amazing Doug Mitchell at the University of Chicago Press. I want to publicly acknowledge four individuals; Tom Guerin, Kelly Moore, Rayna Rapp, and Stefan Timmermans, who read the entire manuscript in draft form and had many excellent suggestions for me. Finally, I wanna think my partner, Héctor Carrillo, who provided not only the initial idea for the book but also his unflagging support and encouragement. Thank you all very much.

RUBÉN RUMBAUT: Last, but most certainly not least, the W.E.B. Du Bois Career Award of Distinguished Scholarship honors scholars who have shown outstanding commitment to the profession of sociology and whose cumulative work has contributed in important ways to the advancement of the discipline. Earlier this year in the first of a series on ASA Awards, *Footnotes* published an article by Mary Pattillo on the significance of the W.E.B Du Bois Award. You can find it online at the ASA website. Please welcome Robin Wagner-Pacifici, as she presents this year's recipient.

ROBIN WAGNER-PACIFICI: On behalf of the W.E.B Du Bois Award Committee, I am delighted to present the award to this year's recipient, Sheldon Stryker. Over six decades, Sheldon Stryker made major contributions to the study of self, social interaction, mental health, deviance, and family. His theoretical insights showed how symbolic interaction is structured by ongoing social relationships and institutional forces. Stryker re-oriented our thinking about society and the self to elucidate the dialectic connections between fluidity and stability and both. As a prolific scholar with 100 publications, influential leader of a major social psychology training program, and editor of ASR and the Rose Monograph Series, he has earned the W.E.B. Du Bois Career Award in recognition for a lifetime of distinguished scholarship, mentorship, and service to sociology. Brian Powell will be accepting this award on behalf of Sheldon Stryker.

BRIAN POWELL: My colleague and dear friend Sheldon Stryker asked me to read the following remarks. “My initial thanks go to the University of Minnesota faculty in the immediate post-WWII period, in particular Clifford Kirkpatrick, Ted Caplow, and Arnold Rose for providing formal and informal training enabling me to assume the role of professional sociologist. My over 50-year colleague, mentor, and friend at Indiana University, the late Karl Schuessler, more than anyone else taught me enduring lessons and the meaning of that role. Among other things, Karl told me that the if I'd hope for sociological immortality I had to have a law. He had one. Schuessler’s law is “sociology must be fun,” a truth that underwrites my approach to professional activity. At Karl's urging, I found my own law, which he exemplified and which I had hoped to exemplify. Stryker's law is “good people don't have to be SOBs.” Karl had another maxim that helped me round out the proper specification of a professional sociologist. “Take your work, but not yourself, seriously.” Of course, I thank the ASA committee for choosing me to receive the Du Bois Award. I also express my appreciation to Indiana University for supports I needed to do the work I wanted to do over the years, including the period of my “official, though largely mythical retirement.” I never seriously contemplated leaving Indiana, in good part because in my experience the dominant administrative orientation seemed to be, “if it's a good idea we'll find a way to help.”

I am deeply grateful to my department for providing me up to the present with a continuous set of smart, young, energetic new colleagues from whom I could, did, and do learn so much and for equally bright graduate students and post-doctoral fellows who match the contribution. On the last score, I can mention only among many others the unequal contribution of Richard Serpe to work underlying this award.

My deepest heartfelt thanks go to my wife of 62 years, Alyce, and our five children, Robin, Jeffrey, David, Michael, and Mark. The love, friendship, and caring they provided and still provide undergirds any professional contribution I have been able to make, but perhaps it's a contribution of a different more impersonal order that is more pertinent to note: each of them individually, and all of them in concert, have the infinite wisdom to know and use a needle to effectively puncture anything in my words or my behavior that tends to express a ballooning ego. If this award to me has merit, it contains a special message to all here - pursue the work you love. Give the field your best shot. Good things will happen." As many of you know, Shell is not here today because several days after he wrote this his wife, Alyce, passed away. Our thoughts are with him and his daughter Robin and the rest of his family.

MARGARET ANDERSEN: Let's take a minute to now congratulate one more time all of the winners for the ASA Awards.

I will also invite you now to attend the reception that immediately follows this plenary session where you can meet and mingle with colleagues, with the award winners and give them your personal congratulations, as well as meet the officers and your president Patricia Hill-Collins. It is now my job, oh and by the way, that is in the Imperial Ballroom, which if I have my bearings is that way, but I don't promise that.

It is my job now to introduce the 100th President of the ASA, Patricia Hill Collins. Well, you can applaud for her later too. Introducing Pat is actually the most challenging task of my vice presidency - and you thought the program committee work would be hard, this was the hardest thing, because how could I in a very few minutes possibly summarize her extraordinary professional accomplishments and strike just the right personal note for someone who has been my friend for a quarter of a century. 25 years ago, fresh out of graduate school at Brandeis where Pat earned her Ph.D., she joined the Minority Fellowship Program Committee of ASA, where I was also serving. We were both learning our way through the Association. We were basically nobodies in search of communities to support our work on race and class and gender. It is especially fitting that we have served together this year as vice president and president in the 35th anniversary year of the Minority Fellowship Program. We became friends through the MFP and later the ASA MOST Program, where we were part of a task force, which we affectionately still call, "our gang," that initially designed the ASA MOST Program.

You may not know, although I hope you do, that Pat is the first MFP Fellow to become an ASA president. It is actually my hope, and in fact my expectation, that she will be the first in a long line of MFP Fellows to assume this podium, so those of you who are out there who are younger nobodies, dream your dreams, work hard, get connected in the community, and you could be up here too.

Pat's theme for this year's meeting "The New Politics of Community" really resonates with how I have come to know her. To this day, I can visualize seeing Pat at earlier ASA meetings and can hear her saying, "you wanna hang out together?" Or, there was the day we were sitting together in a Sex and Gender Section Meeting where they were asking for volunteers to work on a teaching resources collection on what was then the new scholarship on race, class, and gender. We whispered to each other, "you wanna work on that together?" Not long after, I was driving Pat to the airport after she was visiting Delaware and told her I was thinking of editing a book on race, class, and gender. She said, "I'd work with you on that." Well, I guess you'd say the rest is history. Connections within these different communities as we were both insiders and outsiders have fostered our relationship and our work.

Patricia Hill-Collins was born and raised in Philadelphia, the daughter of working-class parents Eunice Randolph-Hill and Albert Hill. She graduated from Girls High in Philly. She describes herself as she was growing up as frequently the only African-American or working-class person in her schools and her workplaces. In Philadelphia, as in later places in her life, she describes herself as an outsider within, the term that she coined to theorize the particular standpoint of African-American women navigating their way through dominant social institutions. Pat uses this social location to inform her path-breaking analyses of black feminist standpoint theory. She finished her BA in sociology from Brandeis and after her undergraduate studies she completed a Master's of teaching at Harvard and then worked as a teacher and curriculum development expert in a community-based progressive school in Roxbury. When you know that, you realize that Pat is a teacher at heart and that's where her path to us began.

After several years of teaching and doing curriculum development she returned to Brandeis for her Ph.D., where, as I have said, she held an ASA Minority Fellowship and also a Sydney Spivak Dissertation Award. In 1987, she joined the faculty in African-American Studies at the University of Cincinnati where she also served as Chair of the department and is now Professor Emerita. In 2005, she was appointed the Wilson Elkins Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland where she now holds the title Distinguished University Professor.

Her work is sweeping in its influence. Her books include, as you probably know, *Black Feminist Thought*, which won the Jessie Bernard Award, *Fighting Words*, *Black Sexual Politics*, which won the ASA's Distinguished Book Award, seven editions of *Race, Class, and Gender*, and most recently, *From Black Power to Hip Hop: Essays on Racism, Nationalism, and Feminism*, and also, *Another Kind of Public Education: Race, Schools, the Media, and Democratic Possibilities*. She is the editor of a forthcoming handbook of race and ethnic studies. Her books are rich with sociological insight grounded in a feminist perspective and delivered in a powerful voice: one that has transformed thinking, not just within sociology or within the United States, but across the disciplines and crossing international borders. Arne Kalleberg said to me, the past president of ASA last year, that when Pat opens her mouth really smart things come out.

Countless numbers of her works have been reprinted and she has given more invited lectures than I will name here. She has been active in public appearances on radio, television, and has managed to find time to serve on numerous community boards, hold appointments as a visiting professor in several institutions, work on editorial boards, and given her time to many ASA communities.

She has a radical, but inclusive vision. She thinks always about what would improve the lives of black women and thus improve the lives of us all. She has provided crisp and cutting-edge analyses of consequences, both theoretical and practical, of work and action that excludes groups because of race, gender, and sexuality. She calls on us to be inclusive even within exclusionary institutions. She has been an institutional transformer herself.

Her many contributions have been recognized, as I have noted, by ASA awards, but also most recently she has been recognized with an honorary doctorate from The John J. College of Criminal Justice and the Morris Rosenberg Mentorship Award by the graduate association in the Department of Sociology at the University of Maryland.

Now, those are her professional accomplishments, but I had to ask myself, "Is there something about Pat that you might not know?" Because, of course, you already know the tremendous impact that she has had because of her work. Don't worry, Pat, I'm not talkin' about Austin. What you might not know is she is a tap dancer. She really does tap, but as I thought about that I realized that is also a metaphor in some ways for how she survives in academic institutions as a black woman and a metaphor for the way that she theorizes how black women improvise their lives where dominant patterns of social interaction require their constant vigilance. Now, with all of that she does, and I have left out a lot, she is a loving mother and wife. Her husband, Roger, is here tonight. He holds a degree in clinical psychology from Harvard and is a Professor of Education at the University of Cincinnati, and is now developing quite a career in writing literature. Also here tonight is their daughter Valerie, who just graduated *summa cum laude* from Howard Law School where she was editor of the *Howard Law Journal* - wait! That's not all! She is now clerking with the chief judge for the U.S. District Court of Washington, D.C. Good goin'!

So, through many nights in Austin, writing sessions in various hotels, restaurants, and cafes, Pat and I have a theory that our book will be jinxed if we ever work on it in an office. Through conversations with her at her kitchen table in Cincinnati, where I remember saying to her right before *Black Feminist Thought* was published - I didn't say, I asked her, I said, "Are you prepared to be famous? Do you really know what that is going to involve in your life?" She didn't think I was right. Through numerous ASA projects, Pat has become my friend, my co-editor, my co-author, and my inspiration. She is now your ASA Vice President...oh, I'm sorry – President - we're both rather tired. So, in friendship and appreciation of her leadership and vision for our community, I introduce the 100th President of the American Sociological Association, Dr. Patricia Hill-Collins.

PATRICIA HILL-COLLINS: Well in the words of that very prominent Harvard University Sociologist, Larry Bobo, "boo-yah!" For those who were here yesterday, that's an insider joke. Alright.

Thank you all for coming. This is obviously such a wonderful honor. I am completely thrilled by this. I am also exhausted from working on this program. Then when I hear my biography I think, "Well, no wonder I am so tired. How did I manage to do all of that?"

I would like to start off, though, by thanking a few people, since this is an evening of thanks. I would like to start by thanking my family, my loving husband, wherever he is - oh, there he is, he is taking a picture, thank you. Let me behave. I am supposed to be professorial and dignified, so let me work on this. All right. And, my wonderful daughter, who you have heard her accomplishments and I can't tell you, those of you who are parents, we write all these books and we do all these wonderful things professionally, but being a parent is one of the hardest jobs anyone will ever do. And there are people out there who do this every day, they get up and do it every day, the best that they can, with no books and no support. So, we really, I just want to say that I am very proud of that.

I would also like to welcome my daughter's very good friend Lauren Pruitt, who is here this evening visiting with us, who also recently graduated from Howard University Law School. So, we're really proud of both of them in beginning to carry on that social justice tradition of Howard University Law.

I would like to thank my colleagues in the Department of Sociology at the University of Maryland, it has been a wonderful opportunity to go there and to be there and to be able to work there. I am especially appreciative of Suzanne Bianchi, because when I said, see, I didn't agree to run for president first, I went and asked Suzanne Bianchi who was chair of the department, "Does this make any sense? Is this possible? Can we work this out?" And she was very, very helpful to me. I would like to thank at the University of Maryland my two wonderful graduate assistants, Valerie Chep and Kendra Barber. Could you stand up please? Get up! Thank you. Our third assistant, Chang Won Lee, was not able to attend the meeting and I would like to mention him as well as doing wonderful work for me this year. I am telling you, they are scary good. You ever work with people that good? They're just scary good. So thank you so much because each time I would ask them to do things, they sort of did even more and I thought, "Wow, that worked. Let me ask for something else!" Then they would come back and I would say, "They're back again!" It was wonderful.

I would like to call special attention to the ASA Staff, who are quite fabulous. We as a professional association do not recognize the high level of accomplishment our staff has. We have people working for us who are very dedicated. Again, the earlier comments about Carla Howery, for many, many years dedicated to the Association in ways that I think very few people are ever going to forget. I would particularly like to identify and think Sally Hillsman, our executive director and Kareem Jenkins the coordinator for the events on this site, the meeting services coordinator. Could we clap for them?

The last people that I would like to thank are you, each and every one of you, especially those of you who voted for me. And if you didn't vote for me, I love you anyhow, all right? Because at least you've come.

This has been a fascinating journey because when we begin this kind of work it is very lonely, as Maggie pointed out, but what has been wonderful along the way is to collect and meet a whole series of friends of different ages, of different backgrounds, of different regions, of different ethnic groups, of genders, sexual orientation. We are a fabulous organization. We are a trend-setter of discipline. We have worked hard to move ourselves to this place. To have a sociological community that strives to be excellent, diverse, and just. Now many people tend to think that excellence and diversity are contradictory terms: that when you have someone like me heading up an organization somehow you've compromised because you've gone for diversity and excellence has somehow been compromised, because when we think about excellence in terms of purity and exclusionary politics we miss the talent that is out there. Instead, I like to think about building communities that are excellent, diverse, and just.

So today, in the few minutes that are allotted to me, what I'm going to do is talk about two initiatives of my presidential year; one very briefly and one in great length, which is the presidential address, the actual intellectual substance of this project that we are involved in.

The two initiatives... the first initiative I would like to make you aware of... we are a 160-year-old, I believe, professional association. We are a mature association. We don't want to model maturity as fossilization because often that's what people think maturity is. We need to support our discipline in its maturity and enable it to grow. In order for that to happen, we have to make sure that we as a sociological community have the best talent available in our organization. Now, many of you may not be aware that this year the Minority Fellowship Program is reaching its 35th year, but it is also losing a good deal of its funding. I thought that the irony of it all - to be the 100th president during the year when the program that supported me and that has been very central to diversifying our discipline, struggles to find funding for its next 35 years.

So Margaret Andersen and I, having coffee somewhere, I don't know where we were, we don't work in offices on things like this because they can find you if you're working in offices. All right? Had a conversation and kind of came up with the idea of, in fact Maggie Andersen's idea, that we then hashed out of a quiet leadership campaign, where what we would do, is we would ask some of our senior scholars in the association, who were in a position to contribute to the association, to contribute. We know that not everybody can contribute money. Some can contribute time; everybody can do something. But we felt it was important to begin to establish a leadership position, a tradition, for this particular sociological community. So over the past months, several people have been approached and asked if they would pledge for a five-year period $5000, $1000 per year. Now, if you are noticing, I am wearing a little pin. Okay? It is the MFP 100 pin that we're aiming for. Thus far, in our quiet campaign we have raised a quarter of a million dollars in pledges from you. I wish I could take credit for doing the asking, but your vice president Maggie Andersen and Sally Hillsman really made this happen.

This is a very good example of having to work diligently to create the conditions that make your scholarship possible, to never assume that other people will pay your way. That we have to support the kind of organization we want to see. This is not the end of this particular campaign, we intend to begin to think about over the next couple of years not just MFP, MFP is the catalyst, because we're in the moment of having to fund this particular program, but to think more broadly about how each of us can build the kind of community we want as a sociological community through our actions, through our contributions in any way to this particular endeavor, so that we can pass on to those coming behind us, like some of the younger honor students who were here with us today. Who are quite fabulous. So I wanted to make you aware of that particular accomplishment because that is something to be celebrated, but that is not an endpoint. It is a beginning point. What we want to be able to say to foundations is that we are committed to our organization. Here is what we are doing. And we'd like to ask you to join us in this particular endeavor. Right? So that's one initiative. Is everybody still here with that? Kind of shocked aren't you? Ooo! Now!

In our spare time we worked on the second initiative, which would be that… and I am sure many of you all got this wonderful program book because the theme "The New Politics of Community" is a theme that is so flowing through this particular program that I wanted to let you know that it is not just an idle theme for publicity purposes, it has intellectual depth. That is what I would like to talk about now. Because the second initiative that I have spent a good amount of my time in this year is thinking about the intellectual frame for the meeting that we envisioned and that you created. You see, there was no meeting until you showed up. There was a meeting on paper that we envisioned, but the meeting that's actually happening is all about you.

Now, I'm going to try very much to stay on task here because you're all kind of "ohhhh" and I know we have lots we want to say. I want to remind you that the actual presidential address, not actual, but the one that's written out, the full written version will be published in the *American Sociological Review*. So that what I'll be doing today is sharing with you some of the highlights of this particular intellectual framework. I'm going to start off by reading, and in some ways I'm telling you the intellectual framework that frames the moment you're in. Kind of, "What are some of the issues that lead to this particular program and what are some implications that that come from this particular program?" In the middle I will talk about the program a bit more. All right. So, we're ready to go. Let me turn this on. Is that up there? No. Can we get the PowerPoint going?

I'm gonna start off by reading and when I feel a bit more comfortable perhaps then I will just not read.

Now, first of all, is everybody okay out there? It really helps me if I know that I'm talking to people who have not died. All right? It's really helpful to know you are still breathing. All right? I take that seriously.

On the day after the 2008 U.S. presidential election African-American cultural critique Bernice Johnson Reagon was interviewed on the radio program *Talk of the Nation*. When asked about Barack Obama's historic victory, Reagon responded that the election gave her "a new way of looking at what is possible in this country." A veteran of the civil rights movement, Reagon pointed out that many of the new voters that helped elect President Obama were the same age as she was during the 1960s. Reagon expressed in intergenerational affinity with youth, one where the election produced a “widening of the civic space that enabled neighborhoods and nations to move beyond coexistence to co-living.” The campaign’s rhetoric of hope and change seemingly tapped a storehouse of ideas about participatory democracy as an achievable ideal. Yet the new Obama administration provides a provocative glimpse into the workings of a new politics of community. Using the big tent of an imagined American national community and as evidenced in his inaugural address and imagined global community, the Obama initiative aspires to knit together individuals and groups with contradictory histories, world views, and political perspectives. During the campaign the Obama team demonstrated an impressive virtuosity in organizing cell phone users, YouTube posters, Facebook frienders, the internet bloggers, the 24-hour news cycle, and simpler communications technologies to stitch together heretofore separate traditions of place-based and issue-based community organizing. Using new communications, media, and old-fashioned, one-of-a-time, door-to-door techniques than any community organizer will tell you is the foundation of grassroots politics, they managed to build innovative political coalitions and potentially new communities across differences in age, race, gender, class, sexuality, and immigrant status among others. Now the election of Barack Obama may have marked a defining moment in American political culture, yet it also called into question long-standing debates about social inequalities and progress towards social justice because race has long done the heavy lifting in framing analyses of social injustice and democracy in the United States. Race has served as the touchstone for broader discussions of social inequalities of gender, ability, sexuality, class, ethnicity, age, and others, as well as steps that should be taken to remedy these particular injustices. But this election was about far more than race. Did the 2008 election signal fundamental change in social inequality in the United States or did it constitute more of the same? Framing the issue about change in stasis in this fashion may be familiar. Change is often defined as the opposite of stability leaving stasis as the de facto enemy of change and vice versa. Yet bringing stasis and change as opposites may miss the point. Instead, the notion of the “changing same” might better describe the contours of social inequalities. The case for example where gender inequalities are simultaneously the same and different than prior eras, or where youth today have more and fewer opportunities than prior generations. Thus a better question might be, “How might studying defining moments within periods of noticeable social change, in this case the historic presidential election of Barack Obama, shed light on the workings of the “changing same” of social inequality?” What a mouthful. The seemingly oxymoronic concept of the changing same encompasses contemporary social dynamics where the global political economy has changed so dramatically, ostensibly providing opportunities for addressing social inequalities, but where social inequalities themselves simultaneously change yet remain the same.

So in my talk today, I analyze how reframing the idea of community as a political construct might shed light on the broader question of the changing same of contemporary social inequality and also on social justice initiatives to address that.

My talk has 3 parts. The first part of the talk, “Why Community?” What I would like to do in this particular part, and I am going to read this to make sure that I get the framing ideas in here for you, so that I can then carry on with the rest of the PowerPoint.

Part I investigates the construct of community and hopefully shares with you why

I think this is a particularly good starting point for thinking through contemporary power relations that change and stay the same, particularly those of social inequality. I argue that the construct of community constitutes both a principle of actual social organization as well as an idea that people use to make sense of their everyday lives and by recasting this particular notion of community as a political construct and not simply as a primordial aspect of human nature, we can highlight how power relations might be organized differently. They might be organized via structural principles of community and made comprehensible through a language of community.

Part two examines selected contemporary sites of what I call the new politics of community, where community is either visibly named as a political construct or implicated in significant political phenomena.

Now the interesting thing about working on this particular paper before the meeting was I did not know what you all would do. So what I've done in this particular section is identify what I consider to be particularly promising sites of the new politics of community. See, community is everywhere: when you start looking for it you trip over it. All right? But to start looking for sites of community defined and used as a political construct, I honestly did not know what I was going to find, so I have selected sites that are meaningful to me to help us map this new politics of community.

But what I realized when I looked at the program book is that you have actually done a lot of that work. When I look at some of the papers that people have brought, or things that people are talking about it is really quite amazing.

The third part of my presentation, which will be very brief, I'm just going to come back and identify several features of this particular construct that I think make it especially salient in navigating contemporary power relations of the changing same.

My goal here is to sketch out the implications of the new politics of community presented in part two for the changing patterns of social inequality and social justice initiatives that aim to deal with them. Now you cannot accuse me of being shy here. Obviously, we have lots of big questions. All right? This is a big argument and these are big sets of questions. What I'm going to do is go through this with the highlights, knowing that you will have an opportunity to read the actual document that underlies all of this. This is the kind of pique your interest.

So, why community? How do we start unpacking the changing same of social inequality? Well I suggest there are many places we can start. We are sociologists. We do a lot of work that does this already. So I am going to start in a different place. I suggest that ideas matter in explaining the seemingly oxymoronic idea of the changing same. Any given society is organized around core ideas, the cultural stock that forms the bedrock of social relations, both in shaping social structures and in making those structures comprehensible. These core ideas can be found within the terrain of formal systems of knowledge as well as commonsense ideas expressed as everyday knowledge. People from diverse backgrounds use these core ideas, albeit they may use them differently, but virtually everybody knows about them. So instead of looking for the exceptional idea, we need to look for the ordinary. What is so ordinary that we don't even think about analyzing it because we just take it for granted?

So let me just sort of share one core idea; for example, how many of you have ever been in love? Have you been in love? Now when I say “love,” you're raising your hand yes. You know, some of you are all happy, warm, and fuzzy: “I've been in love!” Some of you have not been in love happily and the looks on your faces went, "Oh yeah, I've been in love….” But I mean there's so many ways that we could go to that. I mean, bad poetry has been written about love. Are we talking about romantic love or are we talking about the love of puppies or are we talking about the love of ice cream fetish in the evening - what are we talking about when we talk about love? Are we talking about “I love your outfit girl, it’s sooooooo cool!” What are we talking about there? Are we talking about “I love you so much I'm going to kill you because I can’t imagine living without you?”

Are we talking about that kind of love? Are we talking about - what exactly do we mean? Now, despite its prominence, defining love with any degree of precision remains elusive, and building causal and/or predictive models of love seems silly. Can you imagine a path analysis of love? Or you know, a correlation analysis? I mean it just seems like there's just some things you just go, “Love, how can we do that?” Love defies these uses. Instead, love circulates as an ambiguous, contradictory, messy, but nonetheless core idea of everyday knowledge that has substantial and differential impact on everyone's lived reality. Love structures social practices and love helps us attribute social meanings to those practices, but love may or may not be central to inequality, I will leave some of you to write that paper.

What I'm going to ask is, “What core ideas, like love, might underpin the changing same of social inequality?” In my earlier work, I investigated the concept of family as one such core idea. Family is simultaneously a principle of actual social organization, as well as an idea that people use to make sense of everyday lived realities. But traditionally the construct of family was largely theorized - let me stop here for a minute. I forgot my PowerPoint. OK, there it is, uh, uh, uh, oh, come back, come back. There. Thank you. I meant to put that up there. These things happen everybody; you should know this. All right? You just adjust and then you go on. All right! Back to my sentence. All right.

What I am arguing here is that traditionally family was theorized in largely apolitical terms. Family was tucked away in the so-called private sphere of household and neighborhood, where people just loved one another uncritically and you know did all these kinds of cooking things, I don't know exactly what they were doing there, but you get the feeling that it was just this sort of happy, harmonious sphere. This view advanced an uncritical binary view of society itself, one dividing social relations in to seemingly non-political private sphere of family and a public sphere of work and civil society or to invoke Ferdinand Tönnies’s ideal types, the juxtaposition of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*.

Now feminism, bless their hearts, you know feminists are a rowdy crew. I hate to say it. Feminism challenged this view, pointing out its deeply gendered subtext. No longer hidden in plain sight, identifying how the construct of family was a building block of patriarchy and how family helped structure social inequalities of sexuality, class, race, and age became subjects of investigation. In contrast to earlier interpretations that naturalized, normalized, and idealized the family, the new politics of family conceptualized family as a site of political contestation. The construct of community may require a similar transformation in part because it has been so closely associated with family and resonates with understandings of family and, in part, because it is an important category of analysis in its own right. Like family, the construct of community is also simultaneously a principle of actual social organization as well as a system of meaning. This association of family and community has been the space to which women, blacks, ethnic groups, the religious faithful, the dependent, young, old, and/or disabled, and the overtly or differently sexual were assigned. In essence, the pre-modern, non-thinking, value-laden, emotional-embodied dark side of society. Moreover, community has long been attached to ideas about nations, nation states, and imagined national communities. The case of comparing the ethnic nationalism attributed to pre-modern, seemingly backward peoples to the civic nationalism of modern industrial economies. So there is clearly state power very much implicated in understandings of community when they rise to that particular level.

The construct of community has been heavily implicated in sustaining and in challenging hierarchies of race, class, ethnicity, and nation as important power differentials between communities as well as inequalities of gender, sexuality, age, and ability that have operated within communities.

In this context, the organizational principles and interpretive meanings of community did the heavy lifting of shoring up multiple systems of social inequality. For example, protecting family, communities, home, race, and nation merge within ideologies of white supremacy and from this fusion come a series of social practices designed to protect the hearth and homeland, as evidenced by the legacy of the Ku Klux Klan and the honor killings of women, people apparently can do atrocious things to one another all in the name of protecting their communities from some perceived threat, whether internal or external. Yet, ideas about community also have served as a base for achieving political solidarities that challenge social inequalities.

Emancipatory social movements invoke the same language of community as a power tool of organization. For example, the civil rights movement that arose in response to racial segregation percolated in the space of kitchens, black churches, and freedom schools, building a social movement around Martin Luther King's desire for beloved community.

When feminists politicized the construct of family, they instituted a sea change in analyses of numerous social institutions. I suggest that rethinking the idea of community as a political construct may catalyze a similar interpretive shift. I suggest that it remains neglected as a core construct of political analysis in part because this construct has long been associated with the others of the world. So instead of seeing the construct of community as a natural apolitical space or even as an empty category that can be used for political purposes, the construct of community may lie at the heart of politics itself. Are you still there? All right.

Now, let me just move on and quickly tell you about sort of how I cut into all of this. I had to read that because other than that I was just going to not get it all out. All right.

Now here's what I went about doing in terms of planning for this meeting and thinking through these particular ideas. Instead of going to the literature, I wanted to think about how people actually use the construct of community. What do I actually see around me? Well, a couple of characteristics that I wanted to use to think about how people used the construct of community and in thinking about this new politics of community that I alluded to earlier on in my talk. First of all, a couple of characteristics, when you start looking for it community is ubiquitous. It's everywhere. When I started listening, and you can strike up a conversation with virtually anybody and use the term “community” and they will talk to you. All right. It's that kind of thing. Now, it's that ubiquity that in some ways has frustrated sociologists. Sociologists are kind of stuck on this article that was written, I believe in the 50s, there are 95 definitions of community, therefore, it is totally useless to us - that kind of thing. All right. Where we need one definition or we can't use it! Then you have later pieces that say, “I've got the right definition, here it is, so we can use it, so we can measure it, so we can tame it!” My point is, it is really difficult to do this. Alright. What makes it interesting is its unruliness. All right. Its ubiquity and the way that it is naturalized, normalized, and unexamined.

A second characteristic that I think is very interesting is it is really versatile. It is difficult to define, yet very easy to use. All right. And I think that's also part of its power and how it travels through groups of the left, groups of the right, you hear everybody using the same language, but what do they have in mind? All right. So. It holds contradictory meanings, which I think is quite significant. If, for example, I had, you know we've talked quite a bit about community at this particular meeting, but if I wanted to set up a meeting about community and I used the experiences of the religious right and we just went that direction we could have a conference on family and community that would be quite different using the same language in some ways but having very different meanings attributed to it. So this is a term that actually travels across several contradictions and people sort of don't pay that much attention to that.

One thing that I think is very significant about community, that's different than many of the other constructs that we use in sociology, is that it catalyzes strong, deep feelings that can move people to action. People may care about what their leaders say. They may believe political leaders... excuse me, people may believe and support their political leaders but they care about their communities. Anybody who's an organizer will tell you: when you have a deep friendship, when you have emotions involved, when you particularly have emotions and movement attached together that's a very different kind of commitment to politics than simply the commitment to an ideology no matter how correct or wonderful it may be, you see. So that whole piece I think is quite important. And finally, I think a characteristic of how people use it, as I started thinking about this, is that I think ordinary people use the language of community to think politics. All right. So the whole notion of translating what you're hearing from other people, we then sort of translate it into the language of, "What does this mean for my family and my community?" And how we conceptualize family and community is actually how we may think about politics itself.

So, because the idea of community is so ubiquitous, and because it holds multiple and often contradictory meanings that can invoke deep feelings and commitments from people, the construct of community becomes a potentially powerful idea for crafting quite diverse political projects. Leaders with diverse political agendas know that when people cease to be mass, a mob, a social group, a collectivity, or even a public, but instead become a community, they are primed for political analysis and action. The substance of what types of political identifications communities claim for themselves for political purposes is certainly an important factor. Bernice Johnson Reagon's widening of the civic space of democratic community differs markedly from the nihilistic political agendas of the KKK. Yet, it is equally important point out that while community may appear to be a benign, apolitical term, in action, even avowedly non-political communities participate in power relations and use the language of community in doing so. Now, how ya doing? You still there? All right.

We're on to part two. Believe it or not that, was part one. All right. That's sort of like the big, fast tour of part one. That's the theoretical tour to kind of frame out this language and beginning to think about this differently.

What I'm doing in this particular section of the paper is fundamentally the meeting, which is mapping the new politics of community by using the same criteria of ubiquity and versatility and sort of looking for where can I find evidence for this particular argument? And, I've got, I'm gonna put them all up here, so you can kind of take time to read them. I've got sites. I wont' be able to read anything from the shorter arguments about these sites, but basically I tried to identify sites where diverse political projects can be detected whether overtly claimed or not, and I have selected sites using these criteria that I have described to you. So, mapping the new politics of community, gated communities as a metaphor in reality, I think it is quite significant, you see them everywhere and it's something that's kind of cropping up. I want to talk about each of these in greater detail. Grassroots politics and the significance of community, imagined communities, mediated communities, citizenship and community service, and the complexities of community organizing.

Now, in the interest of time, I'm going to speed through this next slide and basically what I do here and I will describe in greater detail in the paper, is talk to you about why I picked these particular sites. I wanted to look at sites that were socially meaningful to people. Where the term was actually was used, even though it might be used contradictorily. I wanted to identify sites that I think were implicated in social inequalities of race, class, gender, sexuality, age, and ability. So I wanted things that really seemed to speak to questions of contemporary inequality. I wanted sites that dealt with varying patterns of newness in social change: the fact that the world is changing and how communities, the whole concept of community, might be used. I was particularly interested in social justice: the social justice part of the political terrain of that particular idea. Okay. So. That was very fast.

Gated communities is a metaphor and reality. All right, what can I say here? For each one of these, you should know that this is going to feel like a bus tour of Europe. All right. This is the next five, you know, you're gonna see cathedrals and maybe monuments, and we're going to skip countries, you know. Ironically, I think the papers that you have prepared for this meeting... each of these papers fits within this new politics of community framework in some interesting ways.

What I would be interested in seeing is what kind of mapping you would do with the papers that are actually in the program. I mean, what would be the categories that we would develop for what you've actually brought to the meeting? But since I did not know what you were going to bring to the meeting, I think I want you to conceptualize this as... I was going to do use the metaphor of jazz, but maybe I will use the metaphor of tap instead since I have been outed as a tapper.

Last Tuesday, I fell into the zone of improvisation. Anybody who dances, you know, the whole notion of dancing to the music is one kind of thing. You sort of feel you are supposed to be doing this ballet to the music, lifting your leg, putting your leg down. That's not it. When you really think about the expressive styles that are, there are certainly styles that are black inflected, what you get is a basic structure to work with. You know, the structure of the music that's there, particularly if it is live music. And within that structure you improvise, you bring your own particular song. Sometimes it's in tune with the overarching song that you're in and sometimes it may not be. Tap dancers I think are a really good example of this because we create rhythms, we create rhythms with our souls, with our bodies, with our feet where were dancing with the music, sometimes against the music, sometimes in the spaces, because tap is all about rhythm and rhythm is all about silence as well, you see. So if we think about the whole notion of something like the new politics of community as a framework, all right, let's say a song, and within that song you are bringing your particular tunes, which you sing in various ways or tap in various ways in this particular meeting and in other settings, you get a sense of the epistemological framework that I'm using here. I'm not using a linear epistemological framework of causality that goes from point A to point B in a straight line, I'm using something that is far more circular.

So, what we can do here in part two is to identify sites among this new politics of community that are distinctive anchor points that give us an angle of vision on this bigger issue. Is that okay? Okay. I don't know how I write that out and get that in five pages. I just have to tell you. Sometimes the oral tradition is a fabulous thing. All right. We just want to go there.

So this first site, gated communities as metaphor and reality, for each of these sites such I just want to give a little personal wide this interests me and just sort of the big idea that might be attached to this that we might think about.

I was really struck by the growth of gated communities. I think about 10 years ago we were out here on a trip, I believe we were in, I can't think of where we were, but somewhere in California. Right across from the hotel was the first gated community I'd ever seen. Then I went to Pretoria South Africa and saw a gated community. And then in Washington, DC, where there was a lot of gang violence in a particular neighborhood. There was an effort to close off the Trinidad neighborhood of Washington, DC to make it a gated community ostensibly to keep the people inside safe from violence. So it really got me thinking about the notion of gated communities as a metaphor for the preoccupation with risk and security that waxes and wanes across societies as they undergo social change. Gates, fences, and increased technological surveillance of those both outside and inside a given set of borders is increasingly the currency of response to changing patterns of social inequality. The growth of gated communities suggests that actual physical walls, numerous gates, and techniques of surveillance are increasingly called into service to produce results that symbolic walls and gates of custom and practices had formerly provided.

Now we're in a period of time of tremendous growing interdependence. When you have groups of people who have gotten rights, this is another way of coming at this, who no longer are going to stay in racial boxes or gender boxes or sexual boxes or any box you want that are ranked in society, and that loosens up so we don't really know who belongs where they're supposed to be anymore. The most recent example would be the Cambridge Police and Henry Louis Gates. Obviously, there was a misreading of the boxes there. All right. By who knows who. So, we have encounters now that are very, very different than those in the past because the structures are very different. Public space used to be regulated by symbolic boundaries. That was called racism, sexism, patriarchy, homophobia, etc. Those symbolic systems of ideas regulated public space so we didn't have to think about the actual physical gates and surveillance to make sure everybody was in their place. But when you loosen up physical space, physical space can become a place of danger to people, particularly to elites. So what begins to happen is the withdrawal of elites into enclaves of protection for reasons of surveillance.

So I'd like to use this whole notion and there's far more to it than that, by the way, I mean this is an argument at one could spin out historically and in some very interesting ways. But I'd like to use this whole notion of gated communities, as I have been doing some of the reading in this field as to why people move to gated communities. They cite safety; they cite security. Sometimes the communities aren't even particularly safe and secure. The gate may just be a little – or the fence may be a little hedge that somebody could leap over, even I could leap over this hedge. You know? So how safe is that? But it's the notion of having symbols that gives one a sense of security and protection from the danger and the threat that lies outside. And the danger and the threat is often coded as the other, you see. So I think gated communities and the fact that the language that's invoked here is a language of community is a very interesting dimension that I would like us to spend a little more time on as a profession.

Grassroots politics and significance of community. This has come up actually in the last couple of days. This is a whole notion of poor black people and the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. All right.

Where, what this is done has kind of peeled back some layers of politics and to me reinvigorated long-standing debates on dispersal versus community development as strategies for addressing black poverty. Dispersal is a strategy that is an individualistic strategy. We're gonna to disperse people one a time, maybe a family at a time, into opportunity structures. We're going to integrate, we're going to assimilate, but development why would you develop a community full of poor black people what a horrible, you know like, why would you do that? There is nothing there of value. Now, that is very, very different than the perspective that people who support community organization, people who are involved in grassroots politics, people who are thinking about community control. That would be the movement of the 60s and the position that they take.

So, this I think it is a really interesting place to begin to think about an alternative conception of politics. Rather than looking at community as the place to go to, to retreat from politics, politics may be more often refracted through a language of community and an important site for people who are denied access through other means. So, I would argue, that the construct of community has long permeated the grassroots politics and political activities of less powerful groups: African-Americans, Latinos, new immigrant groups, Appalachians, and similar groups of poor folk may advance claims through an analysis of community, because they can see the effects on their communities of things that are these larger social forces.

So, someone puts a chemical plant in your neighborhood. You don't think about, you don't take that personally. Like they put it next to your house, because it's you. It's something you did, you know, “Oh me, as an individual, I can't believe they put this chemical plant next to me.” We personalize things so much in terms of an individualistic framework. Instead, it's much more of a collective response “It's in our community.” “It's about us!” So the solutions will have to be about us.

The third one, going to a totally different place, I'm just sort of giving you some things that sort of come from the program. Imagined communities, mediated communities, very interesting instead of graphics here that you might recognize some of these folk in terms of imagined communities, because the imagined community here is the sociological community, but you see, earlier on we imagined it as being much smaller than it is actually has turned out to be, all right.

So, I really love this idea, Benedict Anderson's idea of imagined communities, because what he did with this idea and when he talked about nations and nationalisms was expand the imagined space to think about race as an imagined community, my racial people, my white people, or gender, my feminist friends, my women people, you know to think about imagined communities, to think about ourselves as belonging in communities that were far more expansive than the here and now.

Now, I think we are in a media generation, which in a sense creates a very different set of opportunities for us to build communities that are imagined quite differently. I think we live in mediated communities and sociologists in particular. I don't know how much time you spend on e-mail. Do you spend a lot of time on e-mail? On the Internet? Now when we started with this, we think about these machines and this software and this media as tools, and then we sort of want to make sure we’re pushing back against those who control these tools, who are controlling, but now we are in a situation where, do the tools, are the tools so part of our communities that we cannot imagine living without machines? I think we're in an era, as Donna Haraway talks about, it of cyborgs. In some ways, we're in an environment where our machines are so much a part of the social landscape that we're in communities that are now mediated quite differently. Kids know this. If you look at it, certainly these social network sites are about that, but I would really want to start looking at sites where kids are developing mediated communities and they're using them for political reasons or to express political perspectives and they're not just playing around. They're actually doing politics in a very different social location via mediated communities.

I would encourage you to look at, this is why hip hop is so interesting. Not hip hop writ large, all of hip hop, but the struggles within hip hop in terms of the political messages that kids as a global youth community will in fact express. Still there? Okay. We're making progress. It may not seem like it. I know. You're going to get to the reception, people. There will be food out there for you. All right? You can have my portion, alright. We're going to get there.

Yesterday's presentation on Citizenship and Community Service by, oh gosh, Peter Levine? Ah yes, Peter Levine, was spot on to me in terms of community service. We now have a new agenda coming from-- this is another site that is very different from the ones that I have been talking about. We have another cite where President Obama says, “I will ask for your service and your active citizenship when I am president” - he chose the exact same quote that I did - “of the United States. This will not be a call issued in one speech or program. This will be the cause of my presidency.” That caught my mind. Because “I will ask for your service.” Now, if you put community before service, because when people think about service they’re imagining service to something. They've got to imagine what they are in fact serving. What's happening I think that's quite interesting in terms of the Obama administration is using the rhetoric of community service and linking it to a national political agenda, but again social inequalities enter in in a very interesting way because we are all positioned quite differently around this concept of community service. Just to give you a quick example, when I gave, I'm not going to give, I have a whole speech on this, but when I gave an earlier speech on this at a university, one young man raised his hand and he said, "You know, Dr. Collins” or “Doc”, I don't know what he said, but I loved the way he felt familiar enough to talk to me. He said, “You know in some communities, community services, you know volunteerism and free labor, you know you give all this. In my community, community service the Obamas as they are demonstrating community services, it's the food line, giving out charitable work, doing good works, giving away your time, that kinda of thing.” He says, “You know, I'm not giving you any, we, we, we don't go for that, we don't go for that.”

Community service may be something you get in lieu of jail time, all right? Now, that leaves to a very different relationship to the concept of community service. So what the administration has to do is begin to think about ways that people are differentially positioned around this particular concept. Particularly communities of color where free labor is not seen as a glorified thing that one does, in the way that the government may celebrate it, yet free labor devoted to certain institutions for building community capacity and community empowerment are. So all of those hours spent in the church working for free is community service, but it falls out of the framework. It doesn't show up in the framework necessarily of the currently more narrow definitions of service. So, I think that this has something will actually be fought over, right, in the next couple of years that we might want to look at.

And the fifth site that I find particularly interesting to think about in terms of mapping the new politics of community are the complexities of community organizing.

Now, I originally approached this through transnational feminism, because I think that communities are important sites where people negotiate differences among members of given communities as well as power differences between communities that are differently ranked within broader social structures. You see this within feminism, the struggles to keep the movement together, global feminism.

To keep the movement together as a movement not just for women, but for certain principles that will empower women. But within feminism you see the differences of the rankings of who's actually in there working across differences of power. So we have a movement that in fact is itself trying to empower a population that within its own ranks has to struggle with issues of differences of power in order to do its work. Now this taps into just some really old ideas about affinity and identity politics that are often presented to us as yet another binary that somehow if you're doing affinity politics it's really like, cool and, you know forward thinking and civic nationalism. And if you're doing identity politics it's kind of backward and you're just clinging to your community and your identity and you cannot get beyond that. When actually I think when we look at community organizing it's clearly a fusion of the two. It's much more of a hybrid situation. A shifting shape over time of the various needs of what you need at a given point in time. Sometimes you need more of an identity politics, sometimes more of an affinity politics. Now that's just really going very fast there. So let me just finish up. Rethinking community, and there is our lovely graphic, all right?

In the context of the fluid social relations associated with contemporary social inequality, community has not disappeared from view. Hopefully, I've convinced you that community appears to be as, if not more, prominent than ever. When you look for it, community is everywhere and infused with social meaning, much of it explicitly political. Several features of the construct of community make it especially salient in navigating contemporary power relations, especially the changing patterns of social inequality and social justice initiatives that aim to deal with them. So, in essence, the construct of community is well-suited for four elements of contemporary social relations. Let me just talk about those four.

I think we're in a period of change where - many of you do work on this - the whole notion of flexibility is the hallmark of contemporary social relations. When you are in a period of fluidity and change and flexibility. What I think is quite interesting about this construct of community, is not, it is not a static fixed dead category. It's a very flexed, fluid, versatile community and it can shift shape. So its flexibility and adaptability, because these are core dimensions of community, in some ways make ideas about community ideally well suited to grapple with the types of changes that we have today. Again, I'm going really quickly, but I developed this in greater detail.

A second element that I think is quite significant around this construct of community is relational thinking. If we live in an era where interdependence is a defining feature of contemporary social relations, we have to start thinking about relationships. We' re not used to thinking about what happens in Ohio may affect somebody in Benin. We' re not used to thinking about the interconnectedness around social inequality. We' re used to separate boxes and separate communities and they’re all ranked, and they're over there and we' re over here. But if you begin to see everything as related... it's like one has to develop a new cognitive model for the world where one is living. And I think relational thinking is central to community building. You find it in the early work of the Chicago School, I mean the attention to relational thinking of Dewey and Peirce and James and just sort of thinking about those issues more robustly, because they saw during their particular period of time how these ideas might have been central to the social changes that they were experiencing. And I think we're in a similar period. So relational thinking is quite significant.

A third area where I think this construct seems to be quite powerful as to what might explain its salience today, is the notion of negotiating boundaries. Blurred boundaries are central to contemporary social relations. Many people think that the boundaries have gone away. This is a whole notion of the post-racial society: that we' re past race. Therefore, the racial boundary is not there, it does not mean anything. I don't think that's it. I think what we've got is we've got more muted and blurred boundaries and we have to find a way to actually establish those boundaries to know where people... who fits where. The construct of community can be quite functional in negotiating structural and symbolic boundaries, both in reinforcing those of inequality and in erasing and lessening those that uphold inequality. So this whole notion of negotiating boundaries is a major theme of our times and community is about that.

A fourth theme, and final theme actually. Aspirational politics. People use community to wed strong feelings to political projects with diverse ideological and strategic agendas. I've alluded to some of them, not all of them. I think what we've got going here with community as a political construct is it holistic. People who link emotions to political projects possess the staying power needed for social justice initiatives. The people who are in it for the long haul. If it's a social justice initiative, care, alright. They care. It's aspirational, it's not the here and now, it's sort of what is to come. It goes back to the earlier comments about those who had the vision for this field, to create it, and then the vision within the field to transform it so that it becomes more inclusive, more excellent, and more diverse. So, closing remarks. Try not to cheer, am I hearing cheering? I said closing remarks, yes I know, in conclusion - you get all happy when I say that, alright.

I'm going to read two paragraphs to kind of wrap it up to pull this back together.

One reason that the construct of community is so useful in helping people deal with change engage in relational thinking, negotiate boundaries, and harness political aspirations is that community is a holistic construct. People do not aspire for a better or different world for intellectual reasons only: because they care, they act. Thus, community provides a window on a holistic politics that draws upon both its proven track record as well as its relational cognitive frame to provide the hope that is needed for politics. Social justice initiatives require just this sort of holistic commitment and the construct of community can be a powerful organizing principle for these endeavors.

19th century African-American journalist Ida Wells Barnett’s anti-lynching crusade illustrates the effectiveness of joining an unshakable commitment to community with a passion for social justice. Wells Barnett was compelled to act when a friend of hers was lynched. She realized that what happened to her friend happened to others, and that no individual could be safe from the threat of lynching without changing the legal and social status of African Americans as a group.

Black people were not her mass, her mob, her public, her population, a statistical collection of potential lynching victims. They were her community. Emboldened by community commitment, Wells Barnett dared to speak the forbidden and go where she was unwelcome. In her work we see the power of deep feelings wedded to social justice agendas. I suspect that as long as social inequalities persist, perhaps in ever evolving constellations of the changing same, new people with a passion for social justice will emerge who use community in innovative and imaginative ways. I encourage you to join them.