

## Transcript

Society for the Study of Social Problems Lifetime Achievement Award,

Gary T. Marx, Las Vegas, August 19, 2011

### **I. Speakers**

Professor Glenn Goodwin, La Verne College

Professor Kimberly J. Cook, University of North Carolina

Professor Nancy Reichman, University of Denver

Professor Kevin Haggerty, University of Alberta

Professor Glenn Muschert, Miami University

Professor Dmitri Shalin, Univ. of Nevada

Professor Jay Wachtel, Cal. State University at Fullerton

### **I.**

#### ***Glenn Muschert:***

It is a real pleasure to have the opportunity to bring everyone together for this session. Colleagues from various points in Gary's long and productive career will offer brief comments. We will then present the award and Gary will offer some comments. The speakers in order are:

Professor Glenn Goodwin, La Verne College

Professor Kimberly J. Cook, University of North Carolina

Professor Nancy Reichman, University of Denver

Professor Kevin Haggerty, University of Alberta

Professor Glenn Muschert, Miami University

Professor Pat Gillham, Western Washington University

Professor Jay Wachtel, California State University, Fullerton

Professor Dmitria Shalen, University of Nevada

**Glenn Goodwin:**

]I think I've known Gary almost from the beginning. Thanks for this opportunity to say some things about an old friend and colleague. When I began to think about what I would say today, I tried to remember how it was that Gary and I met. I read his 1967 book *Protest and Prejudice*. I was so impressed that I wrote to Gary telling him what an impressive piece of work it was. It didn't stop there –as anyone who knows Gary realizes, you don't just have a short exchange with Gary, --because a written interaction soon becomes an exploration of whatever you and he might be working on at that point.

For example, after I wrote about *Protest and Prejudice*, Gary wrote back thanking me, and included pages of the manuscript that he was working on. He also asked for some comments should I care to offer any. That manuscript turned out to be *Undercover Police Surveillance in America*, a work that is still recognized as the groundbreaking statement on police surveillance in America.

That exchange, and many others after it, made me realize that Gary is one of the most sharing and generous scholars I've ever known. Generous

in a willingness to share his own work, as well as to respond to the ideas of others. That was the beginning of a professional and collegial friendship that continues to this day. Let me turn to the undercover book.

The reviews of undercover indicated another attribute of Gary's work that I have always admired. He has an almost uncanny ability in his written work to speak to both the lay public and his colleagues, and to do so in a voice that gains respect from both. For example, a publication called the *Narc Officer*— guess who would read that? Noted regarding undercover: “a thoughtful analysis that would appeal to law enforcement administrators and supervisors... provides a useful framework to continue the debate on the uses and abuses of police undercover work.” In reviewing *Undercover*, Ed Lemert, a central figure in the study of social interaction and labeling, wrote the book “exposed not only important new civic concerns, but also rich new veins and drifts of social control research. In a striking fashion, it has opened up a whole new terrain for research in criminal justice.”

Consistent with the approach of C. Wright Mills, Gary's translation of sociological phenomena into language that speaks to the public at large is an attribute of Gary's work that I deeply admire, and indeed, have tried unsuccessfully for the most part to emulate in my own work. Related to this is using literature and other humanistic sources in his writing. Sprinkled throughout his work are references to everything from Shakespeare to the Beatles. He does it successfully. A lot of people do it,

but it just doesn't quite work. For Gary it works. His presentation drawing from his forthcoming book *Windows into the Soul* at the recent conference he organized in Claremont is filled with enriching humanistic examples.

Gary is one of the few classic Renaissance minds that we have left in sociology today. He is as comfortable discussing recent technological developments in police surveillance or Simmel on secrets as he is discussing the history of art, literature, or revolutionary movements. I'm a theorist by trade. That's what I do. And I have never failed to be impressed by Gary's grasp of the history and development of the social sciences.

At last year's meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, I put together a panel entitled, "Resurrecting Revolution: American Sociology from '67 to '74" and invited Gary to participate [his paper is at <https://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/conoptreactcounter.html> ]. His insights and grasp of the history of our discipline during those tumultuous years outshined all of us.

Panelist Bill Donhoff summed it up nicely afterward when he said to me, "I wish I had known Gary 40 years ago." Later, at that same conference, Gary presented his recollections of Erving Goffman, and again he emerged as the epitome, in my view, of the theorist's theorist.

One final anecdote, and then I will sit down. When Gary was a visiting scholar at Harvey Mudd College in Claremont about a year ago, my wife and I invited him and his wife, Phyllis, to dinner. It happened that the

assistant dean of Harvey Mudd, a physicist by trade, was our next-door neighbor, so we invited him and his wife as well. What happened at that dinner continues to amuse me to this day.

At some point during the meal, I said something to my physicist neighbor about epistemological issues in the natural and physical sciences, which, of course, generated a typical response from the physicist. He responded, “what epistemological problems? In science, no, we don't have such issues”. Well, that launched a discussion, as you can well imagine, that went on for the rest of the meal and again put me in awe of Gary's depth and breadth of knowledge of the history of science and related philosophical issues. The discussion ended only when Phyllis tapped him lightly on the shoulder and in her gentle voice said, “it's time to go.”

As you can tell, I stand in great admiration of Gary, and thanks again for the opportunity to give you a brief view of why. I'm very pleased that you have chosen to honor Gary with the SSSP Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Section Lifetime Achievement Award, and I can assure you that you have chosen very, very wisely. Thanks for that!

**Nancy Reichman:**

I started graduate school at MIT in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning in 1978. That makes me old. I knew that I wanted a graduate degree, but I came to MIT knowing nothing about the department, its' programs or its professors, and I had no real sense of what I wanted to do.

All I knew is that I just wanted to go to school. I was an anthropology major as an undergraduate. I went through a nighttime program in public administration, and now here I was at MIT in urban studies. For a future career, I thought I would do some kind of policy research.

The first year at MIT there was a seminar for beginning graduate students. Gary and (perhaps) Marty Rein were the instructors. And I can tell you with absolute certainty that had Gary not been the professor, I wouldn't be here to bless him. And I was incredibly impressed and inspired by Gary from the very beginning. And I started reflecting on what it was that he offered. Some of it was substance. But more, it was question-raising about surveillance and social control and how we should think about social order generally. The questions were different and refreshing relative to my previous education. They opened my eyes to how narrow my own public policy lens had become.

I was also drawn to Gary's style. And what I saw very early was scholarly rigor, coupled with a heavy dose of irreverence. A lighter term would be skepticism, but irreverence fits. And I like both.

Not all of my urban studies and planning colleagues appreciated the irreverence part. I don't mean to take anything away from them. Many of them are brilliant. But they had aspirations for a more traditional, policy wonky kind of career. And I realized very early in that first seminar that I wanted something different. And Gary was the path to different.

I'm not sure why Gary picked me to work with him, or even how that came to be. Maybe I was the only one remotely interested in criminal justice issues. I like to think that compared to my colleagues, I demonstrated a bit more intellectual curiosity and a bit more out-of-the-box thinking that would appeal to him. But there I was, working with him.

My first project with Gary was pretty traditional. I did odds and ends for the textbook (*Society Today*) he was revising with Norm Goodman—I totally forgot about this until putting together these remarks. The work wasn't very interesting. I had minimal exposure to formal sociology until I had to actually teach it.

The next project we worked on together was the undercover book. I did policy wonk kind of stuff, looking at the evaluation of undercover projects and we gave a paper on it at Law and Society in 1984. But I also was there for the messy, creative part of writing that book. And there I learned a lot about how to work with the intellectual puzzles and seeming contradictions that have been the hallmark of Gary's work.

I learned how to pull concepts apart and put them back together. And I learned a lot about those two-by-two tables. We were always making two-by-two tables. And sometimes they were three by two, but where did things fit together? Having taken them apart and looking for combinations, reassembling them came next. I also learned how much fun it could be to play with ideas, but not just for ideas' sake.

You will hear some very common themes. Gary's work always opened up new perspectives on social phenomena, provided new conceptual takeaways, but they always were also geared to broader audiences. That's the critical part,--that it's not just talking to us, not just talking to sociologists.

I remember one time a reporter from the *New York Times* (David Burnham) called about our early computer matching and profiling project. Gary and I talked about how to approach these kinds of requests. He was really comfortable; I was totally uncomfortable about talking to reporters, and unfortunately still am. But Gary told me then that it wasn't so important to have your name in the *New York Times*, (although I think he really liked that, too). What mattered most on social issues was to have the ideas heard.

Talking to reporters was an opportunity to teach, to help a reporter rethink a story, to ask different kinds of questions, and to kind of really shape the way the reporter might think about the topic. At the end of that talk, reporters should come out thinking something different about the social phenomenon of interest and be sort of questioning why they were asking the first set of questions. I try to live that lesson, not just with the media, but with community and policy groups, the people that I work with every day. When you hear someone else use your idea, your concept, your turn of phrase, it can be as rewarding as seeing that idea published in a sociology journal. I do not mean to dismiss the importance of publishing,

but to recognize that what we do needs to get beyond sociology and help others see the world in a clearer light.

After the undercover project, Gary and I worked on a project related to computerized data matching and privacy that followed from some of my dissertation work. It always seems great these days to reflect on our concerns about privacy, and I remember we were worried about what people might know when library checkout systems became computerized, and data became more open to access and dissemination. I didn't have the imagination to think about all the possibilities and challenges that new technologies would bring. Thankfully, Gary did, and we all owe, and continue to owe, a collective debt to his work.

My MIT career development is informed by another memory. We had the opportunity to construct our own program, really, and we did it from courses in the department and other departments around MIT and from the broader community. I took my social theory class at Harvard from a very prominent sociologist, and I got an A on the first paper for that class. I was very proud of that, having not come through the sociology program. I gave it to Gary and he gave it back to me with lots of what those of us who work with him know as “Gary's scribbles”. These were not the, “this is very good” scribble, nor “this is a really fine” scribble; it was a “this is the bullshit” scribble. And at the end of this paper, you probably don't remember it, you wrote one word: sophomoric.

As a sociologist working in the academy, we have the privilege of time and the opportunity to read, observe, think, imagine, and write. And with that privilege comes an obligation not to just rehash what others have said. It's our responsibility, I learned from Gary, to create knowledge. That's our job. And that's a blessing and a curse. The blessing is the permission to unleash your creative potential, to challenge, to critique, to create something useful. The curse is that it's hard to do, and it often flies in the face of more conventional sociological thinking and writing that gets you published. You can find yourself sometimes ahead of the crowd, sometimes even ahead of yourself, and you have to backtrack to lay a more proper foundation. But the point is, you go for it. You do it.

Because that's our obligation. That's what it means to be a sociologist. Working with Gary also taught me about the incredible creative potential that exists when you're able to operate or exploit the dialectic of marginality and centrality. There's an intellectual strength that can build from working at the margins of disciplines and institutions, and I've seen him do that. But the real power comes from recognizing the connection back to the center of disciplines and institutions. Gary's career is a hallmark example of the centrality of marginality. One of his moral imperatives, and I'll get back to that, is to be both at the center and the periphery, and I encourage us to think about it and to try it.

Since I believe my work with Gary was formative to my own

development as both scholar and university professor, I decided to test that belief by looking back at an article that Gary wrote, "Methods and Matters for Aspiring Sociologists: 37 Moral Imperatives." I looked to see how my career stacked up. And I think I've done pretty well at internalizing most of them, a little less well at actualizing some of them. It's a work in progress. The point is that I recognize so much there of what I consider to be excellence, and what I teach students, and particularly young faculty. Those are the very same imperatives that I learned from Gary: to be creative, flexible, imaginative, bold, risk-taking, and humble; to learn from others, and to have fun.

But there's a 38th and a 39th imperative that are missing. I'm going to suggest that there ought to be at least two more. The 38th imperative, that I'm surprised was not on the list, is the imperative to *appreciate the role of family*, however it is defined or composed, in support of your work. I'm not going to say that Gary taught me how to balance work and family. Nobody could do that, I think. But it was always clear from the very first time I sat in his house in Newton, Massachusetts, how important family was to the whole package that is Gary Marx, and it's not surprising that you see the family here. I'm so excited to have them here with me. Phyllis and the boys were always present, not always in a literal sense, but always there in who Gary was. So that is important, at least as a moral imperative. And the 39th imperative is *to acknowledge and appreciate your mentors*. I don't do that

often enough, and today I'm happy to be with you and to support and honor Gary, who has taught me how to be a sociologist and an old woman now.

Thank you, Gary,

**Kimberly Cook:**

I was really honored when I received the invitation to be here. I've been thinking about Gary a lot this year, partly as a consequence of being invited to speak on this panel, which is very humbling, but mainly because of the condition of the world and our place in it. Early this year, of course, we watched the Arab Spring unfold, and it is continuing; the reverberations of that will continue for decades. I wondered what Gary would say about these events and the role that social networking has played, particularly in shaping those protests. Second, when the United States military covertly entered Pakistan and raided the home of Osama Bin Laden, killing him and others, I wondered how much covert surveillance went into this operation and what ultimately will be revealed in the decades to come, and what are the implications for our everyday lives now?

More recently, with the unrest in the United Kingdom, I wondered, is this an example of an issueless riot spreading out of control or something more? I wondered how Gary would react to the British historian David Starkey analyzing the recent events in London, Tottenham, and Manchester, saying that the whites have become black. Did you all hear that in the news? It was really quite shocking and disgraceful.

And then, on a bit lighter note, even when I received my invitation to join AARP this year when I turned 50, I thought about Gary Marx. He admits that after a certain age, he “never missed an issue of the AARP Bulletin”. I now don't miss an issue of the AARP Bulletin and can laugh at myself when a recent cover featured Harrison Ford and I commented on how sexy Harrison Ford is. You just know you're getting up there in years when the cover of AARP inspires such thoughts.

But I don't want to talk about surveillance or riots or getting old. The first two are not my areas of specialization, and age has graced me with the wisdom to know that I can't fake substantive content, especially in this crowd. Therefore, I will focus on something a little different.

A different aspect of Gary's contributions to sociology and criminology are his reflections on the discipline and the profession. His website provides numerous links to published works, of course, and while I draw from these, I also draw from having the pleasure of knowing Gary for more than 20 years. I believe we first met in Reno at the American Society of Criminology meetings in 1989. So anyway, my memory is a little cloudy as to when we first met, but the impact and the friendship that we've shared has been very meaningful in many ways.

The profession and the discipline can be seen, I think, as a barrier island or a series of them: dynamic ecosystems that are always shifting, evolving, and enveloping newly introduced ideas, ferreting out those whose utility is

limited or injurious, and changing contours, providing habitat for hundreds of species and also prone to erosion, renourishment, enduring storm damage, and providing refuge.

Through it all, sociologists and sociology have established their foundation, staked out their topography, and shifted over the years and decades as the wisdom of our students and mentors pushes our boundaries as a discipline.

Gary refers to the profession and the university beautifully, in my opinion as: “the repository of the highest ideals of Western civilization”. I couldn't agree more. It is, I think, one of the few truly honorable professions. Well, as he noted, it seems like our initial offerings are only ideas poured into a swallowing ocean of words and that we write in the dark and our publications disappear into a vacuum; yet eventually they may come ashore. They land on the beach called knowledge.

They can become grains of sand and sometimes dunes, and eventually mountains of understanding that can improve humanity, one grain of sand at a time. I recall being a quivering mass of insecurity when I was starting out as a young scholar. When I first met Gary, I was in graduate school, new to the profession and to the discipline. I was uncertain as to where my career would go, what I would be able to accomplish and what types of talents I might have. I had no idea if I would, “make it”, whatever that meant. And what on earth could I possibly contribute that others hadn't

already analyzed and published? I knew I enjoyed learning, and I got excited about theory, if less excited about statistics.

I remember my first orientation day in graduate school, and I looked around me and wondered how many in the room would make it to our doctoral graduations, including myself. I shared this self-doubt with Gary. He reassured me that such feelings were absolutely normal, and in fact, he and so many others had experienced it. The gracefulness of that admission to be human helped me see I could get through what I was experiencing.

It gave me strength to continue, even when things were hard. Seeing that doubt was common to beginning scholars was a huge relief to me, growing up in rural Maine in a working-class family, the youngest of five, and the first to go to college. I didn't feel entitled to a higher education or even to being taken seriously as a student or a scholar.

Compound that with, of course, histories of sexism. Finding out that it was normal to have personal doubts helped me hang on in the precarious shifting barrier island I had landed on.

There are six specific lessons I want to share with you that I gained from my friendship with Gary. I will suggest the tenor of the ideas that Gary has shared in person and in writing over the years, although not with exact quotes.

First he writes that personal reflection is worthwhile. I don't know if you spent time reading his incredible body of work which is so worthy of

respect. But he has also taken the time to reflect personally on what it means to be human in this profession. And what a gift it can be. Such personal reflection is crucial for emotional health and perhaps professional success. So, we should reflect early and often during our career.

While the discipline requires us to justify our scientific research and situate it within the existing discussions of our field, our moral compass also requires us to identify what value it has for humanity. As advocates for social justice we may use our skills and analysis for the improvement of society through the alleviation of poverty, sexism, racism, heterosexism, imperialism, and other injustices. While some value-free scientists within sociology and criminology might disagree with that statement, many of us, particularly those in SSSP, laudably pursue our craft in order to make a difference.

What that making a difference means might have personal manifestations in each and every one of our lives. And that reflection of personal worth and value; why we do what we do, what's motivating us, matters.

Embracing it, proclaiming it, and organizing ourselves towards it is extremely rewarding. It comes with a caution. The process of reflection must include a candid questioning our own assumptions and discarding those that we discover to be extinct, toxic, or useless.

The second piece of wisdom that I've gained from Gary is that

professional success is really weird. LAUGHTER Here's the secret to success. Show up to work regularly, do your work well with consistently good quality, and eventually they put you on the other side of the desk, and then the desk gets bigger.

One day turns into a year, a year turns into a decade or two, and pretty soon you're beginning your ninth year as a department chair, and you didn't even realize that you're successful until someone asks you to do things like be on a panel like this, serve as an officer in a professional association, help others with their promotion and tenure applications or blurb a book. When you have a blurb-worthy name it implies that there's some kind of success happening. So what's weird about success? Well, the more you learn, write and publish, the more you realize how much more there is to learn, write and publish, and the more humble you become in the process.

If you're doing it right, the more responsibility you have at work, the more stress your life has. I thought I was stressed out in graduate school: a single mother with a son, living in poverty, commuting 70 miles a day, taking six classes a semester, going full-time in the summer. But then I got to the tenure track and good grief, I had no idea what stressed out was like until then. Now, as a department chair and an upper-level university administrator I've learned being a leader also means being a target at times. It's not all bad, you just need to know when to duck so that the osprey doesn't pluck you out of the water when you're quietly minding your own

business swimming in the marsh grass looking for tasty algae to eat. It's weird.

A third thing to learn is to balance rejections and acceptances. Many academics were always the brightest kids in school, right? They always got the A's, worked really hard and there was lots of positive reinforcement from teachers. However, I didn't really blossom as a student until I got to college.

By the time we get to graduate school, we need to feel appreciated for our intellectual acumen. No one likes to be thought of as inadequate. In fact, Gary shared a similar experience when one of his early graduate school professors predicted that he wouldn't even get a master's degree, let alone a Ph.D. That resonated! I was once told, “you know, Kim, you're not college material. Why are you setting yourself up for failure? You're never gonna' make it.” My response was, well, there's nothing wrong with failure, but there is something wrong with not trying, so I at least wanna try.

We all get rejected by journals or for grant proposals when we thought we should have a good chance of succeeding. Some of us have failed and had to retake qualifying exams. I'm not bitter; I've been to therapy, I'm okay now. Others must start their dissertations over. Eleanor Roosevelt said that you need to develop skin as thick as a rhinoceros hide. She's right! Persistence and determination are as important as talent and intelligence.

Thick skin helps, but not if it's so impenetrable that you fail to have

empathy or compassion for others. My perspective here in large part reflects the importance of empathy and compassion that I've learned from Gary and his relationship with people that he cares about.

The challenge, and the great wisdom, of the potentially enriching peer review process may also bring pain in response to criticism. And yet we have to embrace peer review because of its' positive functions.

Gary makes it clear that just as it's a mistake to conflate rejections with self-worth, it's a mistake to conflate successes with self-worth. In fact, pushing ourselves through peer review or other activities that can cause discomfort can end up being positive if this leads to further thinking it through, improving analysis, reframing the regression equations, path analysis or coding scheme, it can be the best compliment to self-worth.

A fourth thing Gary taught me is that small kindnesses can have enduring effects. Gary reports how much it meant when Professor Morris Janowitz, in commenting on his master's thesis said, "I look forward to reading your future work". I remember my college advisor, Stephen Marks, at the University of Maine praising my academic work. That was the first time that I recall someone really valuing my thoughts and encouraging me to continue being analytical. So, while we write comments on student papers and in peer reviews, being kind and supportive when appropriate matters as well.

The fifth thing that I've learned from Gary is that perspectives you

disagree with may have some validity. This is especially true for those of us who in quasi-administrative roles when faculty in our department disagree with decisions we've made.

With the talking heads in our popular media and a cacophony of declarations of right and wrong about every conceivable issue, it's very easy to get swept up in the murky estuary of policy debates, buoyed by our scholarly credentials as experts who think we know the right thing to do. Our views should be expressed with humility and gracefulness, not arrogance or boastfulness. There may come a time when you're not right, and memories are long in this profession, and stung egos can hurt for a long time. Sometimes we get it right, and sometimes we realize we have a lot more to learn.

The sixth lesson is a bit more fun, and that is to play. Play games with children, play music, play sports for fitness and fun. Have a good time, seriously. This is one of the most enduring lessons from Gary: that life is too serious to be taken so seriously, after all, even when the world around us is shifting and changing, you can still take time to have some fun. I reserve the right to have a personal life without having to explain myself to others.

Emma Goldman said, "If I can't dance, I don't want to be in your revolution," and I concur. As a still unreformed workaholic, I am powerless over my addiction to work. Recently, coming to terms with this way of

being, I've begun making pottery. I'm lousy at it, but I have a good time. I don't sing as often as I used to, but maybe one of these days I'll join a singing group again. I absolutely love reading novels, going to the beach, helping to monitor endangered species of sea turtles and colonial nesting seabirds on our barrier islands, and major home renovations that involve tearing stuff apart and putting them back together more beautifully. The intellectual life requires tactile diversions. Take them and enjoy them.

Finally, make use of metaphors --milk them and mix them up! So, these are a few of the lessons, certainly not the only ones, that I've enjoyed learning by knowing Gary. His scholarly contributions in sociology and criminology are plentiful; his contributions as a mentor and friend are equally enduring. I'm proud to inhabit this barrier island of sociology, essential to the ecosystem of higher education. As tides change and inlets shift, our contours and locations will evolve, and I offer these sentiments of appreciation into the swallowing ocean of words with deep affection. Gary, thank you for such a strong foundation. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

**Kevin Haggerty:**

It's a great honor to be here to say a few words in relation to Gary. I think there's lots to be said, obviously, about Gary's scholarship on surveillance, undercover work, and policing, but I want to continue the thread that we've been working on for a little bit, particularly to other

aspects of Gary's influence and writings, particularly his scattered works over his career on advice to graduates and established scholars, particularly as expressed in his 37 moral imperatives. I think that was among my first encounters with Gary along with the undercover work as it involves how to be an ethical, moral and sane academic. I've shared that work widely.

I've had many different types of relationships with Gary over the years, I do a lot of editing and Gary has generously been one of my authors. He has written several things for me. So, by way of tribute, I encourage him to go back to the keyboard and to write something about being a mentor. I think this is a role that he's played exceptionally well, and it's often with little recognition, little fanfare, and it's probably symptomatic of the apathy, which probably doesn't end up with recognition of these things. Mentoring takes many different forms. It can be expressed in formal types of communications and articles of the types that Gary has written.

It also takes place behind the scenes, in informal kinds of encouragement and advice. And it also takes the form of just being a role model, the type of scholar that someone might want to be, and I think Gary has excelled in all of these areas. So, looking over his career, I just want to draw attention to four ways that I think that he stands as an exceptional mentor, and maybe use this as a preliminary draft of the piece that I hope he will write on being a mentor. And I think the first place to start is actually being willing to be a mentor, to be willing to take on that role. It's not

something that everyone is comfortable with; it's not something that we often do enough of, but the academy is a strange place.

It's learned much in the same way that adolescents learn about sex: through sort of scattered hallway conversations, sort of half-truths and mythologies. The effect on performance in either situation is not ideal. But it's important to take this role on, even if people aren't willing to do so. I also learned from Gary to use sexual examples as metaphors because they get attention.

Being in the academy can be a very isolating experience, and it's vitally important to find someone you can look up to, that you can send emails to and get some guidance from.

Gary has been exceptionally willing not only to take people under his wing informally, but also to pass along some of those more formal types of communications about how this profession of ours works.

The second thing Gary has said, is to follow your interests. And the reason I stress this one is, over the last couple of years, I've had several discussions with graduate students who are starting off on projects that are drop-dead boring. And I asked them, why are you doing this? And they've told me because this type of research stands a good chance of getting published in a prominent journal, or that there's a new funding initiative and it stands a good chance of being funded. And I think that it's the exact wrong way to approach this enterprise.

We have such a privileged occupation to be able to choose what we're going to do for long-term projects, and to waste it on things that aren't interesting to you at the outset is just a tragedy. And so Gary shows that you can build a fascinating and fulfilling career studying things that are intrinsically interesting. It's not that surveillance, privacy, undercover policing are topical issues. What's important is to take these things and to apply some rigor, some politics, and some ethics. And recognition will follow. So, you don't chase the recognition; it will follow your passions. And I think you see this every day with Gary. I mean, you don't get 120,000 hits on your homepage by accident.

People follow when you follow and study interesting things. The third thing is you have to be willing to communicate these things to the public, not just to other academics. Write op-eds, use social media to communicate some of your findings. And I think this is particularly important in the increasingly managerial university where, quite literally, these things don't count. They are not part, in many universities; they are not part of the rubric of what our productivity is, notwithstanding the fact of how important they are for pedagogy, for politics, and for ethics, for what we do and what we give back to society. So, it's a real tragedy if you're not willing to take that role on. And Gary, throughout his career, has been willing to do that.

He essentially was doing public sociology 30 to 40 years before anyone invented the phrase, with a truly remarkable range of publications in such

diverse areas as having a piece in, in the *Dissent Harvard Business Review*, having a piece in *The Nation*, and the *Wall Street Journal*. This is not something that many academics do, but it goes back to the point that if you're doing something well and studying interesting things, you'll find a readership.

Finally, I just want to say that I think it's important to do all of this with a sense of perspective and humor. The most insufferable people in the academy are the ones who tend to believe their own public relations. And we can all sort of think of some of those people.

I think Gary is lovely for standing at the opposite end of that, for notwithstanding the accolades and the awards, he approaches everything that he does with a sense of humor, and he remains one of the most self-deprecating people I know. And this is all to his credit. So, I think that all of these stand as different examples of how Gary stands as a mentor, and I really do want to encourage him to think about sitting down at the keyboard and using just these ideas as a preliminary draft to write something about mentoring throughout his career. I certainly know there'd be an audience, and I'd be one of them. So thank you, Gary, and congratulations.

**Glen Muschert:**

I first met Gary in, I believe, 1994, when I started a doctoral program at the University of Colorado at Boulder. And I can honestly say that it has been an honor to know and to work with Gary. Many of you received

emails from me about this event. And I want you to know this is my expression of gratitude towards Gary. One of the things that we've heard from a number of our colleagues so far is about Gary's contribution to us as students and as scholars, and how he helped us to learn. It's so rare that you get the opportunity to pay back to someone who has paid it forward to you. Of course, as it goes --we pay it forward to those who come next, right?

And we do that in a way of honoring what our mentors did for us. So it is a rare pleasure to be able to pay it back to you today, to get us together and to have this.

We really aren't talking too much about Gary's scholarly contribution, okay? And it's almost because those goes without saying. So, I'll just really briefly encapsulate it. Gary T. Marx has made an exemplary and a massive scholarly contribution to the areas of sociology and criminology. His research is relentless and incisive. I know of no other person in this field who is so productive and creative in such a consistent fashion as Gary. Both by his example, as well as through his mentorship, Gary really taught me a lot about what it is to be a scholar in this field.

Gary taught me the importance of the discipline, as different from the profession, right? And so, I try to use, as a rudder, my sense of the importance of our field as a discipline in my own work as well. And I think that shows forth in Gary's contribution to the discipline as well.

Gary has also been an excellent example to me. He's taught me how

to be a colleague. Gary has always been a tremendous colleague to me, even when I was at the point that Nancy spoke about, when she went to graduate school, but you didn't necessarily know why, or what, you were doing. And Gary, you've treated me as a junior colleague at that time, even though I was kind of amorphous and ill-informed.

I'm grateful for that as well. And of course, we mentioned Gary's writings about academic success, about how one should comport oneself as a scholar and as a colleague.

I was going to also add something to the list of 37 moral mandates for aspiring sociologists. And we can argue about it later on, whether mine gets to be 38, 39, 40, or whatever. But the one that I want to mention is that aspiring scholars in sociology should read, know and emulate Gary Marx in his scholarship, in his person, and in how he behaves as a professional. So anyway, thank you very much, Gary. Yay!

**Pat Gillham:**

Well, I have a lot to say, even if I'd rather listen to Gary talk. I met Gary in 1994, also as a new graduate student at the University of Colorado. And I wasn't really that interested in technology and social control, but I had learned about that a bit about it from through the French scholar, Jacques Ellul. When I got to the University of Colorado, I decided that I was more

interested in studying, and helping to mitigate, social conflict. CU had a very good program at the time in conflict studies.

I took a class from Gary in 1996 on technology and social control –it just blew me away. I was profoundly influenced by the insights, the abilities that Gary has for synthesizing huge volumes of seemingly disparate and totally unrelated, information and then bringing it all together in a way that makes sense to people.

One of the conversations we had as graduate students was about that. As Chair Gary had a lot of control over us. But he didn't seem to exercise it. It kind of bothered us. It's like, “why isn't he telling us what to do?”

The ideas from that class and our subsequent interactions prepared me to go in 1999 to the Seattle World Trade Organization protest. I went there to study organizational aspects of protest groups, but because of what happened there (for those that don't know, it was basically the beginnings of the U. S. Civil Justice Movement) my focus shifted. It was quite a contentious four or five days in Seattle over the Thanksgiving break as students were available and the holiday shopping season in downtown Seattle began.

Fortunately, Gary lived nearby on Bainbridge Island by that time, having left Boulder after Spring 1996. I don't think any of us knew it at the time, but he continued to work with graduate students for some years --out of love not duty, as he by then had no formal connection to the school.

I had initially planned to talk to him about the organizational aspects. In seeing him the day after the first huge confrontation that had escalated between police and protesters we met. I intended to debrief him on what I had seen. Well, after an initial sharing, instead of my debriefing Gary quickly debriefed me. He has an incredible skill of getting to the heart of what's important. Instead of prolonging the conversation, he basically said, 'You've got to go back,' as soon as possible to observe. But before I left, we basically laid out the first paper I was going to publish. It was done on the back of an envelope with Gary's help.

Fortunately, Gary also prompted me to actually write it as the sole author. He suggested that this would be my first publication about those very historic events. I said, "that's crazy. I want to have my first publication with Gary Marx."

I'm going to spend the next few minutes going over some snippets of comments received from a few of the colleagues who wrote to mark this occasion.

First, I want to give you a quick analysis of the responses. It was amazing to read this. I felt very honored to be able to read what people thought and think about Gary. But first off, I just want to say that there were 30 pages of text from nearly 50 responses to my request from people acknowledging Gary [additional selections posted at the end of this]. These people regretted not being able to be here. A few childhood friends, who

later became colleagues, commented on his sociological acumen, expressed as early as 12 years old. It's true.

All recognized his brilliance and profound contributions to several branches of social thought, not just one, not just surveillance, not just social control, not just race, but many different strands. And really, being at the forefront of these, and being the person who moved these conversations light-years ahead.

Many used words like unpretentious, and I like this one: “endless politeness towards other people”. Most recognized him and his work for influence in their careers and life paths. Many commented on the clarity, beauty, and humor expressed in his thoughts and writings. Most commented on Gary's willingness to read and provide brilliant commentary on their manuscripts. And if anyone's ever gotten feedback from Gary, it's amazing if you haven't.

Former students noted how Gary's teaching style instilled confidence and helped them take risks and grow intellectually. And only one used the word 'envy,' and it was directed to his former graduate students. In earnest, one used the word 'homage,' and several used phrases like, “I hope I can grow up to be like you.” Several commented on his physical attractiveness and vitality. The same people commented on the high number of push-ups he can probably still do [rumored to be over 100].

Many thanked him for co-authoring their best work or for writing a

brilliant introduction or afterword to their book. Many recounted memorable stories, and I think it's funny, many of them said, "I don't know if you'll remember this, Gary, but I suspect you will".

Many recognized Gary for his friendship, mentoring, and exemplary humanity. And one reminded him that this is not an obituary, and he has much more to contribute.

A few more:

--"My husband and I both researched and published over the same time span. We have often said that we wished our writing was as powerful and flowed as beautifully as Gary's writing does. In addition, the importance of what he has offered to the field of sociology is surely great."

--"Gary is one of those rare professors who has the power to teach one of those very rare classes. He changed the way I look at life daily, even for something as simple as going to the grocery store. I would never have completed my Ph.D. without Gary. He was an unconditionally supportive, generous cheerleader who quietly and patiently guided me to intellectual maturity.

--"Gary is a generous and thoughtful mentor and became a dear friend. In the years of my academic career, I learned more from Gary not only about sociology and how to navigate an academic career but also about life, relationships, and the pursuit of meaning and wisdom. He's taught me this more than anyone else."

--“I will not attempt to imitate the inimitable and give you inventories of the 27 ways in which I have been influenced, the 45 thoughts that your work has prompted, and the 93 intellectual errors you have prevented me from making, all illustrated with amusing and provocative pictorial slides. I will simply say that I hope you enjoy this day, cherish this award, and look around at friends who were either present or absent to assure us that there is yet more to come from your pen and your voice.”

--He is “an exemplar of public sociology without parallel in contributions to the academy, public policy, and public education”.

--“I expected to find the standard critical sociologist in love with European theorists but no there were pragmatic aspect to Gary.”

“I have no doubt that having one of the world's leading surveillance scholars on the board contributed to the European Commission deciding to fund our project.”

So, there Gary was, opening surveillance themes long before we all did. He was a scholar and teacher who effectively bridges the university and daily life beyond it. Whether it was race relations, civil rights, police enforcement, privacy in the digital age, or whatever, he brought great substance, critical thought and a searing conscience to his work which fueled his efforts and success.

I wish I had the skill to categorize these comments into some Gary T. Marxian typology. But alas, this might yet be another task that only Gary

can properly do.

**Jay Wachtel:**

I first met Gary in fall of 1980. He was, well, you were playing the hooky from MIT, weren't you?

**Gary:** Yes, I was. You received support for only one semester of the sabbatical. So I was picking up support, experience and data by teaching in Albany. Beginning scholar Larry Sherman whose book I had recently reviewed and who I had known through the Police Foundation was on leave, so I filled in for him at his suggestion.

**Jay:** I was in the PhD program at the SUNY Albany School of Criminal Justice. I think I have the record for getting out in record time --three years. For that, all credit goes to Gary, because when Gary got there, I think I was in my first or second year, and I found out that Gary was writing the book *Undercover*. I think the class was on deception and social control. We got to know each other.

When I got to talking to Gary and know him a little bit, I realized that he might have been shadowing me for the last eight years of my career. Because I had been an ATF agent and I had done a lot of undercover work in Phoenix.

I was interested in the topic, and it seemed like every time I communicated with Gary, he knew exactly what I was talking about. Gary is really one of the few scholars, --Peter Manning and Hans Toch are others,

who had an intuitive sense for the streets. He really understood it. And that really provoked a lot of respect.

I said, well, here's a person who's not just a scholar, which I will never be, but has this real organic understanding of what law enforcement is like. It was a tremendous experience working with Gary.

Our interests nicely overlapped. With the support of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fund who sponsored Gary's undercover work (thank God for them, I love those people!) I was able to collect data nationwide for my dissertation, while I was also traveling around doing interviews for Gary's book. I don't know how much good I did you with the interviews, but it worked out great for me! Legitimacy. You gave me legitimacy. You covered mine. It was a terrific experience, and we've kept in touch since then. He truly is one of the few people who have this just very innate understanding of how the world really works.

When he writes, he writes with peculiar CHECK PARTICULAR authority, and that's the reason why it's recognized in law enforcement. That's why the people in the narcotics journal or whatever might have said that, well, this man makes sense. He really does make sense, and what he says really rings true. And I can tell you from experience.

The one thing, though, that Gary wasn't able to talk me into was to save the academic world. Instead after I got my Ph. D. I went back to ATF, and I retired in '98. Then I went ahead because of Gary's influence and started

teaching myself. But I've got to tell you, Gary, I owe you not just my little occupation now; I just owe you a tremendous debt. And I think it's true. The only way to pay it back is now with my own students. Work with them and try to inspire them, and then they'll have to pay it back in the so-called days. So I applaud you.

**Dmitri Shalin:**

I came to know Gary just a few years ago when he offered a helping hand with the Erving Goffman archives. And here's a man who should be able to protect his backstage and not let people look into what's going on in his part of mind. Gary's words-- taking off from Descartes' -- "he lives well who is well hidden". Gary wrote in general, that "suits me just fine. I am in the uncovering business, not in the business of being uncovered. Our power, such as it is this, is in revealing other secrets, not our own. I know what I think." And yet, I think over the course of years, certainly in the last few years, I found that Gary is more and more willing to bring us into the inner workings of himself, his thinking, and his personality.

He writes beautiful stories about his life at Berkeley and beyond, and I hope more of it will become available in time as Gary works more on autobiographical analysis. I hope you will continue along the same lines, discovering the joy of self-uncovering and not only of covering up what you have. Thanks for everything. Thank you.

