

2/19 Note: *After action reviews* are an important component of emergency service, sports, military and many other organizations. They can also benefit the professional reflectors. Seeing the errors of our ways, roads not taken, new questions, misperceptions by readers, fresh insights from reviewers and subsequent events can bring a certain closure to long lived projects and may be of interest to others engaged in related research. It can as well offer a behind the scenes look at the messiness and indeterminacy of research projects in the face of polished results. If you have the stomach to return to yesterday's news, it can also offer directions for your future research. Reflections on completed projects can highlight unresolved questions or topics one was not able to cover and can identify questions that can be noted, but not fully answered. In preliterate and psychoanalytic tribal traditions this might also help to exorcise ghosts and demons by identifying them. I took a small step toward this in the lecture for a methodology class below and took it further after books on surveillance (http://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/marx_satirical_rev.html) and undercover police (<http://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/recent.html> - see the section on "Second Thoughts and Enduring Tensions"). Once one runs out of questions such as those in that last section, it is perhaps time to find a new line of work.

Gary T. Marx

Reflections on Protest and Prejudice 1969.

Given academic norms of humility and understatement, I am a bit hesitant to talk about my own work. Of course, implicit here is the expectation (even invitation) to one's colleagues to dispute the humility and stress how significant a piece of work is.

Given the liberal milieu in which I grew up and education at UCLA and Berkley, I had a strong interest in understanding and seeking to change the racial injustices of the United States. Though now, a decade later with greater maturity, I see injustice as a property of all social systems, though to be sure this is true to varying degrees. I had read C. Wright Mills material written for graduate students in the appendix to *The Sociological Imagination* and I felt that sociology should be more concerned with studying human problems and not building grandiose theoretical schemes or elaborating on intricate, and equally incompressible, statistical methods. Even at Berkeley in 1963 such a perspective was by no means dominant. Two of my closed advisors had done their dissertations on topics such as "Masturbation in the Army" and "Interviewer Errors".

I was partly led to the book's topic by the inconsistency between what I read in the books of Baldwin and Wright to what I experienced working in CORE. The rhetoric or ideology was that all blacks hate whites and are filled with aggression and are eager to overthrow an oppressive social system. Yet the blacks I had contact with generally didn't show this hatred, and in trying to mobilize blacks for CORE projects, we (both black and white workers) not infrequently encountered apathy and even resistance. 1963 was a time, as now [1969] when everyone was talking about the black mood. Yet, there was no systematic data.

The 1964 riots resulted in a broadening of the original Survey Research Center Anti-Defamation League sponsored project on anti-Semitism in America. Originally this project was to involve studies of 1) Christian belief and anti-Semitism, 2) public response to the Eichmann trial and 3) a national study of the American population, attitudes towards Jews, including blacks. With the 1964 violence, there was increased concern about Negro anti-Semitism. The ADL made fund available to do a study just of Negro opinion.

One can raise the question why spend thousands of dollars to study the Negro mood, when novelists and common sense tell us what it is. Here let me draw upon research of the late Harvard sociologist Samuel Stouffer from his classic World War II study of the American soldier. Stouffer began lectures to the unbelieving, often skeptical audiences, by stating that sociology after all, was just common sense, and research hardly justified the effort. He then would give some examples from his own study which found, for example that 1) those soldiers in army units with the lowest rates of promotion were the most dissatisfied 2) whites were more eager to be officers than blacks 3) Southern Negroes preferred Southern to Northern white officers 4) Southern soldiers whether white or black were better able to stand the hot South Seas climate than Northern soldiers 5) Given discrimination and oppressive living conditions, the Negro suicide rate is higher than for whites. His audience would then nod smugly, at which point Stouffer would indicate that, in fact, the reverse of each one of those things was true. Clearly, there is a vital need for social research in the face of the unquestioned assumptions of folklore and commonsense.

So the ADL put up the funds. It was decided to take a national non-Southern, urban sample and then special samples for 4 cities (New York, Chicago, Atlanta and Birmingham). The ADL was concerned about Negro attitudes toward Jews. We did a study for them which included Negro attitudes towards Jews, but we argued that such attitudes could not be studied apart from general considerations of black responses to the civil right struggle, so the scope of the study was considerably broadened.

I was primarily concerned with what makes for conventional black militancy in the hope that some understanding of this could be used to increase activism on behalf of civil rights. I was also reacting against people like Eric Hoffer, who saw social movement participants as sick, deluded failures. My experiences in Berkeley CORE and on the campus suggested the opposite. Activists seemed to be an elite group, especially sensitive and bright, though perhaps this has changed somewhat by 1969. I had some hesitancy in studying black prejudice and I wrote at the time, "In a forest fire of hatred only the most myopic and self-righteous have their attention drawn to burning twigs." Though I also wrote, "Perhaps this study can be relevant to social change by shocking white Americans into awareness of the depth of anger and hostility that exists. I was concerned with Negro attitudes towards Jews, beyond anti-Semitism, because of an interest in understanding the conditions under which minority groups might come to realize that they have a common cause and could cooperate in creating a more just society. While I devoted only a sixth of the final product to the ADL's original interest, they remained very supportive of the project. With their help in promoting the book about 25,000 copies were sold, rather more than the usual academic book.

Research Decisions

Many research decisions are dictated not by highly codified research rules but by matters of aesthetics, taste, chance and style. As is the case with various social reforms, a given decision is likely to have both benefits and costs. I will consider some technical, linguistic and social areas in which I had to make decisions.

When and where do you collapse an index? Do you open the index up and run the risk of having relatively few cases, but a more powerful instrument, or do you collapse the index in order to gain many cases, and in doing, lose something in predictive power? How many items do you include in your index, independent of where you collapse it? The more dimensions you build into your index, the stronger it is likely to be with respect to prediction. Yet, you don't know just what has what effect when you do this. Do you dichotomize many variable or do you deal only with a few variables and make fine distinctions among them? I combined my five samples and this gave more cases. However, it also meant that I was unable to deal with inter-city variation. In samples of two hundred, it becomes difficult to control for more than four variables. So, for most of the analysis I ended up collapsing categories. Yet, if the categories of samples are to be combined, then why bother to take separate samples? In this case the ADL wanted to contrast cities in the North and the South.

Do you use tests of significance or not? I decide not to use them simply because the people supervising the work (and previously my teachers) Charles Glock and Hannan Selvin did not require that they be used. Selvin has suggested that the worse one's data are, the more sophisticated the statistical technique needs to be. There is a methodological argument for not using tests of significance. I must admit I don't remember what it was, and I'm not sure I ever fully understood it.

Another decision is whether you write for the layman and be accused of being a "popularizer" (many sociologists hate Vance Packard for that) or do you write for academics and risk being called a pedant, obscuritanist and purveyor of jargon? I tried to walk a middle path, but I don't think many non-academics read the entire book. Is a given finding so unimportant that only a specialist could love it, or is a finding so important that it must be included no matter how complex and time-consuming the understanding of it? What kind of a balance does one strike between the empirical and theoretical structure of the work? One scholar has divided sociologists into two types, the "action painters who dribble their thoughts on the canvas of the journals unrestrained by systematic evidence, while at the opposite pole there are hordes of engineers who grind out work according to the mechanistic formulas of elementary statistics texts." C. Wright Mills talks about the abstract empiricists and the grand theorizers. I tried to steer mid-way between the two. How much historical analysis to include? How far do you go in using international, comparative data? When do you stop controlling for possible variables to explain or account for a relationship? Here I'm reminded of the problem of the number of fire trucks at a fire and the amount of damage that is done (the more trucks the greater the damage!). There is no easy answer to this question. If you like the numbers in a table and its consistent with your research assumptions and ideology and you throw in a few obvious controls to be honest, then the tendency is to stop running tables. If the finding is troublesome, you can run everything

imaginable against it and sooner or later by chance, you might serendipitously find out why it didn't work.

There are also problems in trying to decide whether a given variable should be treated as dependent or independent variable. I had this problem with my militancy index. It's also possible that the two variables such as social involvement and militancy (central to the book's analysis) may both be related to some third variable. Another issue has to do with how much data you present. Where do you put the tables, in the text or in an appendix?

There are also subtle problems of interpretation and evaluation of the data. Do you say *only* 30% approved or *fully* 30% approved? In my chapter on the attitudes of Negroes toward Jews, people came away thinking that Negroes are less anti-Semitic than whites. This isn't quite true, especially if you fail to control for social class. However, I'm glad people got that impression from the text and they did because of the way I consciously or unconsciously slanted my wording. Someone with a different orientation might have given that data a different treatment. Does this therefore mean that you can prove anything with statistics? Not quite, using the same body of data two competent analysts would probably not arrive at radically opposed conclusions, at least if they agreed on the question. However, they might differ in terms of their emphasis, organization and selection of the material. It is important to be honest about your work and to point out shortcomings and to consider how personal factors and the social setting may have influenced the work. This can forestall critics since you do their job for them. Yet, if you are too self-critical you may convince readers that the work isn't worth much.

The Social and Personal Context

Research, like other kinds of social behavior, occurs in a context of rules and traditions. Here I turn to the sociology of social research.

If your research is paid for by others (and large scale projects such as *Protest and Prejudice* require that) the interests of your sponsors will rarely perfectly align with yours. My sponsors were reasonable. However, there were areas of disagreement. For example, they did to want me to use the word *black* in the title of the book and they urged me not to use it in the text. I was invited to participate in a symposium on Negro-Jewish relations which was to receive widespread publication and involved leading scholars that I, as a beginning scholar, was eager to meet. The sponsor did not wish for me to participate because the data had not yet been made public. Organizational rivalries were involved here. The sponsor set the deadlines for the book to be released. I would have liked to work several more years on it. The book's postscript indicates some of the things that I still wanted to research. This included a comparable study on the attitudes of Jews toward Negroes and also a study on merchants in ghetto areas. However, funds were not forthcoming to study those topics. Sponsors are not usually trained as social analysts but they have opinions and preferences about "your" (or their?) study that they are paying for. You need to listen and when you disagree, decide how far you can go in ignoring them.

The ADL was interested in reaching an audience of laypersons and there were pressures on me not to write too academic a book, to cut down on the number of tables and footnotes and some of the discussion. I disagreed. The organization wanted me to make speeches for them

about the data. Initially I didn't mind, but after a while the thought of yet another chicken dinner was not appealing.

There are intense moments of joy and even exultation as one pores over a new set of tables fresh off the mainframe computer [in 1965 there were no desk laptops to work from at your leisure]. There can be a great sense of excitement and anticipation. In some cases, I'd come in to the office late at night in a driving rain to eagerly discover if upwardly mobile people really were more militant. Then, when an empirical relationship actually worked as predicted after appropriate controls, or when a pile of tables suddenly fell together into a coherent chapter, I had a great feeling, a sense of creativity and discovery. I kept a score card of pages written and then chapters, not unlike persons in prison counting the days and crossing off the months. At the end of each day of writing, I compulsively added up the total number pages written thus far.

At times I felt like the highly driven mad scientist, staying up all night to finish a chapter or suddenly waking up at three in the morning to write down an idea for testing a theory. At times, in manic fits, I would subordinate and sublimate everything in working on the study. That is no way to run a railroad or live a life (fortunately our first child appeared just as work on the project was completing). But for short periods of time it was functional and exciting.

However, there are also moments of great frustration and questioning of my motives and competence. There was a fear that what I was saying was obvious, trite, wrong or had political implications I didn't like. At times I also questioned my own motives. How much did I really care about advancing knowledge rather than finishing the dissertation and advancing my own career? And, when the main frame computer would break down, or be closed for a holiday, or when the desired result didn't emerge and a completely incomprehensible one did, or I felt overwhelmed with analytic possibilities with no clear guidelines for choice, or when someone else published a paper with related findings before you did, or when a national magazine reports on the research of another ADL project being carried out at your research institute and fails to mention your project, there are moments of anger and depression.

The Analysis

The study was partly exploratory and partly explanatory and hence, research was guided both by prior assumptions and by what is called in the trade "playing around with the data". Among the more profound things Professor Seymour M. Lipset said was, "there is an inverse relationship between the number of tables and the quality of ideas in a given book". The book has over 100 tables. You can infer what you like from that!

In the classical scientific model, one has theories or propositions and single-mindedly tests them. Yet for much social science research, that model is too restrictive. Work is all too often far muddier and murkier. There can initially be a lot of confusion and you need a high tolerance for ambiguity as you set out to forge some order out of a vast amount of data. For example, I had eleven hundred people in my study and I used five IBM cards for each person. A given IBM card has room for 80 pieces of information on it. There were thus 440,000 pieces of information (5 x 80 x 1100)

I was concerned with 3 main classes of variable. Two of these were dependent variables, or the things to be explained or accounted for. The three variables were A) civil rights concerns, attitudes toward whites, and militancy (separating the racially aware from the non-aware and then dealing with types of concern). B) various sociological and ethnographic independent variables such as age, sex, class and psychological variables such as self-image, and contextual variables such as the racial composition of a neighborhood.

I then tried to figure out ways of measuring these variables. In some cases such as age, the problem is fairly simple. Yet even here, one must collapse age into manageable categories such as 20-30 and 30-40. However, there is still the need to find measures for other variables and to build indices. I followed three steps in setting up an index. First, determine how to logically measure it. Second, I had to determine whether the items in the index were interrelated. Third, I had to determine whether the index had any predicative value. Usually, people validate their attitudinal indices with other attitudes. I was fortunate in having a behavioral measure, whether or not a person belonged to a civil rights organization (p. 46) There is a lot of trial and error in building an index given the variety of items that could be included. The same is true in analyzing relationships. One looks at a large number of tables and pulls out those that work or seem particularly interesting. Then you need to be sure that the result is not due to its being a chance statistical artifact (fire trucks and the amount of damage at a fire).

Much of index construction is really common sense and logical thinking about what should ideally be in an index. Considering the issue of black anti-Semitism, I realized that measures were also needed of black attitudes towards whites in general, the attitudes of blacks towards non-Jewish whites and the general relationship between anti-Semitism and anti-white attitudes. With these three clusters of dependent and independent variables I built a twenty by twenty matrix. I thought about how each variable related to each other variable. I looked for patterns or central organizing tendencies. One important tendency I saw was the concept of social involvement. This offered a way of summarizing the effect of multiple variables. Just as Durkheim used degree of social integration to explain various correlates of the suicide rate such as the higher rates in Protestant countries and among elderly and divorced people, I used social involvement as a central concept to explain why educated, Northern, urban, male, younger, employed people were more likely to be militant, just as people who voted and belonged to voluntary organizations and read newspapers and magazines were more likely to be militant.

In writing up the analysis striking findings can sometimes be deceptive. For example, the table on page 74 goes from zero to 46%. Unfortunately in survey research correlations are not usually very strong. A correlation of .3 is relatively strong for this type of research. What we end up with are probability statements. We say, "on the average people with this characteristic are more likely to behave in a given way than are people who don't have this characteristic" We aren't saying that everyone with the characteristic will behave this way and that no one without it will behave this way. This raises the interesting problem for analysis of: what about those who have the predisposition to show prejudice but don't, as well as those who aren't highly predisposed in terms of background characteristics or psychological characteristics but in fact do show the phenomenon that you're interested in? One thing to do, of course, is to ask other

questions to take the analysis further. Thus, after showing that social class was important to militancy, even among the highest social class only half of scored as militant (although this figure for those lowest in social class was under 10%). I then analyzed this further by asking what effect homeownership had on militancy (this is on page. 65).

The model that I used in the book was, 1) to describe the data 2) build indices 3) analyze sociological variables 4) analyze psychological variables 5) to bring them together and 6) when relationships were found see if they could be explained away as on page. 103.

Unanticipated results are often present. One in this study was that, measured in some ways, Negroes were less anti-Semitic than whites. That contrasted with what I had earlier assumed in writing, "It is ironic that the white group most sympathetic to blacks, Jews, may be the group most disliked by blacks."

I was pleased that the data came out as it did and it required no shifts in analytic strategy. But in the case of support for black nationalism this was not true. Given the mass media and the significance attributed to the Muslims at the time this study was done in 1964, I had expected to find a relatively large amount of support. At least enough support for explanatory analysis. I had hoped to do something along the lines of the hypothetical table and the footnote on page 109. But instead I was only able to offer a descriptive profile.

One of the criticisms of survey research in general and studies on blacks in particular is that middle-class Negro interviewers may bias the study and induce more moderate responses. In at least one instance, the problem may gone the other direction. One of our interviewers was later indicted for trying to blow up the statue of liberty and his interviews were not included in the analysis.

It's hard for the mind to grasp much more than a four variable table. More sophisticated data analysis techniques such as path analysis are required for that. There are definite limits in dealing with survey data only through the use of contingency tables. However, the more sophisticated the technique, the farther removed one becomes from the concrete data and it can be difficult to know in any kind of realistic or intuitive sense what the data mean.

In the midst of my graduate school enthusiasm and perhaps naiveté, I realized that I may have had a tendency to take the data too seriously and acted as if I was explaining much more than I really was. The footnote on page 77 reflects this. There is a certain methodological seduction that can occur when one working with survey data.

As a Northern white middle-class person relatively isolated from contact with Negroes and Negro history, I experience a certain shock at various points in mulling over these data. The world-view I took to the data and certain expectations which one normally makes were severely shaken by some of the responses. Several respondents reported father's occupation as "slave". The question on voting, "did you vote in the last presidential election in 1960 when Kennedy ran against Nixon or did something happen to keep you from voting?" must have seemed to some Southern respondents to be a particularly hollow question given restrictions on voting. Furthermore, one respondent did answer, "no, something did keep me from voting –the

interviewer penciled in “respondent was in jail.” This is not the kind of contingency that keeps people from voting that middle-class creators of such questions have in mind. In drawing up questions, you can never be sure how people will respond or interpret them. That is why pilot tests are so important. In some cases people responded, “don’t know” to questions about Jewish as against non-Jewish landlords or merchants. The reason they responded “don’t know” was not because they were hesitant to appear anti-Semitic, or because the issue was not salient, but rather because they had only had Jewish landlords or employers. In response to the statement, “the day will come when the Negroes will be fully accepted by whites” some of those questioned did not appreciate the question (one respondent said, “the real question to be asked is whether Negroes will ever accept whites.”

The talk ended with some ad hoc thoughts on ethical issues involved in social research, later expanded upon in http://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/ethical_dilemmas.html

Second Thoughts And Enduring Tensions

Scholars such as those represented in this volume, who choose to work on criminal justice issues from a broad, interdisciplinary, qualitative, skeptical, and often critical perspective, generally have a more difficult time than their colleagues whose feet are squarely planted in a single discipline and who quantitatively pursue microlevel questions defined by funding agencies and criminal justice establishments.

In this section I shift from a consideration of substantive issues to some more personal issues. My study of covert practices was published in 1988. It moved from being a boomerang (with its recirculation between author, sponsor, and publisher) to being a missile. But alas, even missiles leave remnants. I did not part with the book easily, although I did so gladly.

Doing an interdisciplinary book on a broad topic that mixes social science with social criticism and is aimed at academics, practitioners, and the educated public is a recipe for angst, self-doubt, and role conflict.

I address eleven issues here that are more professional than substantive. These go beyond the specifics of the study and touch more general concerns. There are empirical or practical answers to some of the questions and, where there are not, I know that the tension between polarities can be positive. But that insight does not eliminate the discomfort. Knowledge is one thing and feelings another. I offer these concerns (stated in the form of questions) in the preliterate and psychoanalytic tribal tradition of exorcising ghosts and demons by identifying them, and because I know many colleagues share them.

1. Is it appropriate for social scientists whose legitimacy and traditions involve ordering microempirical measurements with systematic theory to study broad amorphous topics, such as privacy, deception, authenticity, liberty, autonomy, and justice in an interpretive fashion? Wouldn't it be better to start with just one question, replicate prior research, or

test a few propositions using rigorous methods and quantitative data? Perhaps, but when the topic has rarely been studied there is also a case for beginning by casting a broad net in the hope of stimulating more delineated studies. There is no correct answer to the recurring issues of forests, trees, and grasses. They are all there and are all important.

For social scientists trained in the positivism-happy times of the 1950s and 1960s, one risks (or at least imagines risking) peer rejection, a negative self image, and guilt in not following the standard linear model of moving from questions to answers, and theories to systematic numerical tests. Yet the specificity and rigidity of this model did not feel right for the surveillance project. Instead I started with an interest in the phenomenon of deception by the state and a feeling that it was wrong, or at least risky as public policy. I began with an answer, or better a feeling and looked for the questions. Some of the most important questions (how to balance the rights of the individual with the needs of the community) cannot be answered by empirical research. I also struggled with finding the right balance between description, classification, measurement, explanation, and prescription/proscription.

2. Even if one opts to focus on a broad topic, should it be approached from a multi- and interdisciplinary perspective, or from a narrower disciplinary base? Given the exploratory nature of my inquiry I sought whatever tools were available. But then as a nonspecialist one must confront the issues of poaching. I have chapters in areas in which my formal training goes no further than the sophomore introductory class (e.g., in history and in ethics) and I rely on secondary sources. Can/should we trespass with impunity/immunity in other professional vineyards if we like the look of their grapes? In trying to be all things to all people does one risk being nothing to anyone? Does a book need a disciplinary identity? Does breadth have to come at a cost of depth?
3. What does it mean to understand undercover police practices? What were the goals of my sociological inquiry? What does it mean to be interested in reasons as well as causes, in subjective experiences understood empathetically, as well as in more easily quantifiable objective factors? How can surveys and experiments be supplemented in the search for broad understanding? How can we make use of the truths of novelists and philosophers? What role does wisdom play in the results of sociological research? How does prediction relate to understanding? How does understanding relate to judgment? What is the difference between a social scientist, a journalist, an essayist, and a novelist? What needs to be added to Robert Park's observation that sociology is slow journalism?

The strictly scientific part of being a sociologist neither satisfies my soul nor can it do justice intellectually or politically to the topics that I am interested in. I want my writing to be scientifically accurate and to reflect wisdom. I want to advance knowledge and also contribute to the quality of life. The research I have done on social control issues in the last two decades is not the work of an activist who starts committed to an end and selects data to push it forward, nor is it the artist's work of unbridled imagination where anything is possible. But it shares something with each of them. Can we have it multiple ways?

One way to combine these is through fictive social science scenarios (whether dystopian or utopian).⁹ I think these should be as common in the tool kit of the social scientist as the ability to think conceptually or to analyze data. They can be a powerful form of communication, particularly for broader audiences. Yet they must be grounded by one's understanding of fact and social process.

In such writing the possible must be kept separate from the probable. But there is the interesting paradox that these are not necessarily independent. Given the power of scenarios, describing what is possible may effect the probability of its occurring by moving people to action. This lies behind George Orwell's observation that "I do not believe that the kind of society I describe necessarily will arrive, but I believe . . . that something resembling it could arrive" (cited in Crick 1980). Orwell was not making predictions, he was describing possibilities in the hope that this act could help avoid them.

4. Is it possible to balance social science and social criticism so that they are mutually supportive rather than corrosive? We need precision and passion. I don't want my concerns with civil liberties, inequality, and reform to distort my scientific observations -- for both intellectual and practical reasons. Scientific understanding should not be sacrificed on the altar of commitment. Yet in this socially important area, I am more than the neutral scientist who just wants the facts (Marx 1972).
5. Can the same work make contributions to both social science and public policy? Must one choose between being an uncontaminated basic scientist seeking fundamental knowledge with little notion of how, when, where, or if it will be used; a hired gun seeking normatively based solutions to an applied problem someone else has defined; or a zealous, self-appointed social engineer-moral entrepreneur, peddling your own brand of expert truth and action?

How does and should knowledge relate to action? Do you have to know why in order to know how? Can academics, with their cross-case knowledge and tenure, who act as Monday morning quarterbacks with no responsibility for the consequences of the actions that practitioners must take really have much to say that is useful?

6. Is it possible to write so that one's work is well received by both colleagues and the educated public? In trying to reach for (or at least not exclude) a general audience, one runs the risk of dilution and being labeled a popularizer or even a journalist. Books that are accessible are often suspect in the halls of academe. Yet the trappings of academic respectability --literature reviews, sophisticated techniques, jargon, the assumption of a learned audience, and detached and spiritless writing --are hardly endearing to the average reader.
7. Was I taken in? In studying persons who are professional liars how far should I go in discounting what they say? Was I conned by some of the agents I interviewed? Aren't they in the best position to deceive an interviewer (described by one DEA agent as "a choir boy from M.I.T.")?

8. Between starting and finishing the book, my beliefs about the desirability of undercover tactics changed. Rather than seeing them as an unnecessary evil, I came to view their use in the United States under limited and controlled circumstances as a necessary evil. I gained excellent access to the FBI (something I would not have predicted from my days of Berkeley student activism). Does the change in my attitude say something about my openness and intellectual honesty in the face of a very complex situation, or was I co-opted? Had I come to that situation the madam warned the prostitute about: when one starts enjoying sex with the customers it's time to quit? At some level did I want to please and be liked by those sometimes heroic figures in almost white hats? Is the change partly a strategic ploy, since I want to affect the policy debate and know that a hostile polemic would likely preclude this? How can one balance and maintain a degree of respect/appreciation for our subjects and the sincerity of their beliefs, reciprocity (at least in so far as one doesn't harm them since they are giving something to us with little in return), with the need to be objective, to be faithful to our moral concerns, and not to be captured by our subjects?
9. How do you know when you are done? When do you let go? I stopped largely because of the sponsor's expectations, but could easily have spent several more years working on comparative international materials and on literary and film treatments. I was not quite ready to let go. But I know if I had worked on the book for several more years new topics would have appeared justifying further-work, in an endless spiral. In finishing a book on a contemporary topic one risks being out of date as soon as the work is published. On the other hand partial information is better than none at all.
10. With respect to book reviews, was it possible to balance the cynicism of the sociology of knowledge perspective with the belief that there really are empirical and normative truths that transcend social settings?

While I am in this work primarily for the process, I can't claim the degree of disinterestedness or disdain that some artists have for critics (e.g., playwrights who report they never look at reviews). This partly reflects the tentativeness of the scholarly enterprise in which we must learn from each other and any one person is limited in what he or she knows (occupational norms require scholars to be less arrogant than artists).

The many reviews of the book have been fair and more laudatory than I anticipated. Yet I was not above applying a sociology of knowledge view in which a book review is often a Rorschach test revealing as much, or more, about the reviewer as about the book. This is not to suggest that reviewers are simply hapless captives of deterministic social forces. But about half the time I could predict at least some of a reviewers' responses by knowing their discipline and politics. Thus a law professor and a historian found things to criticize in the book's legal and historical sections, respectfully. A sociologist of organizations praised the chapter that dealt with bureaucracy and lamented the fact that the conceptual concerns of that chapter were not found throughout the book and he was impatient with the literary quotes. In contrast, an ethnographer was most critical of the bureaucracy chapter, finding it too abstract and lifeless. A conservative prosecutor accused me of

losing my cool and exaggerating the dangers to civil liberties, while a radical criminologist faulted the book for failing to fully consider the macrosystem that leads American police to behave in the ways the book documents.

It is not news that opinions have social correlates. It does not follow from this that all views are necessarily equal, whether scientifically or morally, merely because they are socially situated and constructed. So are tunnels and bridges, but they show great variation in quality and usefulness. Yet awareness of the social construction of perspectives can be a salve for critical reviews, if also a bearer of humility for laudatory ones.

11. What obligations did I have to promote the book in order to have it be seen and reviewed beyond the confines of a few specialists and friends? Many in the university have a naive faith that if you do good work it will be noticed (as in the film *Field of Dreams* they assume that if you build it the audience will come). But this is life, not the movies. At its worst this optimistic view involves a conceit about how important the work we do is and how eager the outside world is for it. As graduate students in a meritocratic appearing system, we are led to believe that the cream will rise to the top. If it doesn't, no matter, since virtue in scholarship is seen to be its own reward. Even in the American academic context, with only a hint of the genteel, scholarly aristocratic tradition, there is something a bit crass and self-serving about promoting your own ideas. Doing this risks contamination with the corrupt outside world.

The Twentieth Century Fund financed the study of undercover police and receives the royalties. I was glad to be finished and wanted to move on to other things. Yet I also felt a sense of responsibility to shape public debate. This was also consistent with the sponsor's interest in funding books that were accessible to a broad public and in having the results be widely disseminated.

I did not want the book's main impact to be taking up space in libraries and further depleting the rain forests. With more than fifty thousand books published each year in the United States it is rare that a book speaks for itself. I was not shy in calling the book to the attention of audiences whether colleagues, journal editors, policy makers, or bookstores.

Many reporters fell into one of two camps: either the devil's advocate, questioning my call for restraint in the face of serious crime problems, or the alarmist demanding to know what needed to be done to stop the sky from falling. I enjoyed educating the former about means and ends relationships in a democracy and the latter about frames of reference. However, I was frustrated by the media's inability to see the difference between a sociologist and a social engineer.

There is a difference between helping to identify the right questions and having the right factual and then normative answers. Having the right questions is a first step. I think I have those and I have many of the factual answers, but I am far from the normative and policy answers. My initial concern was to identify the issues and encourage public

discussion, and only secondarily to offer solutions. Indeed these topics are fascinating because there often are no solutions in the usual sense.

The mannered debates of the academy are very different from the raucous rhetoric of the radio talk show open to all callers. The ethic of many of the ideologues I encountered in publicizing the book on television and radio was one of simple expediency: say anything that will advance your case. The standards of logic, evidence, fairness, and civility that in principle characterize scientific debate were not much in evidence.

Nor did I enjoy having to fit what often should have been complex answers into the time, space, and sophistication limits of the media format in question. Reporters often ask good questions, but conditions rarely permit your giving good answers. It is frustrating to be told, "Come on, Professor, never mind all the qualifications and hedges, just answer the question yes or no", or "We only have a minute, can you give us a quick summary of the book?" When the story is complicated and ambiguous and there are no easy answers, as with the case of covert policing, the yes/no quick fixes that media questioners are after aren't there. In trying to fit into their format, you must either appear glib and inauthentic or indecisive and academic. The latter is a surefire method for being edited out or not being asked back.

As the above suggests, I never felt fully comfortable marketing the book. I am more comfortable as a producer than a promoter, but books do not reach wider audiences on their own.

Yet in spite of these tensions there is a strong need for qualitative, interdisciplinary, and integrative approaches to broad topics of social importance. The softer social sciences residing between the humanities and the sciences are uniquely qualified for such inquiries. The building blocks of our highly specialized research endeavors must occasionally be brought together in an effort to see the broader landscape.

Comprehensive work on controversial topics takes time and scholarly independence. The Twentieth Century Fund was an ideal sponsor. I spent a decade working on the book and would not want to have been judged for tenure (or anything else) after only five years. The pressure to produce work quickly and to bring in research grants only on topics that established agencies want to fund can be highly dysfunctional.

There is no necessary opposition between policy and basic research, nor between writing for colleagues and the educated public. We need to search for wisdom, as well as knowledge. The former is impossible without the latter and the latter is pedantic and lifeless when divorced from the concrete details of everyday life and questions of value.