

TRANSCRIPT

"GETTING RESPECT: RESPONDING TO STIGMA AND DISCRIMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES, BRAZIL, AND ISRAEL"

A conversation with Michèle Lamont and Chris Stone

Recorded February 13, 2017

ANNOUNCER:

You are listening to a recording of the Open Society Foundations, working to build vibrant and tolerant democracies worldwide. Visit us at OpenSocietyFoundations.org.

CHRIS STONE:

So good-- good afternoon. My name is Chris Stone. I'm the president of the Open Society Foundations. And it's a pleasure to welcome you-- here this evening-- to this discussion with Michèle Lamont. We are recording the-- the program and streaming it live. So-- if you-- care to join in the conversation later, just be-- be aware of that fact.

I am-- really delighted. Michèle is-- to be here. Michèle has-- served since 2009 as a member of our-- member of the advisory board and selection committee of our scholarships program here at the Open Society Foundations-- and-- for even longer, has been conducting research-- that has led-- to the recent publication of *Getting Respect*, subject of her talk-- this evening.

She's director of the Weatherhead (SIC) Center-- Weatherhead Center at-- for International Affairs-- at Harvard University-- and professor of European studies-- sociology, and African and African American studies at Harvard. It is-- the subject of - of the book, *Getting Respect*, and the research underlying it-- is-- is of central importance-- to the Open Society Foundations and, indeed, to all of us-- in societies around the globe today struggling with issues of-- of group identity, of-- discrimination, of-- of stigmatization-- and of-- building stronger, more resilient

societies.

It's-- the book is a tremendous-- piece of scholarship and also a tremendous-- piece of-- of-- of social insight. And I hope we'll be able to explore both of those dimensions this evening in discussion. We're going to start-- Michèle's gonna start with some-- opening remarks about the-- about the book and the research, putting it in some context. We'll have a discussion between ourselves for a brief time and then open it up. And I hope you will-- join in-- with discussions-- discussion questions-- or comments. So Michèle, thank you.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Well, thank you so much for-- inviting me here, Chris. It's a real pleasure to be here, especially since, as I was slaving away on this book, I-- there are some people in the room-- with whom I was-- serving on committees. And they often heard me complain as I was working on this book. And of course-- issues of racism have always been central to the Open Society Foundations. So I was very happy to have the opportunity to come here to talk to you about this.

And in the room, there are some colleagues, academic, researchers, sociologists. And there's also people who are not academics. So I thought that I would-- aim my-- the-- my short presentation or highlights of the book so that I'm-- speaking to both audiences at once.

So the project started from my involvement in a big-- comparative-- research group called Successful Societies, which I have been codirecting since-- 2002. And the group involves members of various disciplines. And together, we started to reflect, collectively, on what might define societal success. So those of you who read the *New York Times* every day know that there are-- economic indicators that are widely read-- but-- widely used.

But many people have been critical of these indicators and have been focusing on collective wellbeing, or the happiness research industry has been growing by leaps and bounds. What the group decided to do is to really have a multidimensional approach that took into consideration the least ethnocentric-- indicators of societal success: low infant mortality, high life expectancy, but also the quality of government-- the extent to which societies are able to support multiculturalism.

The dimension I'm concerned with has to do with the porousness of group boundaries. So the book I'm gonna talk to you about today is really about how-- ordinary people, middle-class and working-class men and women, who are members of different kinds of stigmatized groups, go about responding to incidents where they feel that they are treated unfairly in the course of their everyday life.

So we conducted over 400-- four-- 400 interviews with people who were randomly sampled from-- New York City-- Rio de Janeiro, and Tel Aviv, the cities themselves and their suburbs, and asked them, please describe to me an incident that you've encountered. What happened to you? Where did it happen? And how did you

respond? And our analysis of everyday anti-racism is extremely inductive in that we really try to identify how they describe these experiences, not start with, for instance, resistance, which is extremely salient in the literature, but really proceed inductively to ask them, please describe to us what happened to you and how you respond.

So there are some slides that are not supposed to show. I'm just gonna go very quickly-- through them. So and-- so that's half of the book. And the other half is really to come up with a kind of-- explanatory framework that is unusual in that we wanted to go beyond to anecdote, to ask ourselves, why is it, for instance, that African Americans s-- so much more readily identify an ins-- an incident as racist, as compared to their black Brazilian counterpart? What are the factors that enables that-- them to do this?

And in order to explain this, we decided to single out two sets of explanations that are rarely present in analysis of racism. One of them has to do with the extent to which the group is a group, okay? How much is, for African Americans, salient the fact that they are African Americans, more, let's say, than they are middle class and working class or male and female?

And also, what are the cultural repertoires? What are the tools that are available in their environment that lead them to interpret their experience one way or the other? So the explanation, you cannot really see it here, but you have three sets of columns that are elements that enable and constrains different kinds of responses across national context, which are the historical, socioeconomic, and special context, the groupness, the degree to which the group is a group, and the cultural repertoires they have access to, which includes, not only, national cultural repertoires, such as, you know-- the American dream or racial-- democracy in Brazil or Zionism, but also transnational ones, such as human rights or neoliberalism.

So the analysis goes from the national. And we compare five groups, which are African Americans, black Brazilians. And then we have three groups in Israel, which is kind of a surprise. And we started with only the main victim of racism in Israel, Arab Palestinians.

But then we decided to add two groups-- Ethiopian Jews. So we have people who are phenotypically black in three societies, and Mizrahim, who are not strongly marked, phenotypically, but yet, are stigmatized, because they're at the bottom of the labor market. By any standard, they are. Yet, as a group, they are a very weak group in our-- in that, if you interview Mizrahim, they will not necessarily define themselves, primarily, as Mizrahim.

Those of you who don't know who the Mizrahim are, they are oriental Jews whose families came from Iraq or Yemen. And they are-- often contrasted with Ashkenazi Jews, who are European Jews, who are viewed as the elite of Israel, who are also those who created, you know, pal-- Israel as we know it today.

So what we tried to do, I'll highlight only a few. So we cons-- conceptualized groupness as having to do not only with self-identification. This is very important. Because most of the work in psychology on identity has to do with us-them and the

process by which-- people tend to overemphasize the value of their in group and to l-
- put lower the-- the characteristics of the out group.

And we think of this boun-- groupness as having to do with what's happening in the head. But it also has to do with the structure of boundaries in which people exist, which are moral, symbolic boundaries, the way in which we put down other groups for being inferior to them, which can be more or less porous or flexible, but also social boundaries, as measured by residential segregation, intermarriage, these kinds of demographic patterns.

And this is very important. Because across the three societies we're studying, the social and the symbolic boundaries are shaped very differently. We produce an analysis that argues that, while, for African Americans, you have very strong groupness, although they-- their life evolves in a context where universalism is highly valued.

We're supposed to have friends of various races. You're not supposed to go around saying, "I only want to be friends with people from my-- ethno-racial groups." In Brazil, the boundaries are very blurred. They are much more likely to think that an incident will be explained by the fact that they're presumed poor than by the fact that they're black.

And there's a great deal of hesitancy in calling an incident a racist incident. So we asked ourselves, why is that? In the case of Palestinians, like African Americans, you have extremely strong groupness but so strong, and they so much expect to be rejected, that they don't even make claims of-- of being integrated.

So we have two different kinds of strong groupness, if we look at these two groups together. Ethiopians, like Mizrahim, believe that they are part of the majority group, although they are constantly experiencing rejection, because they're Jewish. And they are in Israel, because they're Jewish.

So it's a little bit like there's a contradiction in how they understand themselves and the message that, every day, they receive from their everyday life in the society. So when the project started, we thought, you know, the more racism people experience, the more extensive will be their tools for responding to racism.

At the end of the day, the book doesn't look like this at all. Because we find that strong groupness does not correspond with, let's say, more of a desire to confront. Because Arab Palestinians certainly end up being silent. They are so deeply-- excluded. So then what we do is, for each of the groups, we did an analysis, really inductively, identifying what kind of things would they talk about, when they described the experiences?

One of the main findings is that they talk much more often about stigmatization than discrimination. Discriminations is basically things that you don't have access to, due to their race: housing, school, jobs, things you can sue about.

Most of what our respondent talked-- talk about are being ignored, underestimated, overlooked. They are not things you can sue about. Like, "I walked in this morning.

And m-- the schools, the teacher's room, no one said hi to me." You cannot sue people, because what-- this everyday, repeated experience really is most of what they talk about, when they talk about the experience of not having any subjective confirmation of the value of what you are saying.

A lot of what we are documenting here is what ep-- epidemiologists describe as the wear and tear of everyday life, these repeated experiences that come with stigmatization. And in the U.S., you have very little difference across the middle class and the working class.

Their racial identity overshadows-- any other differences, whereas in Brazil, you have strong class differences. And-- members of the middle class, in both countries, are much more likely to say that they are being stereotyped as poor and underestimated. So there is differences in-- what kind of experiences both talk about.

As-- when it comes to the responses, they're very different, as well. In the U.S., you have-- it's in the U.S. that you find the most confrontation. African Americans think the main thing you should do, when you experience racism, is to confront. And we ask ourselves, why is that? Well, you can think about the heritage of the Civil Rights Movement. You can think of the-- availability of the law, which is, you know, very easily activated in the American context.

Of course, these laws exist in Brazil and Israel, as well. But you don't have-- it's not as easily activated as in the American context. We-- inductively, we identified five types of responses besides confronting. One, we call management of the self, which is, "Okay, this guy is insulting me again today.

"W-- do I want to be the angry black woman? No. I want to be the respected lawyer. W-- will I get upset again today? No. I'll try to control it," so all this internal dialogue, which is, when repeated, again, takes a toll on-- on-- on your health and on your stress level.

So a lot of the responses that we have in the American context-- roughly 50% of them concerns these narratives about, you know, management of the self. And another 50% concerns what we coded as no response, like, "I was so surprised, I didn't say anything."

But the majority of the responses, 87% or 81%, have to do with confrontation. And much less frequent than we had expected was competence and work, like, "I respond by working hard," or, "I respond by, you know, just turning toward my people and ignoring white people."

So then the puzzle is, again, how do we end up with these kinds of responses? And the responses, the patterns, are, again, very different in the U.S. In Brazil, the confrontation is really avoided. Instead, the main response is to try to educate the ignorant, to say, "Okay, you don't have much contact with white people. I'm gonna explain to them what is white-- what are white people about."

So this notion of racial mixture, which is extremely salient in-- in the context of-- Brazilian society, leads them to downplay the conflict and want to find to-- to coexist

in a more peaceful way. Doing anything else is viewed as balkanizing society and leading to greater polarization, which they try to avoid.

Arab Palestinians really want to ignore the incident, whereas, ethi-- Ethiopian Jews and Mizrahim are rather assimilationist. They also try to downplay the incidents that they experience, to-- and have individualist responses.

So some general conclusions, I'm really s-- trying to stay bey-- below my 10, 15 minutes-- would be-- well, one of the big puzzles is, in the c-- we-- our questions had to do with actual events that they have experienced. But another set had to do with, what are the best tools that your group has-- has at its disposal to respond? So that's what we call normative or the idealized responses. When we study these normative responses in the U.S., that's where you have most emphasis on self-improvement, what we came to call the neoliberal response.

Pull yourself by your britches. Show that you have what it takes to succeed. You don't succeed by denouncing racism. You succeed by being upwardly mobile. In a context, the interviews were conducted in 2007, 2008, where there was, in the background, this notion of, you know, reverse racism. If you decry racism all the time, you're viewed as making excuses. Therefore, an i-- individualist response that consists in demonstrating your worth is the best response possible.

Now, we find ourselves, when the book comes out in 2016, where we've had Black Lives Matter. Only 20% of so-- of our respondents emphasized-- collective responses of the type of, you know, you have to fight to build up your community. Individuals improve their fate at the same time as they improve the fate of their community, like, connecting the individual and the collective fate.

So that's one of the puzzles we end up with. And-- how much are these responses we got in 2008-- something that would still hold today, if we were to interview the same people with something that we might-- that we might discuss? These responses, the individualist responses, were less salient in Brazil and Israel than they were-- in the United States.

So-- there's much more to be said. But I think, since-- Chris has read the book, (LAUGH) and he has a lot of questions for me, I'll s-- just stop there. And we can elaborate as the conversation goes on.

CHRIS STONE:

Terrific. Thank you for that. And (THROAT CLEAR) and it's-- it's-- it's-- it's a fascinating book. And you s-- somehow-- manage, in just a few chapters, summarizing these-- these three different countries and-- and five groups. Remarkable am-- amount.

I wanna-- start, maybe, in the area which I-- I-- one of the-- one of the areas I've done some work in, which is-- thinking about the-- the meaning of what you found for the-- for issue in the United States and Brazil, which we think of as-- racial profiling.

One of the puzzles for-- for police-- so police agencies, for the last 15 years, 10, 12, maybe 12 years, have been receiving complaints about racial profiling. And there are huge numbers of complaints. And n-- basically none of them are-- affirmed during an investigation. And it becomes-- a sort of routine, annual scandal. In Los Angeles, for example-- there are, literally, hundreds of complaints of racial profiling every year. In a typical year, zero are sustained in the investigation. And-- this-- this creates-- a scandal in the press every year.

Because the police commissioner says, you know, "How c-- how could this be? How could there be hundreds of these complaints and none of them validated?" And in some ways, your book answers that question, right? It's the-- in the difference between stigmatization and discrimination-- people are feeling stories of being disrespected, being singled out-- being treated differently by a police officer because of their race.

And that-- and they're experiencing that. And they are, quite reasonably, responding to it and complaining about it-- which is just what your-- your research would suggest-- people would do. And then it gets investigated as if it's-- looking-- looking for that subtle-- discrimination. And that begins to disappear in the investigation.

So instead of recognizing the problem, which is what your book tries to do, the police department ends up hiding behind formal application of-- of-- of rules or-- or investigative outcomes. So in some ways, I think this-- you've-- you've got a very powerful frame for understanding the experience of bias, experience of racism, as opposed to the legal definition of discrimination.

And instead of making it seem like a less-important thing, in some ways, you make it into a m-- into the more-important thing. It's what actually defines the experience-- in your case, in-- in this research-- of African Americans in the United States or, indeed, the other groups in the other countries.

So and-- and the-- and I found, personally, the account of-- of-- Afro-Brazilians-- where the-- the research on racial profiling is exactly, again, as you would expect from your results, the Afro-Brazilians surveyed five years ago, may be different today-- don't-- recognize the racial profiling that they are experiencing.

So they will be-- Afro-Brazilians will be stopped much more frequently-- than white Brazilians at police checkpoints. And they don't understand-- they don't experience it as being stopped because of race. Again, very consistent with-- with-- with your findings.

So I'm-- when you-- when you-- when-- when you think about that experience, you talk about, you can't-- you can't sue over-- you-- you have an example in the book where a schoolteacher comes into a room with her-- white counterpart. And he's greeted. She's not. And you point out, well, you can't sue for not being greeted. But you can complain about the police, (LAUGH) right? That's-- when the police do that-- act that differently, you can. Is that-- I mean, should our-- I mean-- should our institutions be responding to this in a different way?

Is it-- you-- you-- your research is about how the African Americans or the Afro-

Brazilians or the Arab Palestinians respond to this experience. But how should the society be respond-- should we be treating stigmatization more seriously than the society does today?

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

That's-- that's a very good point. My colleague, Mahzarin Banaji, has developed the Implicit Association Test, which has now been taken by 13 million thousand people, something like that-- 13 th-- million people. And it is widely used, for instance, by the Chicago police and other police forces to help policemen become aware that good p-- even good people are racist.

And actually, her book, with her mentor-- was titled, *Good People*, or something like this. And the point of it is that, you know, basically, for those of you who are not familiar with it, it flashes an image of a black person and a white person.

And it counts, you know, how quickly you will push a button that associates blacks with bad or dangerous and white with good and intelligent. And that's how this test makes people aware of their implicit bias. And it is viewed as part of diversity training.

Well, it just happens that my husband is an expert of this. And his line is that making people aware-- anything having to do with diversity training backfires. Because people feel that they are being-- ridiculed or viewed as racist.

In fact, much more-- effective is to reward-- managers for doing what they're supposed to do, which is to promote people-- a more diverse workforce that reflects, you know, the-- so I think very much-- the issue of training, in the case of policemen, I mean, I could do like Mahzarin and say, "People should all read my book. Because that's how you're gonna get-- (LAUGH) policemen to understand-- that-- what you're doing, when you're treating someone with disrespect, is extremely harmful.

"And you should just learn to understand, what is the subjective experience of-- of being black in everyday life?" And one of my colleagues would just use the book to teach. And the extension school said, "That's exactly what happened with the book."

Often, when you teach about race in a classroom, students of color and whites just don't understand each other. But after the white students read the book, they said, "Oh, now, I see it, that you know, all these mic--" and it's not only microaggressions. Because a lot of it is not aggression. It is being ignored. So one c-- answer could be, well, you just need to educate people.

And if black Brazilians don't think that they are experiencing-- racial profiling-- then, I mean, if they read what happens to them as-- the-- the-- the policeman presuming they're poor, not discriminating against them, because they're black, you cannot presume that they have false consciousness.

Because they live in a society where-- which is far more unequal and where poverty is a much more salient c-- stig-- form of stigmatization. On the other hand, the

transnational part of the story is also that, during the Olym-- Olympic games this summer, there was a big mobilization in Rio precisely around the-- you know, the mobilization we had in the U.S., to say, "If we ex-- black Brazilians experience a lot of racial violence from the police, well, let's do something about it."

And you have the same thing with the Ethiopian Jews in France-- in-- Israel. So you have this transnational diffusion that matters a lot. But indeed, I think the response in the U.S. of, you know, using the law has been a very powerful tool. But you cannot use the law for everything. So to-- to deal with being ignored, it's just not efficient. People spend a lot of time suing and investing their energy into things that cannot work.

CHRIS STONE:

So let's-- let's-- let's talk about education for a minute, since you mentioned that as-- I mean, I was-- I was surprised, and it's not--

(BREAK IN TAPE)

(OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

CHRIS STONE:

So the-- you report that African American students in the United States report more positive attitudes towards education, towards school-- than white students-- which-- we do, at this foundation, a lot of work on school discipline, school pushout.

And you read enough of that research, and you begin to think, "Well, you know, these-- these schools are organized to--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Punish.

CHRIS STONE:

--to-- to punish African American students more than white students. And yet-- it's fascinating to read this-- this more positive-- but-- but you-- you mention, in your research, that-- when you ask African Americans-- how people should respond to racism, to the problems they-- to the kinds of experiences they're seeing, 60%-- say education.

And I thought that was-- that was-- I was surprised. You talk about, in-- in the stories of their actual experience of racism, they confront it. They-- they-- they respond. But when they're asked, what-- what should be the response, and how are we gonna s--

change this-- change this system, the answer is a lot about education.

And I was just wondering if you could exp-- you didn't mention that in the opening. But I was wondering if you could expand a little bit about the way-- what people mean when they say, "Education." 'Cause I mean, you could think, "Well, that's the old idea, that, you know, somehow, you're gonna transcend your-- you're gonna change your own experience.

"You're gonna-- you're gonna improve your socioeconomic position in the society through greater education." But at least it seemed like, in your account of the book, that people are meaning-- the African American respondents mean a much wider array of things, when they say, "Education is the way-- that the black communities should respond to these experiences of racism."

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Well, we coded all the ways-- we coded all the ways--
(BREAK IN TAPE)

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

(IN PROGRESS) --and it goes from educating the ignorant, which is to talk to the 70% of-- Americans who live in a neighborhood where there is no-- basically, no black people. So the extent to which this is (UNINTEL) or the extent to which the ethno-racial group live very segregated to each other means that many white people have no idea what black culture is beyond having watched Bill Cosby.

So-- there's a real need of explaining, you know, what is the history, and also, what are the shared, you know-- values, not only the social problems, but also, you know, the importance of black church, whatever. So-- but it also means for themselves gaining education as the standard way for-- gaining value in American society.

So people have talked about-- possessive individualism as the key to cultural citizenship in the U.S. How do people come to be regarded as valued members and are given cultural citizenship is by getting this college degree and then all the goodies that come with it, such as consumption, you know, what 25% of the population has. It's a very, very str-- small number.

So many of our respondents draw very strong boundaries toward blacks who don't have that. And they often presume that the black people who deserve respect are those who have these characteristics. And that's a real tension. Because on the one hand, they're extremely anti-racist. They want all human beings to be respected.

But there's also a lot of boundaries. The s-- the poor are the most stigmatized categories in American society. And our respondents are not in exception. They draw extremely strong boundaries toward ghetto blacks. And they-- they qualify their need for s-- racial solidarity by class.

So these-- there's a lot of-- tension and contradictions-- around this. So-- you know, that they view-- also, one reason why education stands out is that it gives you the consumption goods. So some of them would say, "Our goal is not to please white people. Our goal is to get our-- our part of the-- our-- our slice of the pie.

"And how do you get the slice of the pie? It's by getting the sw-- the c-- the human capital. That will give you the job. That will allow you to leave the middle-class life, which is what I want," which is very, very different than engaging in a kind of-- Uncle Tom, you know, let's-- let's please the white man, which many people reject-- as well. So it's-- it's very multidimensional, this education thing.

CHRIS STONE:

I'm just-- one th-- other thing you-- you-- in the book, you talk about-- part of the-- part of the theory of some of the respondents about education is actually education f-- f-- in the group about the group's own history. And I thought that was-- I don't know how that plays out across the societies. Because you focus on it really in the U.S. responses.

But so there's-- as you say, there's education-- so some respondents talk about the importance of educating the white community. Some respondents talk about education as a m-- means of getting more-- what's rightfully yours and getting-- a better share of the-- of the social product of the country and economic product.

But then there's this third group, which is actually how education is gonna help strengthen group solidarity-- in the African American community. I thought that was-- that's not what, usually, we think of, when we talk about education as a solution. And yet, as soon as I read it, I thought, you know, dozens of examples-- where that-- it's-- a pow-- it's a very powerful vision of how education can help.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

And I would say we are--

(BREAK IN TAPE)

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

(IN PROGRESS) --the same thing among-- First Nations, right? We know, for instance, that in Canada, the suicide rate-- among First Nation-- groups is much lower in those-- the tribes where there is a real effort-- in passing on a notion of collective identity and traditions.

So those who advocate this say, specifically, "The way that African American communities will become stronger is by making African American children more aware of the history of our groups and of our strengths and the things we've survived

together." So in that sense, you know, Black History Month or, you know, Martin Luther King or all these things, really, are very, very central as tool-- tools of empowerment, that they're very self-aware of.

CHRIS STONE:

Switch to-- you mentioned, also in the opening, your-- your comments about class. You write, in the book-- that class played a l-- l-- made less of a difference than you were expecting. What were you-- say more about that. What were you expecting class would do? And-- and what was-- what was the surprise?

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Okay. Before writing (THROAT CLEAR) that book, I had published two books, one on the French and the American upper middle class, and one on the f-- on the French and the American working class. And then I went about writing a grand proposal for the National Science Foundation, which was totally structured around differences in class cultures, extrapolating from these books.

But also, talking with my coauthors, I should emphasize that, you know, there are seven coauthors, three for-- Brazil-- three for Israel and two for Brazil and two for the U.S. So we had, you know, really hypothesis having to do with the centrality of self-actualization for the upper middle class in the U.S., you know, all kinds of things that made no difference whatsoever.

And this, we could not know, until we had all connected all these 150 American interviews and went about-- this is a slide that I went very quickly over. What you can see in these tables-- the middle class and working class, in each of the types of experiences that were mentioned and what percentage of the working class and middle class respondents mentioned them.

And you can see, for instance, that the middle class was twice as likely to say that they were stereotyped as low status poor and uneducated than the working class. But this is the largest difference we find, almost. Most of the other things-- the-- the other kinds of responses, you find almost no res-- no class differences.

And that's very com-- counterintuitive. Because you know, a lot of the literature on-- on cultural orientation in the U.S., although we have this myth that it's a classless society, we find a lot of differences in, for instance, musical tastes, I mean, on and on, what kind of food we eat, et cetera.

So it was very, very counterintuitive. Even, like, being misunderstood. 50% of the middle-class people say that they are misunderstood versus 54% for African American-- for the working class. That's very, very small differences. On the other hand, the working class, almost 10% more, think that they suffer from double standards.

But if you think of their work conditions, they s-- they had-- they are much more controlled. You know, they have much less work autonomy than the middle class. So it would make sense that, you know, this issue of double standards would be much more salient for them. So...

CHRIS STONE:

One more-- I wanna just read a passage I found really--

(BREAK IN TAPE)

(OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

CHRIS STONE:

I wanna read a passage I found really striking. We-- we hear a lot and-- today-- about-- about microaggression. And you talk about microaggression in the-- book a lot. But this passage uses a different phrase that I hadn't heard so much and I'm gonna-- I'm gonna adopt.

But you talk about microstruggles. And I thought that was-- that was a powerful reframing. You say-- you say, "Of course, when responding to incidents," incidents of-- of perceived racism, of perceived stigmatization or discrimination, "when-- of course, when responding to incidents, people do not always aim to get recognition or to create social change.

"They may be more focused on just keeping their jobs or maintaining their reputation as competent professionals. Nevertheless, we," you-- you and your coauthors, "claim that microstruggles for gaining respr-- respect and recognition add up and are likely to have substantial impact on both destigmatization and how groups coexist." How do microstruggles add up?

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Well, the women the room-- who are my age, I mean, I like to give the example of, when I was 16, my mother would ask me to-- empty the dishwasher every day. And my brother had to mow the lawn once a month. And my microstruggle (LAUGH) was to be a pain in the neck and to say, every day, "No, it's not fair."

And you know, at the end of the day, I think, the shared norms in my family about who was supposed to do what changed. I had that struggle. But everyone in the room who's my age had that struggle, too. So the social movements operate in conjunction with this everyday feminism that we practice to create very different norms, so that, when we say-- when we see Donald Trump, you know, practice norms of, you know-- interaction with women that are very different from those we are used to, it's very, very shocking.

So it's really kind of trying-- there's another paper I wrote, which is on the destigmatization of people with HIV/AIDS, the obese, and African Americans. And we look at the interaction between-- activist-- experts in the social sciences, in the humanities, and social policy and medicine. And-- we-- you know, we s-- we analyzed these processes of destigmatization as involving collaboration between everyday people but also these macro changes. So that's how I think it adds up. (LAUGH)

CHRIS STONE:

Well, I-- it's-- (THROAT CLEAR) it's-- it's a very h-- to me, it sounded hopeful and-- analysis. You write, several times in the book, that-- that-- that you're-- you're struck, in the United States, that the-- that collective action is not-- doesn't figure as prominently in-- in your respondents' views about how they-- how sh-- how they can-- how they-- how people should respond to these incidents to make a change.

It's 2007, 2008. It's before Ferguson. It's before the revival of a lot of-- of-- organized protest and-- and collective action in the United States. And you speculate, in the end of the book, that, you know, if you'd been doing these interviews after Black Lives Matter had become a more significant force, would you have seen a difference?

Hard to-- hard to know. Maybe we'll find-- find others to-- to pursue that. But I did wanna sort of-- before we will open it up and-- other questions and-- and-- I invite all of you here to-- add your own questions or comments. But I wanted to ask-- really-- stepping back from-- from the specifics to the structure of the research itself. There's-- a film out these days, which-- this foundation had a small part in helping to finance-- Raoul Peck's-- film on James Baldwin's--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Oh, yeah.

CHRIS STONE:

--*I Am Not a Negro*. And in that-- in that film-- sorry?

(OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

CHRIS STONE:

I'm Not Your Negro. *I'm Not Your Negro*, sorry. The-- the-- the-- in that film-- you hear Baldwin, over and over again-- pointing out-- in response to comments about, how is it that the black man in America-- is going to advance or change their position?

And his response, over and over, is-- this-- if-- if-- "This is the wrong question. The

question is how America is gonna change-- and not-- this is-- this is not a question about-- the Negro. This is a question about the whites." He says, at one point, "The-- whites invented the Negro in America. And-- and-- and I have to figure out what they-- (LAUGH) what they think about this and-- and actually confront the past, the history, and the present-- if you're ever gonna see any progress."

This book can't address that question. Because you've-- the-- you're asking people about their experiences, ordinary peoples about their experiences of racism-- of being the, essentially, victims of racism or the recipients of-- of this.

And then you ask how they respond. But in some ways-- one-- you get through the book. And you really wanna know, well, how is the rest of the society going to respond to these-- to this stigmatization? And-- anyway, I'm just curious how w-- as having written the book-- and-- and seeing it-- seeing its response, its use in classrooms-- isn't this a side of-- a side of the story that we need to hear, as well?

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

I-- absolutely. And-- it figures in the book to the extent that we're saying, the response that our African American interviewees give us are enabled by the tools that are available in their environment. In the last few years, there were a number of books published in sociology, like-- Ellen Berrey, *The Enigma of-- Diversity*, John Skrentny.

These are all books about how we now live in a culture of diversity, higher education, the work of (UNINTEL PHRASE). They all show that, you know, we live in institutions and organizations where the norm is diversity. And these norms allow our working-class respondents to go to the unions and complain.

So in some ways, the k-- societal response are very much in the book as what enables their response. But it is-- you're entirely right. The literature on racism concerns nonblack racism as well as how the victims of racism respond. And this book is very much limited by the fact that we only look at the response of the race-- of the victims.

But nevertheless, you know, it's a literature that needed to be, I think, broadened beyond what existed already. Because so much of that literature is basically telling the stories of people without having as much develop a systematic explanation for variations than what we offer in our book. So we thought (NOISE) that was also an important contribution.

CHRIS STONE:

Well, I really-- let's-- let's open this up for-- anyone-- just, I'm gonna ask you, if you can just come up and-- for the-- sake of those listening and watching on the web, thank you very much--

JOANNA MEYER:

Thank you very much. My name is Joanna Meyer (PH). I'm interested in-- I-- I haven't read the book yet, but I would like to. I'm interested in the way that-- Brazilian society and American society have unfolded-- you know, Brazil, they have the *m-- metissager* or *metissage*, the-- the blending of the cultures.

We both had slavery. You know-- I-- I have Brazilian friends. And I-- who are professors. And so I follow, probably, a little more deeper, how their-- like, pre-Olympics, you know, people were being displaced and things. But that-- that is, perhaps, not-- related to race as much but poverty.

And so I'm wondering, I mean-- clearly, v-- we have different histories. But I'm wondering how it so-- how it happened that we have the-- the racism struggle with Black Lives Matter, and-- and they don't have it in that same way-- though, you know, th-- maybe the demographic is-- is similar, you know-- of different cultures.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

It's a very difficult question. The first-- column there that you cannot read (LAUGH) has, as its first-- line, the size of the group. So the fact that they are Afric-- blacks are a majority group in Brazil, whereas here, they're 15%, is one condition.

It's much harder to have residential segregation against a majority group than against a minority group. That would be one difference. You have a great deal of special segregation between classes but not between racial groups, because there's a great deal of racial mixing.

And in the history of colonization, also, they were encouraging-- missionization, which was not the case in the U.S. So you have a number of factors that have to do with how settler colonialism was practiced in both societies. We make a great deal of the issue of the way that racial and class segregation is practiced in the two countries. Edward Telles' book, Eddie Telles' book, *Race in Another America*, is a classic on this. And we really build on his work. So...

CHRIS STONE:

Sorry about that. It'll work. There you go.

JUDY KOMAKI:

I actually have a hearing problem. So I love it when people use the mic. (LAUGHTER) Anyway, my name is Judy Komaki (PH). And-- I was curious, Chris, by your question, which was-- what, if anything-- could institutions do to respond differently, given racial profiling?

And I-- my-- my question was, you're talking about this group of studies that Michèle has done, in which she actually looks at individuals. But I think one of the reasons you did be-- bec-- and you chose the different cultures, was to show the impact of different cultures on the individual's responses.

And so I guess-- I was very interested to read, in your book on neoliberalism, about the American chief who, through his leadership, actually helped to influence the way in which they use, like, mosquito netting and that sort of thing and now the society, the group, the cooperation among the group, makes-- a big difference in terms of how that group operates.

So I guess-- I guess my question is, could we answer your question, Chris, which is, what could institutions do differently in terms of racial profiling, and look at the kinds of things that you, Michèle, have emphasized in your work, which is the leadership, the societal structure? Because in Scotland, they had a problem. They don't have racial profiling issues. But they had an issue in the paper that said-- more people in Scotland are being stopped than in New York.

And people were upset by this. And so what they decided to do was, rather than to look individually at police, they looked at their measurement system. And what they were doing was evaluating police by the number of stops they made. So that was the way they judged.

And so they just changed the measurement system. You know, there's an old management saying. We treasure what we measure. So instead of looking at the number of stops, they looked at the number of positive searches. And then they found ways of identifying persons, situations in which they'd be likely to find contraband, alcohol, weapons, and so on.

And by concentrating on that, they reduced the number of stops. And they increased the number of positive searches. So I guess my question to both of you was, would that be a cons-- way of considering how to actually change police behavior, so as to reduce racial profiling?

CHRIS STONE:

Well-- (THROAT CLEAR) I mean, to-- I th-- I th-- so there's a lot-- there are a lot of-- th-- there should be more. There are a handful of good stories like that, about police agencies that responded to-- pervasive-- and-- and-- counterproductive (NOISE) stop-- stop policies.

And there-- the Scotland story has been repeated in some U.S. jurisdictions and other ones. I think the-- the reform you describe is a completely good one. But it-- I-- I think what's so provocative about-- about-- Michèle and her coauthors' book is that it changes our focus from, you know, the search, the stop, to simply the encounter.

And if the encounter is-- if the conversation-- even if there's no stop, if there's an

encounter that's simply demeaning, or-- perceived as stigmatizing-- you're still gonna have-- it-- it's not just the-- the microstruggles that add up. It's the-- it's the experiences of stigmatization that add up, as well.

And I th-- I think the-- in some ways, the-- the-- the question I was posing is, do institutions, you know, including employers-- foundations, civil society organizations, as well as government agencies and-- and companies, do all of us just need to be paying much more attention to the daily encounters?

And the-- the-- the-- the book is titled, *Getting Respect*. But the other side of that is showing respect. And do we need to-- work on expanding the showing of respect? Certainly, it seems as institutional good behavior-- not just the-- the manipulation of a particular legal category of event. I guess that was the-- the-- the-- the-- the question I was tryin' to get at. So I-- I'm completely with you. I think the kinds of reforms you're describing do make a difference. They do make improvements.

They do reduce-- the offensive and-- and counterproductive-- experience of racial profiling in discrete incidents. But I think the lesson of-- of the real complaints about roc-- racial profiling is it-- they are-- it's almost ubiquitous. It's-- and it's much more found in the-- in even the very informal encounters-- between authorities and-- and-- stigmatized group-- than-- than the-- than the measurement systems can pick up. At least that's a first answer--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Yeah, and-- and--

JUDY KOMAKI:

I think-- I think the measurement systems could pick it up, if you designed a measure that really looked at positive learning interactions between police and residents.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

But I want to add another wrinkle to the story. (NOISE) One of my graduate students is comparing-- her dissertation is on racial profiling in Paris and Oakland. And she's looking at advocacy groups that are fighting racial profiling in the two-- societies.

And she finds that, although they use very similar means, such as protesting and suing, she looks at the rhetoric that is used in the two national contexts. And they are radically different in that, in France, they manage to fight racial profiling without ever talking about race. So they use words that are, you know, metaphors to talk about race.

So even there, the crossnat-- the challenge of cross-national measuring is enormous. Because the frameworks that are used to conceptualize the same activity varies

drastically. But I put that slide there, because that's another issue that speaks to what can be done. And I think a lot of it is about-- producing social messages that speak very explicitly about-- dest-- destigmatization.

So being a proud Canadian, I think the messaging-- that you find everywhere in Canada, in public-- awareness campaigns-- about, you know, whether it is-- you know-- multi-- culturalism as the ideology of the country. You've all followed on Twitter, you know, our prime minister telling Syrians, "You're home now," this constant, you know, construction of collective identity around the notion that it's an exclus-- an inclusive society, I think, makes a very big difference.

The rainbow flag is there, because I remember once coming out of the subway in San Francisco and seeing, in front of me, this gigantic flag, you know, celebrating queer society. Well, I think this public expression of collective identity, which is not done very much in the U.S. I mean, maybe Lady Gaga at halftime is as far as we go, you know?

But I think this is-- you know, as a cultural sociologist, I'm very interested in how we engineer collective messaging about what the society is about. And we've all read how much bullying has gone up since the presidential election. So that's also (NOISE) a declaration of what our society is about, right?

ROBIN WAGNER-PACIFICI:

Thank you. My name's Robin Wagner-Pacifici. I think I may-- may be just-- just a little (LAUGH) too short. So I wanted to ask about one of the specific responses that you-- mentioned among the various responses-- confrontation, ignoring, et cetera.

And the response that I'm remembering is the-- the one in which they do nothing. And-- and this is-- a particularly-- it's troubling. And-- and-- and it's also really intriguing. Because-- I believe you said that-- that it was the do nothing, because they're shocked.

They're just surprised by this encounter that seemed to come out of nowhere-- and be unprovoked and un-- unjustified, of course. But how does that-- how does that-- response-- reflect or coordinate with a sense of African Americans, that they live in an, essentially, racist society, and that racism is, indeed, everywhere? And yet, it still has the power to shock and-- stymie somebody's response. And so that kind of disjuncture is really-- fascinating and troubling. And I just wonder if you could say a little bit more about that.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Well, there, you have the subcategories for not responding. One of them is to avoid. So you have-- a neighbor you know is racist. You're just gonna try not to deal with him. Ignore was, what, 56% or-- I don't see very well there. 37 pers-- no, 15%.

Known not, this is, like, shock, passivity, circumstantial. People just get fed up and tired of doing it. So they just say, "I don't deal with it." And you-- yes, and avoid is very salient. So I remember one saying, "I didn't respond, because I was at the restaurant. And I was just hungry. I wanted to eat. You know, I didn't want to pick a fight."

So this near tiredness, not, "I'm not gonna pick a fight, because I want to be competent lawyer," (NOISE) but, "I'm not gonna pick a fight, because I'm just tired of fighting," which was more often coded as no response, which is somewhat different.

I think there is-- this was extr-- quite salient, I mean, a real element of lassitude, of having to deal with this all the time, you know? So it's huge. And I don't think it's always recognized fully. I know, as a woman, certainly, we experience this sometimes, right? Not the s-- not as bad.

LILLY HASHEP:

I'm Lilly Hashep (PH). I was just wondering why you picked Israel. It's relatively a new country. And obviously, from the beginning to now, it's-- you know, conflict everywhere. Is it because of the-- so-- so we understand the prejudice against-- Palestinian. Because it's the, (NOISE) Jewish and the Muslim. So it's a religious prejudice there.

But the small group of Ethiopian-- even though they are Jewish, just because they are black. So maybe there is-- a discrimination against them. But why such a small country would be of your interest in comparison to-- to the U.S. or-- I don't know so much about Brazil. But I suppose they have a huge-- you know, population of-- of Brazilian blacks. But why Israel?

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Okay, well, when the project started, we wanted to-- we had six or seven countries in mind, which ranged from-- Ireland to Quebec to France. And we had a conference at Harvard in 2006. And we just, you know, wanted to have the cases that were the worst and the best.

So Brazil always stands out as a case where the boundaries are very fluid. And Israel is, of course, when-- where people get killed every day because of, you know-- the-- the conflict. So when you put together a comparative project like this, you need really good collaborators.

And we ended up with these three countries, partly because of who was ready to commit to the project. But we were very intr-- happy with this. Because we thought, of those three cases, we had one where people-- where the boundaries were extremely rigid, and one where the boundaries could be presumed to be very fluid. And it was a very nice puzzle. But then we added blacks in Brazil-- Israel only later, because we thought so much of the literature on race in-- in the U.S. is treating the

American case as exceptional. And to understand how American racism is very distinctive and how blackness is construed very distinctively is a very interesting question that has not been studied sufficiently, right?

MARTHA LOERKE:

Hi. I'm-- this is Martha Loerke. I'm-- I'm curious about something. Was there-- a distinction between rural and urban? Because when you were talking a second ago about public messaging, and I just started thinking about music and the arts and-- and exposure and what people may be, where their assumptions of-- behind profiling lie and how that changes with interaction with different types of culture.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Yeah, great-- great question. So we have three multiethnic cities. So we-- you know, when you do comparative analysis, you want to compare likes with likes. So we decided to have three large metropolises. And we use-- national surveys to talk about the extent to which what we find in those three megacities can be extrapolated beyond.

So we know, for instance, that in Brazil, the northeast is very different when it comes-- so we do not, to a certain extent, extrapolate. So therefore, we don't talk about the rural-- urban divide. But we know, in Israel, it's very important. Because many-- Arab Palestinians live in villages. And we did our study in-- not in villages. So that raise-- it's one of the limitations of the studies. But--

CHRIS STONE:

And-- and it's-- I just-- I was struck by the-- the U.S. sample is-- is it New Jersey? And it's suburban New York City, basically, right? (THROAT CLEAR) But one of the things I found interesting is-- is the-- the percentage of the-- you're-- you're only interviewing African Americans. And the percentage that say they have any religious affiliation--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Is low.

CHRIS STONE:

--is really low and much lower than the national data would suggest for African Americans, which made me wonder whether you can extrapolate (LAUGH) even to

the rest of New York City, let alone-- there's something-- something's going on in New Jersey. But yes. Go ahead.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

It's true.

JANET CHARLES:

Hi, my name is Janet Charles (PH). I was just wondering if-- when you were doing your research, you took into-- did you take into consideration or look into the-- prison population in those cities-- among the-- the different-- black groups that were-- that were considered?

'Cause if you-- I just recently-- watched a documentary. And it talks about the mass incarceration here in the United States. And although there's a small percentage of African Americans, there's a greater percentage that are incarcerated. And I was just wondering if that was something that was considered or looked at when you did your-- your research.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

It was not one of the criteria for selection. But we have questions on-- what are the lessons that you give your kids about-- dealing with racism. And that's where this was most salient in our study, that the lessons African Americans give to their daughters and son is very, very different.

And much of the lang-- the narratives concerning raising their son has to do with, you know, "Never do anything to get anyone upset at you, especially the police." So these narratives are very much part of their environment in a way that are-- is not the case. Although, among Palestinians, the issue of, you know, crossing-- border controls were s-- very, very salient and a context for men and women where they shouldn't do anything to raise suspicion or, you know, get people upset.

MICHEL ZALESKI:

Michel Zaleski. Unfortunately, I haven't read your book. So perhaps-- all of this is in there. But-- I've had some exposure to the Palestinian issues in the West Bank, not so much in Israel. And-- but I think they're-- the-- probably, the psychology is-- is somewhat similar.

And I'm just wondering what prescriptions you have. You had-- you had some policy prescriptions for the-- for U.S. bias and-- and-- and racism. But-- Israel, it's-- it-- it seems almost insurmountable. And I'm wondering what-- what ideas you have.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Our respondents, frankly, feel like it's not in their hands. And they think it's in the hands of organizational and-- org-- international organizations. Arab Palestinians feel totally disempowered and victimized. And they really don't think they can affect everyday life. And the same thing, I think, among the-- the Jew-- Jewish population we studied. They think it's, you know, a matter to be n-- negotiated at the level of international organizations. Does that resonate with what you understand?

MICHEL ZALESKI:

The problem is that-- to get to that point is very, very difficult. You have to have community action first.

CHRIS STONE:

I think the-- I think what was so striking, at least for me, and-- about the sections of the Arab Palestinians in Israel-- is this sense that they're-- they can't even-- they feel they can't even make an appeal to their group, their-- their-- to inclusion.

They think it's-- that they can, but it's hopeless. It's-- there's no point. I mean, even-- even at the height of protests around racism in the United States, there's a str-- there's-- there's-- a theme. And it's in the respondents you-- you-- you interviewed, as well, about their r-- the right to be included, that-- that an appeal to-- at least a political promise of inclusion, even if experience every day is cutting against it.

And that's what's missing, at least according to the respondents you have. That-- even the sense that there's a claim they can make for inclusion-- is missing. And that leads to the s-- what do you call, the-- the cynicism of the response and-- and-- and-- and as a result, the lack of even confrontation. Because it-- it-- there's something about the confrontation you're experience-- you're s-- documenting in the United States that is hopeful, that at least it's-- a confrontation with a claim that--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

That I'm making.

CHRIS STONE:

--that should be, should be made. It's really quite-- a devastating portrait of the--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Of Israel.

CHRIS STONE:

--of-- of the experience in Israel, yeah.

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

And they think that the allies will be interpersonal relationships with, you know, real b-- bounds that are based on, you know, loyalty, of friends and employers who've decided that, "I'm gonna take on some Palestinian employees," you know, something almost personal-- personalistic that works against the law.

Because they know that, in so many-- they know that most is-- Jewish Israelis think of themselves as the enemy within. Therefore, they don't think that they can even claim being included, given, you know, what's happening in the area. So...

ANN MORNING:

Hi, I'm Ann Morning. And I will out myself as a former student of Michèle's. (LAUGHTER) And I-- and I say that, because, as was true years ago, I remain very inspired by the work she's doing. And already, I'm thinking, kind of methodologically, "How can I copy that (LAUGHTER) for my current project?" So thank you.

I-- I feel like there are many things I could ask. So I'm just gonna force myself to ask one thing-- and that is, I'm curious to know whether you saw, in any of these national contexts-- attempts by your interviewees to reframe the ways in which they were seen-- in these incidents of aggression or discrimination, that is, people saying, "Well, hold on a second. You know, you see me as Ethiopian. But I'm Jewish," or, "You see me as-- as black. But I'm a taxpayer," or you know--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Absolutely.

ANN MORNING:

--sort of-- attempts to shift the-- the categories to which they were being assigned?

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Yeah. And I think that worked most for middle-class people. So there's a wonderful example of a guy who, I think, works at Bloomingdale's. And he's very upset. Because there's a person who comes in, a white person, and he-- he steals within a few minutes, like, 10 very expensive ties.

And he says, "In the meantime, my-- my wife is there, in the store, with her Gucci clothes, shopping. And she's being trailed by some of my colleagues. And I tell them, you know, "This was my wife," you know? And he emphasizes the Gucci coat to say, "She had cultural citizenship. There was no reason for you to follow her."

So I think all these signals, through the clothes and through, you know, the issue of how middle-class identity and-- signals are taken to-- there's this assumption that it should trump racism. And people are really, really upset that it doesn't. Because they think it's just part of the American dream. It is the deal.

These are the rules of the society we live by. And you work hard. You get your college degree. You get your consumption. You should be entitled to be treated equally. And even with all that, you don't get it. So I think this is extremely powerful, especially in Israel-- especially in Brazil and the U.S. You see the same thing.

But I want to say, Ann has written a wonderful book titled *The Nature of Race*, which is very much about the taken-for-granted categories through which African Americans understand race. So I'm now building on her work. (LAUGHTER) It's true, one of the great rewards of being a faculty member.

CHRIS STONE:

Last question. Go ahead.

DANIELLE IKOWA:

Sorry about that. (LAUGH) My name is Danielle Ikowa (PH). And I'm Brazilian. (LAUGH) So I'm especially curious to-- know more about any challenges you have encountered in actually identifying issues of race salience and class salience in Brazil, where a national identity was built on the myth of racial democracy?

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Well, it's very complicated. What happens, or what-- this is not me speaking. It's my coauthors. What they find is the id-- the identity of Negroes has become much more salient. And Negroes is also a political identity. Typically, the literature says, they don't think in terms of racial group. They think in terms of skin color, which is very different. Because they don't assume that black people share a culture. The only thing

they share is skin color.

But yet, since there's a growing understanding that it's a society that has racism, this category of Negroes is now becoming much more widely accepted in institution-wise. And-- despite a context where, I think, they argue, my coauthors, that there's a lot of emphasis put on polite coexistence, which is this celebration of racial mixture, where you should not be a pain in the neck by constantly pointing to people that they are racist.

So the book opens on an example of a woman, a black woman, who goes to a fancy hotel at night, very well dressed. She asked her key by mentioning her room number. And instead of giving her the key, the clerk takes the phone, calls the room, and he-- no one answers. So he hangs up. And he winks at her. And sh-- he says, "She's-- he's not there."

So clearly, he presumes she's a por-- a prostitute. But she feels that she cannot confront him. Because he did not say anything. So she goes to her room. And she cries. And she calls her husband, who is white. And her husband says, "Well, you're just overreacting."

But the point there is that, in the American context, even if the word, race, or you know, anything had not been said, the person would have felt entitled to react. But there's such an emphasis put-- on, I think, kind of convivial coexistence, since everyone has a black cousin or a black grandmother, so the groups are so intermixed, that emphasizing racial identity is just viewed as-- very inappropriate in terms of pleasant coexistence, which I think, in the U.S., it's not a card that has as much value, my understanding is, right? So that's what my coauthors would say. And I should say, all the interviews were conducted by in-group members, although these two coauthors are white. But...

CHRIS STONE:

The-- (THROAT CLEAR) I should-- just-- two quick closing thoughts. And then-- just thank you for-- for doing this. I think the-- we haven't talked a lot about the-- you devote a lot of time in the book to this idea of groupness, about what-- what-- what the dimensions of being a group and how the group acts.

And-- and least I found-- your move in the book from a notion of groups as just strong or weak identific-- to this multiple dimension of-- of what it means to be part of a group. Remarkable-- I thought of as a very powerful sort of sociological counterpart to the experience we're having in a lotta the world about multiple identities at the individual level.

And as we come to-- as we come to s-- come to see i-- individual identity as a much more fluid and multifaceted-- construct-- your notion of groups as, themselves, multifaceted and having strong and weak dimensions at the same time, I thought, was-- was-- a very-- useful insight-- both in a practical and intellectual way. But I think, for me, just to f-- finish today-- for me, the biggest contribution, I thought, is

you can't-- you can't-- read the book and finish it without feeling the-- the real contribution is just how pervasive racism is in all of these societies.

The experiences of the-- the-- the-- the-- the breadth and significance of-- of these-- of these individual encounters and of what people are reporting, you just realize, this is not something you're gonna end through-- you know, a simple campaign or changing a law-- or even the institutions we talked about earlier.

This is-- this is something we have to learn to understand and to d-- and to-- to deal with and to-- to change as a kind of social cultural project, not-- a matter of prohibiting a particular conduct, piece of conduct, or-- or-- or something else. I think it's a tremendous contribution. I hope-- I hope it's widely read. (LAUGH) And thank you so much--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

Thank you.

CHRIS STONE:

--for being here. Thank you all--

MICHÈLE LAMONT:

And I'm so honored. (APPLAUSE) Thank you. I must say, I'm so honored that you read it-- carefully. And you obviously have engaged with it very seriously. I'm very honored. Thank you.

CHRIS STONE:

That's great. So I hope-- those of you who are here physically with us, there are some-- some refreshments-- outside. Please join us. And we can continue the conversation informally. Thanks-- thanks to all of you for being here.

* * *END OF TRANSCRIPT* * *