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#### The Creech Air Force Base, established in 2005, has become the host to the United States Air Force’s unpersoned aerial vehicle program. In this blip of life that is surrounded on all sides of nothingness drones are constructed, tested, and piloted. None of those actions happen at the base. The drone by extension is at the base, but it does not live there. Here too, are where those who are in control of the drone dwell. These humans, whether the pilots themselves or the military officials who create the conditions for the drone, manage the machine as it is piloted in a far away land. In this story provided by Brandon Bryant, a drone operator recounts some of the experiences he had:

**We fired the missile, and 1.2 seconds after the missile fires, it sonic booms.** And so the sonic boom gets there before the missile does. And **the guy in the rear hears this, and he runs forward to the two guys in front, and then the missile hits**. And after the smoke clears, there's a crater there. **You can see body parts of the people.**¶ But the guy that was running from rear to the front**, his left leg had been taken off above the knee, and I watched him bleed out**. The blood rapidly cooled to become the same color as the ground, because **we were watching this in infrared. Then I eventually watched the guy become the same color as the ground that he died on.**¶In my own mind, I thought these guys could've been local people that had to protect themselves, and I think we jumped the gun.¶ There was supposedly three people left in the building, and all were military males. We just aim at the corner of the building. We're going to fire, and we do. And there's about six seconds left before the missile impacts, and **something runs around the corner of the building. And it looked like a small person.** There's no other way for me to describe it. **It was a small, two-legged person.** And the missile hits. There's no sign of this person. A large portion of the building's collapsed.¶ So we lock our camera on there, and I ask the screener, who disseminates the video feed - I asked, can you review that? Like, what was that thing that ran on the screen? And he's like, one second; reviewing - and comes back and says, oh, that was a dog. It was - **it was a person. It was a small person. Like, there was no doubt in my mind that that was not** a - **an adult.**¶ The sun was coming over the mountains. I remember just kind of - the light was too bright, and the dark places were too dark. I felt really numb. I didn't feel distraught, like I felt my first shot. I felt numb because **this was the reality of war; that good guys can die, bad guys can die, and innocence can die as well**.¶ **One day - it was late 2010 - we had a wall that had five pictures on it of top al-Qaida leaders. And I remember walking in one day, and I kind of stopped and looked at one of these guys; and I was like, man, which one of these motherfuckers is going to die today? And I stopped myself and I was like, that's not me. Like, that's just not who I am.[[1]](#footnote-1)**

#### The modern drone is a relatively new technological innovation. While remote technology is not new, the ability for an aerial vehicle to retain flight for long hours and under remote control is new. The scientists behind it aimed to utilize technology in order to further control the world in their own way. Abe Karem is the pioneer of these scientists, and this is one version of his story:

**Born in Iraq on June 27, 1937, Karem was raised in Israel,** where his father took his wife and four sons-Abe was the third-when the Jewish state was founded after World War II. **A precocious child, Abe felt loved and encouraged growing up, even when, as a toddler, he pulled the back off a large standing radio and pulled out the big vacuum tubes, one by one, to see where is the man who talks from there.** As that memory suggests, **Abe fell in love with engineering early in life.** I am a toy man, **he explains. What motivates me from the time I was a kid-call it technology, call it whatever-it was play.** By the age of eight, I knew I’m going to be a mechanical engineer. **And oh my God, by the age of 13 or 14, I fell in love with aeronautics. At 14, I started building model aircraft.** Within two years, I was the instructor in the [high school] aero club. Later, he earned a private pilot’s license. Karem’s aeronautical engineering degree is from Israel’s renowned Technion institute of technology. **He remembers his professors as idealists, working together to build a society and secure its survival.** **Their attitude of selfless common cause stayed with him.** Karem’s belief in the power of teamwork has been a trademark of his career. I built three wonderful teams in Israel, he boasts. I built two here. On the first team he built in the United States, he adds, were several engineers who today are technical leaders and executives at Predator-maker General Atomics, including company president Frank Pace, who once was the closest thing to my right-hand man. While at the Technion, and as an air force officer for nine years afterward, Karem learned to design and maintain real aircraft but also continued his childhood interest in models. He entered free flight model competitions and world championships, in which entrants strive for the longest flight under a complex set of rules. **After the air force, Karem joined Israel Aircraft Industries, where he rapidly made his way toward the top. Within four years, and while still in his 30s, he was in line to be named executive vice president for engineering**, he says, but decided to strike out on his own. There were several reasons for moving on, but among them was an epiphany he’d had in late 1973, while working on an urgent air force request to design a radar-fooling drone decoy. The project came to naught because Israel ended up buying decoys from the United States, but by working on it, **Karem came to see unpersoned aircraft as unconquered territory**. In early 1974, despite protests and warnings from higher-ups, he left IAI and started a company of his own to design UAVs. Karem’s departure from IAI was the first major manifestation of a maverick streak that has been a source of lift to his career but also a source of drag. He has escaped corporate culture and holds more than 20 patents to show for it-on aircraft designs, mechanical devices, material production methods, and subsystem innovations-but his ability to see things in a new light has also made him impatient with those who fail to grasp his insights. Gentlemen, everything I see in this room is nonsensical, one longtime associate recalls Karem telling a roomful of engineers at a major defense company who had invited him in to discuss collaboration on a project. Then he closed his briefcase and walked out. A Karem friend remembers a meeting where Abe called a group of defense acquisition officials clerks. “Abe has no problem telling others what’s on his mind, that’s for sure,” says Martin Waide, who has worked for Karem more or less steadily since 1979. The politics of defense contracting, along with his occasionally prickly personality, have conspired to keep some of Karem’s best designs from being accepted by the military. After leaving IAI, **Karem spent three years offering the Israeli military one UAV design after another without making a sale**. The government-sole shareholder in IAI, whose executives didn’t appreciate his departure-was never going to buy anything from Abe Karem, he finally concluded. Frustrated, he decided to try his luck in the United States, where he knew opportunities for entrepreneurs were far greater. His wife, Dina, whom he’d met when she was an engineering draftsperson in the Israeli air force, backed his decision, as she has supported other big risks he’s taken during their 46 years of marriage. In 1977, to gain a foothold in the U.S. aerospace industry, Karem took a position with a tiny Los Angeles company called Developmental Sciences Inc., which had offered Israel a drone decoy in 1973 and was now working on projects that included a DARPA-funded UAV. Shortly thereafter, Karem set out on his own again. When he took Dina house hunting, she realized Abe was going to be working at home. “I’m looking for a house with a garage attached,” she told him. “You’re looking for a garage with a house attached.” They found a garage Abe liked, attached to a house on a hill in Hacienda Heights, a suburb east of Los Angeles. The garage had 600 square feet of floor space and an equally spacious attic. By 1981, both spaces were crammed full of tools, computers, and handmade molds to fabricate aircraft parts from lightweight composites such as fiberglass and carbon epoxy. Working with Abe in the garage were two other believers in UAVs: Jack Hertenstein, a brainy, bashful engineer and radio control modeler Karem had met at Developmental Sciences, and Jim Machin, a pre-med student who’d impressed Abe at a free-flight modeling meet. The trio produced a UAV demonstrator that was feather-light-it weighed only 200 pounds-and would carry a television camera in its nose. Hertenstein contributed avionics and ground control, and, Karem says, “tremendous expertise in flying his automated model aircraft without crashing.” According to DARPA calculations, it would stay aloft a stunning 56 hours. Karem named it Albatross. During Karem’s brief stay at Developmental Sciences, he had met Ira Kuhn, a technology entrepreneur who visited the company to evaluate its UAV on DARPA’s behalf. In the course of conversation, Kuhn described an engineering problem he had been working on. A few days later, Karem called him with a solution. “It was extremely clever and much better than mine,” Kuhn recalls. Kuhn kept in touch, and was so impressed by the Albatross that he told DARPA director Bob Fossum, “This guy is a national asset.” DARPA ended up funding the Albatross flight tests. The drone’s exceptional performance led the agency in 1985 to contract with Karem’s new company, Leading Systems Inc., to develop a larger endurance UAV the agency named Amber. Navy Secretary John Lehman was pushing the development of UAVs as spotters for the guns on Navy ships. Largely financed by the Navy, Amber also had champions in U.S. Southern Command, who wanted “persistent surveillance” of drug traffickers in Latin America, recalls former DARPA official Bob Williams, who initiated the project. **Karem says those who think the secret to the Predator’s success was endurance should think again. What he brought to UAVs, he says, was a refusal to treat them-as others had-like models or target drones, which aren’t built to last, and therefore aren’t built to be reliable.** He designed the Albatross, Amber, Gnat-750, and Predator to fly hundreds of hours without a crash. He adds “I’m not a genius, but I am probably one of the best aircraft designers in the world today.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

#### The drones have destroyed the lives of families across Pakistan. This is the story of a thirteen year old named Zubair:

The family of a 67-year-old midwife from a remote village in North Waziristan told lawmakers on Tuesday about her death and the "CIA drone" they say was responsible. Their harrowing accounts marked the first time Congress had ever heard from civilian victims of an alleged US drone strike. Rafiq ur Rehman, a Pakistani primary school teacher who appeared on Capitol Hill with his children, Zubair, 13, and Nabila, 9, described his mother, Momina Bibi, as the "string that held our family together". His two children, who were gathering okra with their grandmother the day she was killed, on 24 October 2012, were injured in the attack. "**Nobody has ever told me why my mother was targeted that day**," Rehman said, through a translator. "**Some media outlets reported that the attack was on a car, but there is no road alongside my mother’s house. Others reported that the attack was on a house. But the missiles hit a nearby field, not a house. All of them reported that three, four, five militants were killed**." Instead, he said, only one person was killed that day: "**Not a militant but my mother**." "**In urdu we have a saying**: aik lari main pro kay rakhna. Literally translated, **it means the string that holds the pearls together. That is what my mother was. She was the string that held our family together. Since her death, the string has been broken and life has not been the same. We feel alone and we feel lost**." An Amnesty International report, published last week, lists Bibi among 900 civilians they say have been killed by drone strikes, a far higher number than previously reported. The Amnesty report said the US may have committed war crimes and should stand trial for its actions. The US has repeatedly claimed very few civilians have been killed by drones. It argues its campaign is conducted "consistent with all applicable domestic and international law". Unofficial reports, however, have suggested that hundreds have been killed in Pakistan alone, with up to 200 children killed. In poignant testimony, Rehman's son, Zubair, described the day of the attack, the day before the Muslim holy day of Eid, as a "magical time filled with joy". **He told lawmakers that the drone had appeared out of a bright blue sky, the colour of sky most beloved by his grandmother and himself, he said. "As I helped my grandmother in the field, I could see and hear the drone hovering overhead, but I didn’t worry" he said. "Why would I worry? Neither my grandmother nor I were militants." "When the drone fired the first time, the whole ground shook and black smoke rose up. The air smelled poisonous. We ran, but several minutes later the drone fired again. " "People from the village came to our aid and took us to hospital. We spent the night in great agony in at the hospital and the next morning I was operated on. That is how we spent Eid**." Zubair said that fear over the drone attacks on his community have stopped children playing outside, and stopped them attending the few schools that exist. An expensive operation, needed to take the shrapnel out of his leg, was delayed and he was sent back to the village until his father could raise the money, he said. “**Now I prefer cloudy days when the drones don’t fly. When the sky brightens and becomes blue, the drones return and so does the fear. Children don’t play so often now, and have stopped going to school. Education isn’t possible as long as the drones circle overhead.**”

#### This forces us to consider the relationships that the drone develops with its surrounding world. The drone, as a trope, exists in a state that does not limit it to those it has a material effect on. The concepts of a drone are seen in different aspects of society and how the production of the drone cause those forces are important areas of analysis. If we look at the drone as a more basic unit of meaning we detach the symbolic hold the military industrial complex has on the technology. The nature of the scientific discourse that produced the drone forces us to think that the drone is a weapon of war. Donna Haraway discusses how scientific rhetoric manipulates knowledge:

In any case, social constructionists might maintain that the ideological doctrine of scientific method and all the philosophical verbiage about epistemology were cooked up to distract our attention from getting to know the world efiectively by practicing the sciences. From this point of view, **science**- the real game in town-**is rhetoric, a series of efforts to persuade relevant social actors that one’s manufactured knowledge is a route to a desired form of very objective power**. Such persuasions must take account of the structure of facts and artifacts, as well as of language-mediated actors in the knowledge game. Here, artifacts and facts are parts of the powerful art of rhetoric. Prac- tice is persuasion, and the focus is very much on practice. All knowledge is a condensed node in an agnostic power field. The strong program in the sociology of knowledge joins with the lovely and nasty tools of semiology and deconstruction to insist on the rhetorical nature of truth, including scientific truth. History is a story Western culture buffs tell each other**; science is a contestable text and a power field; the content is the form**.2 Period. So much for those of us who would still like to talk about reality with more confidence than we allow to the Christian Right when they discuss the Second Coming and their being raptured out of the final destruction of the world. **We would like to think our appeals to real worlds are more than a desperate lurch away from cynicism and an act of faith like any other cult ™s, no matter how much space we generously give to all the rich and always historically specific mediations through which we and everybody else must know the world.** But the further I get in describing the radical social constructionist program and a particular version of postmodernism, coupled with the acid tools of critical discourse in the human sciences, the more nervous I get. **The imagery of force fields, of moves in a fully textualizedand coded world, which is the working metaphor in many arguments about socially negotiated reality for the postmodern subject, is, just for starters, an imagery of high-tech military fields, of automated academic battlefields, where blips of light called players disintegrate** (what a metaphor!) **each other in order to stay in the knowledge and power game**. **Technoscience and science fic- tion collapse into the sun of their radiant** (ir)**reality-war** It shouldn ™t take decades of feminist theory to sense the enemy here. Nancy Hartsock got all this crystal clear in her concept of abstract ma~culinity.~ I, and others, started out wanting a strong tool for deconstructing the truth claims of hostile science by showing the radical historical specificity, and so contestability, of every layer of the onion of scientific and technological con- structions, and we end up with a kind of epistemological electroshock ther- apy, which far from ushering us into the high stakes tables of the game of contesting public truths, lays us out on the table with self-induced multiple personality disorder. [[3]](#footnote-3)

## Part II: The DA

#### Limitations on war powers sap political capital for domestic agenda items

Kriner ‘10

Douglas L., assistant professor of political science at Boston University, “After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War”, University of Chicago Press, Dec 1, pages 68-69

While congressional support leaves the president’s reserve of political capital intact, congressional criticism saps energy from other initiatives on the home front by forcing the¶ president to expend energy and effort defending his international agenda. Political capital¶ spent shoring up support for a president’s foreign policies is capital that is unavailable for his¶ future policy initiatives.¶ . Moreover, any weakening in the president’s political clout may have¶ immediate ramifications for his reelection prospects, as well as indirect consequences for congressional races.59 Indeed, Democratic efforts to tie congressional Republican incumbents to President George W. Bush and his war policies paid

#### Failure collapses the economy – goes global and past events don’t disprove

Davidson 9/10

Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole

#### EXTINCTION

Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8

Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our

#### The infamous politics disad. Here we reach the perfect encapsulation of the form of traditional policy debate. Riddled with research practices that reproduce the masculine forms of epistemic context that surrounds the debate community.

#### By analyzing the relationship between the drone, the scientist, and the debater we see a similar pattern of production. The research practices of traditional policy debate is produced by the same factors that produce the drone and the way the drone is used. This technoscientific outlook of the world is one that attempts to assign value and order the world. Patricia Clough furthers,

While it is difficult to determine the long-term effects of the Sokal affair, it would seem that in the years since then, cultural studies of science have been turned over to disciplinary studies of science ”specialized fields of science studies within anthropology, sociology, philosophy, history, and psychology ”as if to assure the disciplinary and methodological rigor of those engaged in science studies. The study of science differently inflected across the disciplines, in fact, seems to have contained the critical probing that motivated the cultural studies of science. The questions once raised about the legitimacy and authority of Western discourses of science, reason, truth, and disciplinary methods have been quieted, and the relationship of these questions to the interarticulated differences of gender, sexuality, class, race, ethnicity, and nation, for so long productively explored in the critical theories of the late twentieth century, has ceased to be central to social criticism. Even more, it has become difficult, seemingly even undesirable, to engage technoscience, not so much as an object of social criticism but as a resource of thought, that is, to return to the ground Sokal cultivated, albeit with the seeds of bad intentions, to seek support from the thought of technoscience in elaborating a framework for social criticism and thus to face the challenges technoscience now poses for late-twentieth-century critical theories. Indeed, even when those critical theories are more robustly, if not more accurately, characterized than Sokal's characterization of them, they nonetheless face **challenges posed by technoscience, as it pressures a rethinking of dynamism and change, shifting the question of "what matters" from an epistemological domain to an ontological one**. While feminist theory, postcolonial theory, queer theory, and critical race theory were not merely dismissive of the existence of an external material world or the possibility of science knowing it, they did nonetheless focus their criticism on epistemological issues, thereby locating dynamism and change in the disavowed forces of knowledge, such as desire and power, that constitute the identity of the knowing subject. This is why or at least how the culture wars became the science wars. The late-twentieth-century critical theories provoked an epistemological crisis in Western thought, a crisis of representation, language, and narrative logic, while insistently interrogating the working of reason and intentionality in the construction of the subject's knowledge. Even when the interrogation turned to questioning the materiality of bodies, it was the subject's body that mattered, the body of the subject of knowledge. Bodies and matter often were taken to be inert, passively awaiting the imposition of significance through "a cultural construction.**"** [End Page 2]But if what is implied by **technoscience is the inseparability of knowledge production from technological innovation aimed at reaching beyond human limitation**, then not surprisingly **technoscience is producing knowledge through experimentation with the structure and organization of bodies, matter, and life.** Along with the high-powered mathematical technologies that allow us to "see" matter as inherently dynamic, operating as a complex, open system under far-from-equilibrium conditions, and the biotechnologies that mass-produce genetic materials outside the organism, there also has been a development of information technologies, both entertainment and surveillance technologies, which are increasingly less about representation and the narrative construction of subject identities and more about affecting bodies, human and nonhuman, directly. **These technologies mean to control bodies of information and to treat bodies as information. Even when appealing to the human subject, these technologies aim to affect the subject's subindividual bodily capacities**, that is, capacities to be moved, to shift focus, to attend, to take interest, to slow down, to speed up, and to mutate. Technoscientific experimentation calls forth new bodily matters while raising the conjoined questions of time and technicity. While epistemologically challenging, technoscientific experimentation also provokes an ontological crisis, thus pressuring a rethinking of the symbolic mix ”culture, language, representation, and narrative ”as the sole resource of dynamism and change.[[4]](#footnote-4)

#### The policy debater is entrenched in technoscience and not only is a product of the drone but is also the creator. The policy debater becomes the drone pilot and the scientist who makes it the most efficient killing machine possible. The relationship with these different discourses is what is being criticized here, not the individual actors themselves. Haraway explains,

Obviously, this essay is premised on the inversion of a causal relation of technology to the social relations of domination: **the social relations of domination**, I am arguing, **are frozen into the hardware and logics of technology. Nature is, in"fact," constructed as a technology through social praxis.** And dioramas are meaning- machines. **Machines are time slices into the social organisms that made them. Machines are maps of power, arrested moments of social relations that in turn threaten to govern the living**. **The owners of the great machines of monopoly capital-theso-called means of production--were, with excellent reason, at the forefront nature of work-because it was one of the means of production of race, gender and class.** Forthem, "naked eyescience" couldgive direct vision of social peace and progress despite the appearances of class warand decadence. They required a science "instaurating" jungle peace, with its promise of restored manhood, complete with a transcendent ethic of hunting; and so they bought it. This scientific discourse on origins was not cheap; and the servants of science, human and animal, were not tame. The relations of knowledge and power at the American Museum of Natural History arenotcaught by telling a tale ofthe great capitalists in the sky conspiring to obscure the truth. Quitetheopposite, the tale must be ofcommitted Progressives strugglingdispel to darkness through research, education and reform. The great capitalists werenot in the sky;they werein the field, armed with the Gospelof Wealth.96 Theywerealso often armed with an elephant gunand an Akeley camera.97 This entire essay has been aboutthe "socialconstruction of knowledge."

#### The role of the ballot is to reposition our knowledge away from masculine epistemology. Haraway explains,

knowledge, omniscience even. **Positioning is, therefore, the key practice in grounding knowledge organized around the imagery of vision, and much Western scientific and philosophic discourse is organized in this way.** **Positioning implies responsibility for our enabling practices.** It follows that **politics and ethics ground struggles for and contests over what may count as rational knowledge.** That is, admitted or not, **politics and ethics ground struggles over knowledge projects in the exact, natural, social, and human sciences.** Otherwise, rationality is simply impossi- ble, an optical illusion projected from nowhere comprehensively. **Histories of science may be powerfully told as histories of the technologies. These tech- nologies are ways of life, social orders, practices of visualization. Technologies are skilled practices.** How to see? Where to see from? What limits to vision? What to see for? Whom to see with Who gets to have more than one point of view?Who gets blinded? Who wears blinders? Who interprets the visual field? What other sensory powers do we wish to cultivate besides vision? Moral and political discourse should be the paradigm for rational discourse about the imagery and technologies of vision. Sandra Harding ™s claim, or observation, that **movements of social revolution have most contributed to improvements in science might be read as a claim about the knowledge consequences of new technologies of positioning**. But I wish Harding had spent more time remem- bering that social and **scientific revolutions have not always been liberatory**, even if they have always been visionary. Perhaps this point could be captured in another phrase: **the science question in the military. Struggles over what will count as rational accounts of the world are struggles over how to see**. The terms of vision: the science question in colonialism, the science question in ex- terminism,15the science question in feminism. The issue in politically engaged attacks on various empiricisms, reduc tionisms, or other versions of scientific authority should not be relativism- but location. A dichotomous chart expressing this point might look like this: But a dichotomous chart misrepresents in a critical way the positions of em- bodied objectivity that I am trying to sketch. The primary distortion is the il- lusion of symmetry in the chart ™s dichotomy, making any position appear, first, simply alternative and, second, mutually exclusive. A map of tensions and reasonances between the fixed ends of a charged dichotomy better repre- sents the potent politics and epistemologies of embodied, therefore account- able, objectivity. For example, **local knowledges have also to be in tension with the productive structurings that force unequal translations and exchanges- material and semiotic-within the webs of knowledge and power**. Webs can have the property of being systematic, even if being centrally structured global systems with deep filaments and tenacious tendrils into time, space, and consciousness, which are the dimensions of world history. Feminist **accountability requires a knowledge tuned to resonance, not to dichotomy.** Gender is a field of structured and structuring difference, **in which the tones of extreme localization, of the intimately personal and individualized body, vibrate in the same field with global high-tension emissions.** Feminist **embodiment,** then, is not about fEed location in a reified body, female or otherwise, but about **nodes in fields, inflections in orientations, and responsibility for difference in material-semiotic fields of meaning. Embodiment is significant prosthesis; objectivity cannot be about vision when what counts as an object is precisely what world history turns out to be about.** How should one be positioned in order to see, in this situation of tensions, reasonances, transformations, resistances, and complicities?Here, primate vi- sion is not immediately a very powerful metaphor or technology for feminist political-epistemological clarification, because it seems to present to con- sciousness already processed and objectified fields; things seem already fmed and distanced. But the visual metaphor allow some to go beyond fmed ap- pearances, which are only the end products. The metaphor invites us to in- vestigate the varied apparatuses of visual production, including the prosthetic technologies interfaced with our biological eyes and brains. And here we find highly particular machineries for processing regions of the electromagnetic spectrum into our pictures of the world. It is in the intricacies of these visual- ization technologies in which we are embedded that we will find metaphors and means for understanding and intervening in the patterns of objectifica- tion in the world-that is, the patterns of reality for which we must be ac- countable. In these metaphors, we find means for appreciating simultaneously both the concrete, œreal aspect and the aspect of semiosis and production in what we call scientific knowledge. I am arguing for politics and epistemologies of location, positioning, and situating, where partiality and not universality is the condition of being heard to make rational knowledge claims. These are claims on people ™s lives. I am ar- guing for the view from a body, always a complex, contradictory, structuring, and structured body, versus the view from above, from nowhere, from sim- plicity. Only the god trick is forbidden. Here is a criterion for deciding the sci- ence question in militarism, that dream science/technology of perfect language, perfect communication, final order.[[5]](#footnote-5)

#### A feminist research methodology solves this problem, and the hegemonic knowledge production of the debate community falls under “malestream” epistemology. The research turns the subjects into objects and halts emancipatory action.

Lentin No Date (Ronit. She is Head of Sociology, the director of the MPhil in Race, Ethnicity, Conflict, Department of Sociology and founder member of the Trinity Immigration Initiative, Trinity College, Dublin. Lentin has published extensively on racism and identity in Ireland, Israel and Palestine and on gender and genocide and the Holocaust. "I'll be a post-feminist in post-patriarchy": Reflexivity is a feminist issue.” http://www.iol.ie/~mazzoldi/toolsforchange/postmet/feminist.html)

In the course of working on the preliminary stages of my PhD study of personal narratives of Israeli writers and film makers who are daughters of Holocaust survivors, I decided that my methodological path would be qualitative, feminist and reflexive. Putting it this way is, of course, a simplification of the gradual process of deciding on a research methodology. **'Theory' in the sense of formulating ideas which attempt to explain something, always comes before research.** **Research is, above all, pragmatic, therefore what is involved here is a series of concurrent decisions as to data, theory and methodology**. In this case, as I suspect in most cases, 'theory' with a small 't' informed methodology, which informed Theory with a capital 'T'. All were shaped by and, in turn, constructed not only an epistemology, a feminist way of knowing, but an ontology, a feminist way of being in the world. **Feminist** sociological **research methodologies are based on** women's lived experiences in patriarchy, **both researched and researcher's, on gender as socially constructed and historically specific, and on a political commitment to the emancipation of women.** Finally, **they are based on reflexivity**, first posited by Gouldner (1971), **the analytic attention to the researcher's role, and the inclusion of research itself as a researchable topic.** Having come into existence as a 'provider of facts' to help political rulers to rule, sociology laid claim to a scientific status, and its practitioners assumed a place as fundable by government and its institutional apparatus. **Grounded in Cartesian dualisms, the dominating motifs of traditional sociology were the separations between knowers and known, subjectivity and objectivity, science and nature**. Feminists argue that these rest ultimately on the division between male/subject versus female/object. And, as many feminist commentators on the role of science within the academy assert, this separates the actual act of knowing from how what is known comes to be known. Feminist sociologists who **reject the binaries of theory and practice, objective and subjective, and researcher and researched**, do so because they believe that **knowing is a political process** (Ramazagnolu 1992: 210), and that **these binaries encourage** an elitist sociology **which cannot produce ways of knowing which avoid subordination** (Williams 1993: 582). For feminists, the known are also the knowers, research objects are their own subjects; objectivity is a set of intellectual practices for separating people from knowledge of their own subjectivity (Stanley 1990: 11). Feminist researchers seek to make visible the lived experiences of women and the research and writing process within social sciences generally and within feminist social science in particular. This paper (1), surveying the principles of feminist research methodologies, posits reflexivity as a feminist issue: feminist social scientists, are also the women whom we study. The experience of oppression due to sexism, to which both researcher and researched are subject, can create a unique type of insight and an ability to decipher 'official' explanations and grasp gender relations and their mechanisms (Fonow and Cook 1991: 1). These insights teach us not only about gender relations, but also about society as a whole. According to Black American sociologist Patricia Hill Collins, bringing groups of marginal intellectuals, such as Black feminist sociologists, as well as others who share an 'outsider-within' status vis-a-vis sociology, into the centre of the analysis, may reveal views of reality obscured by more orthodox approaches (Harding 1991). As feminist researchers often deal with dilemmas that have no absolute solutions, one cannot talk about what feminist research is, only about what it includes. I agree with Reinharz (1992: 7) who considers as feminist researchers who identify themselves in their research publications as feminists. Since feminist studies in the various disciplines, including sociology, are limited by patriarchal academic and research structures, feminist research needs to transform research processes. The main dilemma for feminist scholars has been to find ways of working within a disciplinary tradition while aiming at an intellectual transformation of that tradition (De Vault 1990). While many feminist sociologists seem to favour qualitative research, Sandra Harding claims **it is not the method that makes feminist research [is] different from what she terms 'malestream' research, but (a) the alternative origin of the problems, which concern women rather than men; (b) the alternative hypotheses and evidence used; (c) the purpose of the inquiry, which is to understand a woman's view of the world and assist in the emancipation of women and (d) the nature of the relationship between the researcher and the so-called 'subjects' of her inquiry** (Harding 1987). Some feminist sociologists reject quantitative methods, which, according to Pamela Abbot and Claire Wallace (1990), but also, according to Schwartz and Jacobs, in their 1979 classic text on qualitative methodology, assume a scientificity, that sociology cannot and should not strive to attain. However, feminism has drawn heavily on quantitative, statistical research. Co-Education and Attainment (Hanafin and Ni Charthaigh 1993) and Who Needs Flexibility? Part-Time Working ... The Irish Experience (Drew 1990), are two recent Irish examples. There is no one set of methods, nor even one category ('qualitative') which is distinctly feminist. Feminists should use any and every research method as long as written accounts of feminist research locate the feminist researcher within her research as an essential feature of what is feminist about it. Liz Stanley and Sue Wise locate five related sites of the feminist researcher's behaviour and analysis: **in the researcher-researched relationship; in emotion as a research experience; in the intellectual autobiography of the researchers; therefore in how to manage the different 'realities' and understandings of researchers and researched; and thus in the complex questions of power in research and writing** (Stanley and Wise 1990: 23). Dorothy Smith (1987) argues that feminist research should never lose sight of women as actively constructing, as well as interpreting, the social processes and realities that constitute their everyday lives. Smith looks at **the way the production of discourses, and ideologies colonise the material realities of women's lives. This approach is not radically different from symbolic interactionism's insistence that 'what is going on out there is what the actors say is going on out there' and that actors are experts about their own world**. This approach in turn has its roots in Weber's Verstehen goal of empathic appreciation, as opposed to Durkheim's social facts (Schwartz and Jacobs 1979). As a self-defining feminist sociologist I see as feminist, research which aims to develop theories that explain the world from the position of women. This research should reflect women's interests and values and draw on women's own interpretations of their own experiences, relating them to the way in which the society in which we live is constructed. **Reflexively, feminist research includes the researcher in all stages of data collection and data production.** However, feminist research methodologies are no more a unitary category than is the category 'woman'. One of the liveliest debates in feminist writings is between some radical feminists who see 'woman' or gender as a super-category and those (such as Mohanty 1991) who make the distinction between the category 'woman' and the category 'women'. The latter derives from the material realities of women's lives, socially constructed and historically specific, with ethnic, racial, sexual orientation and class variations. According to Harding (1991), **multiple and self-contradictory identities and social locations facilitated the ways of knowing which feminists have tended to favour** by exploiting the very gap between these multiple identities (those of 'who we are' as in at least two places at once, outside and inside, margin and centre). Vickie Routledge Shields and Brenda Dervin (1993) summarise four feminist perspectives that methodologies used in feminist research have strived to incorporate. Experience **- feminist research, rejecting reductionist scientism and positivism, is based on women's experience of their social and personal world; it treats women's experience 'as a scientific resource'** (Harding 1987); **it is actor-centred; feminist scholars can bring their own subjective experience to the project researched**. Feminist theorists have long debated the construction of the female subject. **Rejecting essentialism**, Teresa de Lauretis argues that **subjectivity is constructed through a continuous process, an ongoing renewal based on interactions with the world**, i.e. experience (De Lauretis 1986). Gender - **feminist research recognises gender and gender relations as social constructions**. Goffman stressed 'sex-class' as 'a category that is purely sociological ... and not ... biological' and gender as a 'way of characterising society' (Goffman 1987: 53). The fact that human experience is gendered is central to the radical implications of feminist theory, grounded, as it is, in women's lives and aiming to analyse the role and meaning of gender in those lives and in society. **Feminist research aims to illuminate aspects of gender relations, the interaction between the individual and society in the construction of gender, and the dynamics of power relations and in particular power inequalities between women and men** (Personal Narratives Group 1989). Reflexivity and intersubjectivity - **feminist research places the researcher on the same plane as the researched** - self-reflexivity is **an essential outcome of emancipatory research**. We are what we study: **the reflection upon and the acknowledgement of one's own objectives and biases therefore become part of the research findings.** Through reciprocal sharing of knowing between researcher and researched, those researched become collaborators in the research project. Through reflexivity a double-edged knowledge is generated. Reflexivity, according to Barbara Myerhoff, is both a 'native' act and an analytic one: the act of recording (the narrator's life) and the act of self-interpretation (by the researcher) are parallel because both are the product of persons reflecting one another and thereby influencing and changing one another (Prell 1989: 248) (2). Emancipation - by providing women with the information they need, research for women must be emancipatory. This is linked to consciousness-raising, and the researcher can bring a 'double vision of reality' (Stanley and Wise 1983) through her membership in two groups - the oppressed (women) and the elite (scholars), and through dialogically-based research methods such as two-way interviews and group discussions. Interviews In their choice of method, feminists often favour semi-structured interviews because they provide 'the principal means by which feminists have sought to achieve the active involvement of their respondents in the construction of data about their lives' (Graham 1984: 112). In her often-cited essay 'Interviewing women - a contradiction in terms?', Ann Oakley describes the conventional sociological interview as a 'masculine fiction'. **'Malestream'** interviews, **as described in mainstream methodology textbooks, are seen as mechanical data-collection instruments** in which one person asks the questions, another answers. Interviewees are characterised as passive and interviewers are reduced to a question asking and rapport promoting role. **The classical sociological interview rejects emotion and prohibits researchers from getting involved with their interviewees.** Oakley proposes a different paradigm for interviewing women. She regards the interview as one way of giving women greater visibility, not only in sociology, but also in society, by documenting women's own accounts of their lives (Oakley 1981: 41-9). Researcher-respondent relationship **Contrary to 'malestream' edicts against emotional involvement, feminist research, rebelling against an oversimplified 'hygienic research', allows, even welcomes, emotion into the research process and as a research topic.** Personal involvement is therefore deemed by feminist researchers necessary because the researcher must and does identify with the women she is researching, and inevitable because she is part of what is being researched - she is involved. **This means reflexivity is essential - the researcher must constantly be aware of how her values, attitudes and perceptions are influencing the research process, from the formation of the research questions, through the data collection stage, to the ways in which the data are analysed and theoretically explained** (Abbott and Wallace 1990: 27). **Traditional research may be seen as recreating a power relationship between researchers and 'research objects', who**, it is sometimes forgotten, **are subjects in their own right**.
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