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#### Darnall Moore explains that…

(Darnell L. Moore 2011, writer and activist whose work is informed by anti-racist, feminist, queer of color, and anti-colonial thought and advocacy. Darnell's essays, social commentary, poetry, and interviews have appeared in various national and international media venues, including the Feminist Wire, Ebony magazine, and The Huffington Post, "On Location: The “I” in the Intersection," http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/)

The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression and see as our particular ask the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives. As black women we see black feminism as the logical political movement to combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that all women of color face. -The Combahee River Collective in A Black Feminist Statement Many radical movement builders are well-versed in the theory of intersectionality. Feminists, queer theorists and activists, critical race scholars, progressive activists, and the like owe much to our Black feminist sisters, like The Combahee River Collective, who introduced us to the reality of simultaneity–as a framework for assessing the multitude of interlocking oppressions that impact the lives of women of color–in A Black Feminist Statement (1978). Their voices and politics presaged Kimberlé Crenshaw’s very useful theoretical contribution of “intersectionality” to the feminist toolkit of political interventions in 1989. Since its inception, many have referenced the term—sometimes without attribution to the black feminist intellectual [genealogy](http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/) from which it emerged—as a form of en vogue progressive parlance. In fact, it seems to be the case that it is often referenced in progressive circles as a counterfeit license (as in, “I understand the ways that race, sexuality, class, and gender coalesce. I get it. I really do.”) to enter resistance work even if the person who declares to have a deep “understanding” of the connectedness of systemic matrices of oppression, themselves, have yet to discern and address their own complicity in the maintenance of the very oppressions they seek to name and demolish. I am certain that I am not the only person who has heard a person use language embedded with race, class, gender, or ability privilege follow-up with a reference to “intersectionality.” My concern, then, has everything to do with the way that the fashioning of intersectionality as a political framework can lead toward the good work of analyzing ideological and material systems of oppression—as they function “out there”—and away from the great work of critical analyses of the ways in which we, ourselves, can function as actants in the narratives of counter-resistance that we rehearse. In other words, we might be missing the opportunity to read our complicities, our privileges, our accesses, our excesses, our excuses, our modes of oppressing—located “in here”—as they occupy each of us. Crenshaw’s theorization has provided us with a useful lens to assess the problematics of the interrelated, interlocking apparatuses of power and privilege and their resulting epiphenomena of powerlessness and subjugation. Many have focused on the external dimensions of oppression and their material results manifested in the lives of the marginalized, but might our times be asking of us to deeply consider our own “stuff” that might instigate such oppressions? What if we extended Crenshaw’s theory of intersectionality by invoking what we might name “intralocality”? Borrowing from sociologists, the term “social location,” which broadly speaks to one’s context, highlights one’s standpoint(s)—the social spaces where s/he is positioned (i.e. race, class, gender, geographical, etc.). Intralocality, then, is concerned with the social locations that foreground our knowing and experiencing of our world and our relationships to the systems and people within our world. Intralocality is a call to theorize the self in relation to power and privilege, powerlessness and subjugation. It is work that requires the locating of the “I” in the intersection. And while it could be argued that such work is highly individualistic, I contend that it is at the very level of self-in-relation-to-community where communal transformation is made possible. Might it be time to travel into the deep of our contexts? Might it be time for us—theorists/activists—to do the work of intersectionality (macro/system-analysis) in concert with the intra-local (micro/self-focused analysis)? Intersectionality as an analysis, rightly, asks of us to examine systemic oppressions, but in these times of radical and spontaneous insurgencies—times when we should reflect on our need to unoccupy those sites of privilege (where they exist) in our own lives even as we occupy some other sites of domination—work must be done at the level of the self-in-community. We cannot—as a progressive community—rally around notions of “progression” and, yet, be complicit in the very homo/transphobias, racisms, sexisms, ableisms, etc. that violently terrorize the lives of so many others. If a more loving and just community is to be imagined and advanced, it seems to me that we would need to start at a different location than we might’ve expected: self.

### Droning Link

This Week In Blackness 13 ("Drone Policy Is the Most Important Racism," http://thisweekinblackness.com/2013/07/25/drone-policy-is-the-most-important-racism/)

There are several incidents of privilege-blindness among the mostly white male drone-obsessed elite. First, their public anger over the drone program seemed to begin when Eric Holder made [statements](http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/05/politics/obama-drones-cia) extending the legal justification for the program to killing U.S. citizens on U.S. soil.  That implies that these critics think that the U.S. government killing U.S. citizens is new or unusual, when a simple surface-level review of this country’s history shows that the government has always committed sustained and fatal violence against brown people, women, gay people, transpeople, disabled people, and poor people among others. People who insist on talking about drones as an ultimate evil ignore this history of violence, which is well-known in communities not their own. And, the likelihood that white men personally will be targeted by a drone is absurdly small, compared to the likelihood that a member of a marginalized community will continue to suffer from the government’s active and passive violence. So, hearing these critics air their feelings of being “targets” for the first time is offensive to those from communities that have lived under the gun for generations, especially because these feelings exclude points of view from those communities. If you are privileged enough to suddenly feel scared of the government, you are complicit in denying the violence against marginalized people that has always existed.The other part of white male critics’ anxiety comes from recognition that the world order is changing. Traditionally, the American president has been a white man who identifies and legitimizes white men’s problems as American Problems. Now, President Obama is the public face of America, and when he identifies a traditionally invisible Black People’s Problem, it becomes, for the first time, an American Problem. By stubbornly forcing Obama’s statements about Trayvon Martin into the framework of opposition to drone strikes, white male public intellectuals are attempting to return to white men the power to define American Problems. White critics insist that Obama addresses drone strikes above all other expressions of white supremacy, while claiming that they are the “true” soldiers against racism. They apparently believe that they get to decide which policies are “important-racist” and which ones are “unimportant-racist.” It must be a coincidence that the “unimportant-racist” policies are the ones that most directly validate white upper-class male privilege. Also, by arguing that drones exhibit “important racism,” these critics reinforce the narrative that killing Black people is “unimportant racism,” and not as valuable as executing white men’s philosophical priorities.

### Alt

Perucci explains that (Tony, ssistant Professor of Co mmunication Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, "What the F uck is T hat? The Poetics of Ruptural Performance," Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies Vol. 5, No. 3, September 2009)

Recent years have seen a rise in the practice of political street performance. Often called “interventions” or “performance activism,” many of these actions exceed the transparent political messaging of traditional agit - prop performance. Rather, they mobilize the particular qualities of performance as embodied action — what I call “ruptural performance” — as a modality in opposition to the stultifying effects of the society of the sp ectacle. Drawing on Brechtian aesthetics and the Artaudian embodiment of “the poetic state” as well as the (a)logic of Dada and the materialism of Minimal Art, **ruptural performance enacts interruption, event, confrontation and bafflement as a form of direct action**. “ Every day, do something that won’t compute” — Wendell Berry, The Mad Farmer’s Manifesto 1 Much of today’s activism emerges out of an experience of the totality, of the intractability and intransigence of consumer culture, and of what Guy Deb ord once called “the society of the spectacle.” It is an aesthetic response to a political/cultural crisis, not to mention an ecological, psychic and economic one. This essay addresses what is particular to the performance of what are variously called “interventions” and “performance activism.” These actions’ characteristics as performance work in ways that are specific to their form and exceed any “message” or content that they might (or might not) seek to convey. The conditions of inequity and ecological disaster that are intrinsic to consumer culture are now an open secret – or not even a secret but an accepted fact of life. Perhaps this is even truer now in the face of what has been named “the current economic crisis,” which spurs the call to “drill baby drill” and sends Wal - Mart sales through the roof while the rest of the economy collapses. Ecological crisis and sweatshop labor are no longer concerns that we think we can afford to address in daily life. In the face of such conditions, Jacques Rancière points out the challenge of what he calls the dilemma of “critical art” thusly: “understanding alone can do little to transform consciousness and situations. The exploited have rarely had the need to have the laws of exploitation explained to them. Because it’s not a misunderstanding of the existing state of affairs that nurtures the submission of the oppressed, but a lack of confidence in their own capacity to transform it” (83). In what follows, I argue for and trace out the critical characteristics of this insurgent form of performance activism that I am calling “ruptural performance.” Ruptural performances are distinct less because of a communicated message of their content and more by their qualities as performance: they are interruptive, becoming - event, confrontational, and baffling. Understanding performance as rupture provides a significant way to think about and create interventionist and political performance that places the focus centrally on the act of performance. This emergent genre of performed activism pays a particular debt to the pranksterism of Abbie Hoffman, the d é tournement of the Situationists, and the absurd enactments of Dada performance. These performance interventions are best known today through the practice of culture jamming and by the staged performances of Reverend Billy and the Church of Stop Shopping, The Billionaires for Bush, and the Yes Men. Such interventions, as well as those by lesser - known artists (partly because their strangeness cannot be easily accommodated by media coverage, political activists and academic theorization), can be understood through the notion of “performance as rupture” (Perucci “Guilty” 315 - 329). Rupture itself is not a “new” element in culture, and it certainly has a long legacy in modernism as the bre ach, shift or break. But it has a particular resonance in current activist practices that are both freer and more delimited than previous such enactments. To define performance as rupture, we must articulate what it ruptures. At the risk of constructing a false binary, let me propose that the obverse of “performance as rupture” is Debord’s “spectacle.” Debord explains that while the society of the spectacle is indeed an “accumulation of spectacles ,” ( Society 12) he distinguishes that “The spectacle is not a collection of images; rather it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images” ( Society 12). While he calls it a “weltanschauung” ( Society 13) it is more than an ideology or a veil of false consciousness. Rather it is “the very heart of society’s real unreality,” ( Society 13) and in that materiality extends the alienation of the production of the commodity to its consumption: the spectacle produces “isolation” through the shift from doing to “contemplation,” where “The spectator’s alienation from and submission to the contemplated object [...] works like this: the more he contemplates, the less he lives” ( Society 23). Ultimately, the spectacle as “social relationship” represents the triumph of the commodity - image, the “ruling order’s ... un interrupted monologue of self - praise” ( Society 19) where “the commodity completes its colonization of social life” ( Society 29). In understanding the spectacle as not merely spectacles, but a modality of experience, in which separation and contemplation fl atten the encounter with presence, Debord proposes “situations” specifically to intervene at the level of the experience. However, in his recent attempt to characterize the new activism, Dream: Re - imagining Progressive Politics in the Age of Fantasy , Steph en Duncombe proposes that spectacle is itself the basis for protest, and that the distinction of the spectacle and the situation is merely “semantic” (130). Instead, he proposes “the ethical spectacle”: **our spectacles will be participatory** , dreams the public can mold and shape themselves. They will be active : spectacles that work only if people help create them. They will be open - ended : setting stages to ask questions and leaving silences to formulate answers. And they will be transparent : dreams that one knows are dreams but which still have the power to attract and inspire. And finally, the spectacles we create will not cover over or replace reality and truth but perform and amplify it. (17, emphasis added) There is much to be gained from Duncombe’s schema tization here. And what I wish to do is revise and amplify it by challenging his dismissal of the distinctive character of “spectacle.” 2 As I have tried to show in my brief summary above, the spectacle is not just a thing to be seen, but is also a mode of performance . Interventionist performance, particularly that which seeks to challenge and disrupt the values and especially the experience of the society of the spectacle, is another modality of enactment rather than a variation of spectacle. While performa nce interventions share with spectacle the qualities of being dramatic and theatrical, what distinguishes them is that they disrupt the experience of daily life, a rupture of the living of social relations — what Reverend Billy of the Church of Stop Shopping calls “the necessary interruption” ( What Should I Do, xiii). The interruption, which Benjamin might call the “sudden start” or the “shock” (163), creates the space for and initiates the experience of a ruptural performance. While bearing in mind the promi sing schema laid out by Duncombe, but also taking into consideration the particular characteristics of the society of the spectacle upon which much “interventionist” work means to engage, I am calling for a proliferation of ruptural performances. Below is an attempt to trace out rupture as a “modality” of performance that means to disrupt, or at least, to fuck with the spectacle. Given Duncombe’s setting of “dreaming the impossible” (158) as a critical element of performance activism, I will introduce my sc hematic be means of an example from a fiction film. The 2004 film, Die Fetten Jahre Sind Vorbei ( The Fat Years are Over , released in the US as The Edukators , d. Weingartner) begins this way: an affluent German family returns to their home to discover a bre ak - in. Their first sign of trouble is a massive tower made of their dining room furniture. They gaze at the sculpture, frozen with bafflement. Nothing, however, has been stolen. But their many commodities have been humiliated: a porcelain bust is hanging f rom a noose, glass figurines are found stuffed in the toilet, the stereo is in the refrigerator, and finally a letter that says “Lesen!” (“Read! ” ). Inside reads the message from the anarchist group that reorganizes the possessions of wealthy residents: “Di e fetten Jarhre sind vorbei.” They stop and stare, confounded. 1. Ruptural performances are interruptive. In some way these performances halt, impede, or delay the habitual practices of daily life. They intervene at the level and in the midst of the quotidian. Such performances engage the “necessary interruption” which seeks to make conscious what is habitual so that it is available for critique. In this way it shares Debord’s notion of the con structed situation — “the concrete construction of temporary settings of life and their transformation into a higher, passionate nature” is inherently interruptive as it “asserts a non - continuous conception of life” (“Report” 48). They seek to destabilize wh at the Russian Formalist Viktor Shklovsky called the “automatism of perception” (13). For Shklovsky, the role of art is to undo “habitualization,” which he says, “devours works, clothes, furniture, one’s wife, and the fear of war” (12). Such a reclamation of perception Shklovsky calls “defamiliarization” (13), for which the Russian phrase is priem ostraneniye , and that translates literally as “making strange.” Brecht realized the political potential for this concept as the Verfremsdungeffekt , which is foundational in that it focuses on the experience of making the familiar strange as much as the transmission of a political message. In the speed - up of a contemporary life characterized by images and simulations, these performances engage what Walter Benjamin c alls the “interruption of happenings” that estranges the “conditions of life” (150). It is this interruption, Benjamin suggests, that allows performance to obtain the “special character [of] ... producing astonishment rather than empathy” (150). Interruptive performance, however, occurs not at the level of representation, but on the field of presence. It is achieved by “putting a frame” around experience (more in John Cage’s than Erving Goffman’s sense) that produces what Richard Bauman calls a “heightened in tensity” or “special enhancement of experience” (43). The Brazilian group, Opovoempé , 3 has performed their Guerrilha Magnética (Magnetic Guerilla) and other intervenções (interventions) throughout public spaces in São Paulo. In 2006, they composed and per formed Congelados (Frozen), a series of intervenções , throughout the city’s supermercados . The performances consisted of simple and improvised ensemble compositions constructed through the use of gesture, repetition, spatial relationship, and kinesthetic r esponse. 4 The piece, in its basic performance of the actions of shopping, defamiliarizes the activities of shopping. The “choreography” that constitutes the “dance and music of buying” only gr adually becomes evident, as the repetition of the banal gestures of shopping begins to mark their strangeness as performance (“Nos Supermercados” Esteves). 5 Though the content of the action is not overtly political (it does not scream its ideology), it ma kes the encounter with shopping, and especially its mindlessness and repetitiveness, seem strange. At its foundation, the pieces are rupture - producing machines : “ The interventions intend to cause rupture of communication barriers, revelation of humor and play, change in the use of public space, and the manifestation of latent contents or social tensions previously unnoticed” ( “What is” Esteves). That rupture is specifically political — particularly in mobilizing the poetic state of quotidian settings. Guerri lha Magnética performances are intended “to break apathy and indifference, to install a creative atmosphere of play and to reveal the poetic content of the city” ( “What is” Esteves). 2. Ruptural performanc es are becoming - events. That is, they do, as Dell Hymes suggests, “breakthrough into performance” (11). And while their boundaries are unstable and unfixed, it is the ruptural performances’ eventness, their status as singular in time and space, which enables the presencing that the spectacle confounds. Alain Baidou puts it this way: “This other time, whose materiality envelops the consequences of the event, deserves the name of a new present. The event is neither past nor future. It makes us present to the present” (39). And yet the instability of the boundaries of the event is equally significant. Ruptural performances tend to confound boundaries of the real and artificial. The actual event of performance is generated by means of artifice, in which audience s often don’t initially realize that they are in a performance. In ruptural performances, audiences often first suspect that something isn’t right, but are not sure if something is amiss. Ultimately, though, the “breakthrough” occurs that things aren’t nor mal, they are strange, and we are in the midst of an event. It is this eventness (and the anticipatory process of becoming event) that enlivens the occasion of the here and now. And that temporal immediacy is captured well by Benjamin’s invocation of Jetzt zeit or the “presence of the now” (261). One becoming - event that has been performed around the world is the “whirl.” The whirl consists of a group of fifteen or more people entering a sweatshop store a few at a time (most often a Wal - Mart, thus the someti mes - used moniker: “Whirl - Mart”) who move empty shopping carts throughout the store. Once all performers are inside and with carts, the participants create a single line of carts that snakes throughout the store, splitting and refiguring as the snake of car ts meets up with blocked aisles and shopping customers (which must look like a Busby Berkley dance sequence to the overhead security cameras). 6 During the hour or more of the performance, if asked by management, security, employees, or customers what they are doing, performers respond kindly with “I’m not shopping.” As performers make their rounds, it is the employees who first encounter the becoming - event, then the customers, then management (who begin manically communicat ing on walkie - talkies), and finally security. When security gets wise, it’s time to return the carts and exit the store. As ruptural performance, the whirl does not make any specific claim on protesting the many things one could advocate against — sweatshop labor, poor treatment of store employees, predatory business practices, etc. ad infinitum — given that all present could recite this litany of wrongs. Rather the whirl enacts the becoming - event of “not shopping,” which in itself can be read as an engagement against over - consumption, Wal - Mart’s imperialism, unfair labor practices, or ecological devastation. 7 3. Ruptural performances are confrontational. By this, I don’t necessarily mean aggressive, though they may be that. Rather, it is as Benjamin puts it, where a “stranger is confronted with the situation as with a startling picture” (151). Ruptural performance is thus distinguished from the “revelatory” performance that unmasks the hidden truths (though it may also do this). In our age, what Marx called the “secret of the commodity” — that its price masked the alienated labor that produced it — is now exposed. We know, for instance, that many of the products we buy are produced by sweatshop, child and slave labor; but we have developed what Adrian Piper calls “ways of averting one’s gaze” (“Ways” 167). Ruptural performance is thus less a critique of ideology or false consciousness, and is more about the experience of the encounter of returning one’s gaze to that which one avoids to maintain acceptance of the inequities of the contemporary social orders. As Husserl notes, “Things are simply there and just need to be seen.” Bruce Wilshire also gets at what I’m talking about when he describes phenomenology as a “systematic effort to unmask the obvious” (11). In fact, this quality is what Michael Fried complained about as the central quality minimal art: its “stage presence” or “theatricality” where “the work refuses, obstinately, to let him alone — which is to say, it refuses to stop confronting him” (140). And in this way, ruptural performance owes as much to Minimalism as it does to Dada. As such it enacts what Fred Moten suggests is not only an “excess of meaning” but also “the anti - interpretive nonreduction of nonmeaning” (197). Ruptural performances, like Minimal Ar t , are characterized by a “concrete thereness,” that Barbara Rose says is a “literal and emphatic assertion of their own existence” (216). As Rosalind Krauss says of Donald Judd’s work, we can say of Ruptural Performance: it “compels and gratifies immediat e sensual gratification” (211)

### Crisis Based Ptx

CHRIS J. **CUOMO** is assistant professor of philosophy and women’s studies at the University of Cincinnati. She teaches courses in ethics, feminist philosophy, social and political philosophy, environmental ethics, and lesbian and gay studies, fall 19**96**

Theory that does not investigate address the depth and specificity of the everyday effects of militarism on women. on people living in occupied territories. on members of military institutions. and on the environment. These effects are relevant to feminists in or even notice the omnipresence of militarism cannot represent or a number of ways because military practices and institutions help construct aendered and national identity. and because the.- justify the destruction of natural nonhuman entities and communities during peacetime. Lack of attention to these aspects of the business of making or preventing military violence in an extremely technologized world results in theory that cannot accommodate the connections among the constant presence of militarism, declared wars. and other closely related social phenomena. such as nationalistic glorifications of motherhood. media violence. and current ideological gravitations to military solutions for social problems. Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states lead to crisis-based politics and analyses. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options. crisis- based ethics and politics are problematic because they distract attention from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed. omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the false belief that the absence of declared armed conflicts is peace. the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege. and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism. to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict. creates forms of resistance to militarism that are merely exercises in crisis control. Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs. or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened. and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declarations of war might actually keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the General presence of global militarism. Seeing war as necessarily embedded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific. state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time. and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state.

### Data

Jeong 99 (Ho-Won, associate professor at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University (Ho-Won, Epistemological Foundations for Peace Research, [classweb.gmu.edu/hwjeong/epistemological.htm](http://classweb.gmu.edu/hwjeong/epistemological.htm))

Other peace researchers have attempted to find the sources of violence through a **critical analysis** of existing social, economic systems. Understanding the meaning of power in a hierarchical system is important in a critical peace research tradition. The analysis of **structural sources of repression and exploitation** is considered as the **first step** toward eliminating the root causes of violent conflict. Thus **the** emancipatory goal of peace research isassociated with looking for obstacles to structural changes and exploring strategies to overcome them. Peace research has to serve the policy goal of transforming a world full of violence. This chapter discusses how a theory building process in peace research has been influenced by epistemological debates between the proponents of behavioralists and their critics in social science. In the first part, the author briefly explains the modes of inquiry for theory building. The majority of the chapter, however, looks at such issues as values, critical pedagogy, and holistic approaches in understanding the nature of peace and conflict. The Emergence of Peace Research Some argue that the history of peace studies has no geographic boundaries. It can be traced back hundreds and even thousands of years. Gold mines of ideas about peace were presented by philosophers in the early period of human civilization. Discussion about how to understand peace has been developed in various cultures. The study of peace and conflict in modern social science traditions originates in the 19th century. In Karl Marx's work, theoretical efforts were made to discover the structural sources of conflict in human history. Such sociologists as August Comte attempted to find general theories on social order and conflict. Social processes of conflict were understood in terms of organismic analogies. Max Weber analyzed the links between an individual actor's behavior and patterns of collective action. The impulse for studying peace and conflict systematically was fomented in the early 20th century. The experiences of World War I led to the realization that given the enormous costs to human well-being, solutions have to be found to prevent war at both an intellectual and policy level. Research on the processes leading to an armed conflict was supported by efforts to examine socio-psychological and economic conditions. In addition, changes in the perceptions of political leaders were regarded as important in the transformation of an international system. Peace research after World War II was influenced by the emergence of international relations as a new scientific endeavor to investigate problems between states. The course of peace research was also determined by the possibilities of nuclear war along with fierce political, ideological and military confrontations between Soviet led socialist bloc countries and Western alliances in the global arena as well as the devotion of resources to preparing for a war which would annihilate human civilization. The opposition to Vietnam War generated critical thinking about national foreign policy agendas, and it expanded theoretical perspectives and research areas to be investigated. The evolution of peace and conflict research since the 1970s has been characterized by inter-disciplinary understanding of violence and conflict at various social levels. Such social science and humanity fields as psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, history, literature, linguistics, and geography brought new concepts and methodological innovations. It was essential to adopt experiential research methods as well as traditional scientific methods to explain the causes of violence at individual and group levels as well as international. The study of social phenomena is stimulated by intellectual challenges that derive from continuing and new sets of problems. The involvement of various disciplines in the development of peace research was inevitable with the realization that peace cannot be achieved by one particular approach. Peace research has to rely on diverse methodological traditions given its disciplinary goals and the complexities of subject matters. Modes of Social Inquiry In a positivist mode of inquiry, social **knowledge emerges from emulating the procedures of natural sciences**. There is a clear distinction between facts and values. Efforts for new theoretical departures **remain valid only if concrete empirical research programs are developed**. A theory needs to be verified by the process of operationalizing and testing hypotheses. Research should be freed from non-empirical claims of individual conviction and conscience. In dealing with the complexity of empirical phenomena, theory ought to explain and predict the trend of events Contrary to that, hermeneutics is based on the analysis of the meanings which human beings attach to their actions. The study of mind is different from that of nature. Analysis should reveal social constraints and promote cultural understanding. The goal of research is enlightenment and emancipation. The values and priorities of goals tend to be **diverse across social groups and classes**. What is rational changes across time and space. Rationalities are intersubjective in the sense that they **can only be really examined from within the experiences of social groups which are the object of research**. Critical theory methodology identifies forms of conflict and patterns of development which could lead to the transformation of a world order. There is no over-arching ahistorical structure. Explanation of the prospects for change requires analysis of the connections between modes of production and hierarchical political structures (Cox, 1996). The scope of the inquiry also focuses on a **distorted ideological account** of social relations by a hegemonic class. In a postmodern vein, problems in different social locations and histories are interpreted by multiple minds and knowledge rather than meta-narratives (Seidman, 1994:5). Speculation is the most open form of inquiry. Humanity cannot be studied through a legislative reason which is helpful in producing general theories. The social world is fragmented into a multitude of communities and cultural traditions. The role of a social analyst is to mediate between different social worlds and to interpret unfamiliar cultures (Sediman, 1994:14). Resolving major theoretical differences is not desirable nor feasible. Scientific Approaches to Peace Research The early endeavor to establish a peace science originates in mathematical modelling of dynamics of arms races (Richardson, 1960). Quantitative studies of conflict behavior in the 1960s was affected by the revolution of behavioral sciences. Theoretical development was believed to be promoted by the **collection of raw data**, highly deductive propositions, and empirical verification. Formal models supported by **statistical analysis** were expected to explain both behavioral and structural characteristics of violent conflict. The motivation behind scientific research was that ideas for creating a peaceful world would emerge from theories on human behavior and institutions verified by empirical methods. Hypothesis building would help researchers observe cooperative and conflictual patterns of behavior under different circumstances. Order in international relations could be analyzed in terms of such variables as distribution of power and patterns of interaction between political units (Kaplan, 1957; Modelski, 1978). Perceptions and cognition of decision makers and group processes are important variables in scientific approaches to research on war decision making. Regularities in human behavior were conceptualized and generalized in the studies of the Korean War decision making and the Cuban Missile Crisis.(Allison, 1971; Paige, 1968) Scientific orientation has paid a great deal of attention to data collection and representation of the data through a modelling process. Simulation, gaming techniques have been utilized in developing a causal model of violent conflict (Guetzkow and Alger, 1963; Singer and Small, 1972). Later the interaction of economic, social, political and environmental systems was studied by world modelling approaches (Bremer, 1987). Methodological rigor and precision were sought in systematic observation of the problems of violence and other types of human sufferings. The Critique of Behavioral Sciences The behavioralist traditions of peace research have been criticized for being too empiricist.(Galtung, 1975) **Quantitative analysis is not able to reveal** intentional **aspects of behavior in a specific context**. Developing peace research requires a framework for synthesis in integrating different sets of issues. While collecting data on manifest violence, arms races and military coups is critical to the development of empirical theories (SIPRI, 1996), research design has to be guided by appropriate theoretical frameworks. The ability to think about and discuss key research questions stems from conceptual development of issues to be studied. **Ignoring normative questions would not help find alternative visions.** Conditions for building peace are not dealt with in behavioral research traditions. Statistical data and empirical findings are themselves do not offer strategies for creating a peaceful world. The uncertainty of politics would not be removed by pure scientific analysis of human behavior. According to some observers in peace studies, the efforts to find regularities have been pursued "to the point of **eliminating individual creativity and responsibility may well mire us in cyclic determinism**."(Forcey, 1989:13) Critics of the positivist paradigm attribute the **reductionist** character of contemporary thought to the drive for control of nature. The critique of behavioral sciences coincides with a "critique of conscience" in the academic community. Conscience dictates feelings, moral stances, and a concern for truth and justice. The desire for value explicit inquiry stems from the fact that human behavior would not be investigated without references to social collectivity in historical contexts. Overall, the normative starting point of peace research has to be anchored in the agreement that peace is the object of the quest.(Broadhead, 1997:2) The utility of any research methods could be evaluated in terms of the way they are compatible with the general goal of a disciplinary focus. Holistic Approaches Some researchers suggest that peace studies should start from **holism as the framework**.(Smoker and Groff, 1996) Knowledge about general human experiences of conflict helps interpret specific events. Given their abstract nature, however, theories may not correspond with the facts and events which they seek to explain. The meanings of events are set up within a context of wholes. The intellectual transformation is necessary for developing a paradigm of peace. The achievement of peace should be a holistic goal of research. Holistic versions of theories project the flow of **alternative images of reality**. **There are different theoretical explanations about how and why to go to war**. The plurality of theories ought not to be regarded as a preliminary stage of knowledge which will eventually lead to one true grand theory. Universally applicable knowledge is not produced by piecemeal theory building efforts. There seems to be consensus that peace research must not be limited to conventional empirical methods. Extended historical perspectives illustrate what is important in understanding conditions for peace. The evaluation of research findings needs a yardstick for examining their relevance. The incorporation of emancipatory cognitive interest would help suggest theories for a peaceful world. More holistic approaches can be encouraged by hermeneutic philosophy of science. Reasoning needs to be combined with experiences in understanding the holistic pictures of social relations. The outcome in the real world is not easily deduced from abstractly modeled relationships. In considering difficulties for justification of inducing wholes from parts, the ultimate validity of the big pictures is elusive. Theories which can be positively verifiable does not necessarily mean that they are true. Realities in peace and conflict do not last long enough to be subject to comprehensive, systematic and effective empirical assaults on them. Explanation can be based on intuitive understanding of long and varied experiences. There are various ways to observe the world, including historical interpretations. Different perceptions of social relationships result from the process of formation and transformation of images and symbols. Peace studies may belong to the same category as history and critical sociology in terms of its methods to study an object. In contrast with economics, many factors related to structural violence such as political repression and economic exploitation cannot be easily understood without socio-historical contexts**.** Distinctions between independent and dependent variables are artificial. Understanding the outcome of an event would be enhanced by clarifying the specific goals of actors. Emancipatory Projects Direct criticism of sovereign state power may be based on questioning the mode of analysis to **construct linear histories**. Social and political boundaries cannot be imposed especially when truth and meanings are in doubt. Sovereign claims are used to shape human loyalties, but the forms of identities are not any more certain. Resolving differences of opinion about the legitimacy of state institutions is not possible within clearly defined and demarcated areas of research. Thus emancipatory projects oppose intellectual and social closure which does not tolerate diversity. In a poststructural approach, language and discourse shape politics and social institutions.(Bannet, 1993) A normative social space is located in the process of assigning meanings to opposing phenomena. Binary opposition have contributed to the creation of **linguistic and social hierarchies**.(Seidman, 1994:18) Poststructuralism aims to disturb the **dominant binary meanings** that function to **perpetuate social and political hierarchies**. Deconstructionism is the method to be deployed. This involves unsettling and displacing the **binary hierarchies**. The goal of a deconstructionist strategy is to create a **social space which favors autonomy**. This process is tolerant of difference and ambiguity.(Seidman, 1994:19) The historically contingent origin and political role of binary hierarchies are uncovered by deconstructionism. **Instead of being instruments of bureaucratic social control, human studies should serve emancipatory aims. Society is** imagined less as a material structure, organic order, or social system than as a construction **rooted in historically specific discursive practices**. Communities serve as texts whose symbols and meanings need to be translated. Interpretative knowledge promotes diversity, expands tolerance, and legitimates difference as well as fosters understanding and communication (Seidman, 1994:14-5) People's perceptions about the world rely on their social and cultural milieu. The goal of emancipation has nothing to do with science. Legitimation arises from their own linguistic practice and communicational interaction. As long as social science serves as the instrument of a disciplined society, **truth is produced by power**.(Foucault, 1967) All knowledge claims are moves in a power game.Social science can contribute to emancipation by widening and deepening our sense of community. If meanings rest with communities, knowledge can have a specific role in promoting human solidarity.(Waever, Ole, 1996:171)

### “terrorist”

**Kay Whitlock writes..**

co-author of [Queer (In)Justice](http://www.queerinjustice.com/), is contributing editor of CI. Criminal Injustice

(Kay, “Desperately Seeking Assata”, May 8, 2013, http://criticalmassprogress.com/2013/05/08/ci-desparately-seeking-assata/)

Last week, on May 2, 2013, 40 years to the day after a shootout in which[Assata Shakur](http://www.assatashakur.org/index.htm), a well-known Black Panther Party and Black Liberation Army activist, was shot twice, and a fellow activist and a New Jersey state trooper were killed, the [FBI announced](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/03/fbi-wanted-first-woman-joanne-chesimard) that Shakur, whose original name was Joanne Chesimard, was the first woman to be placed on the agency’s [Most Wanted Terrorists list.](http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/wanted_terrorists/@@wanted-group-listing)(It’s worth taking a look at the makeup of the list; notice anything about it?) At the same time, the New Jersey state police and the FBI doubled – from $1 million to $2 million – the reward offered for Shakur’s capture.As it happens, she escaped from prison in 1979 – an embarrassing development which law enforcement still cannot coherently explain today – and made her way to Cuba, where she sought and received political asylum.Why on earth would law enforcement dredge up a 40-year old case and enshrine it in the annals of Most Wanted Terrorists?Welcome to the surreal world of Racist Criminalization.There’s a lot about the way the police targeted her for the trooper killing that never made a shred of sense in terms of the official story– including the fact that medical experts testified that her injuries were so severe that she could not have fired the fatal shot.(Disclosure: I don’t believe she was guilty, and I remember how the case played out in the day.)Assata Shakur was simply the Designated Dangerous Black Radical of the moment.And through [COINTELPRO](http://www.pbs.org/now/politics/cointelpro.html)(Counterintelligence Program), the FBI was then utilizing legal and illegal means to disrupt and discredit anti-war organizing and movements for social justice and liberation. Black leaders and organizations – from Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to the leadership of the Black Panther Party – were among those most heavily targeted.If you were politically active during that time – and I was – then you know that actual guilt for actions charged was not remotely necessary for the hunt to assemble and the racist, criminalizing din to take over.But this isn’t a column about what happened in that case, although that deserves to be known.You can read about Shakur [here](http://www.assatashakur.org/)and in[her autobiography](http://www.amazon.com/Assata-Autobiography-Shakur/dp/1556520743/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1367879728&sr=1-1&keywords=Assata+Shakur)and[latest book.](http://www.rbgstore.com/books/assata-in-her-own-words/?utm_source=assata-main-side&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=tdc#.UYgwfoKsC28)[Listen to her voice.](http://www.democracynow.org/2013/5/3/assata_shakur_in_her_own_words)It’s important to know that before she was finally convicted of several felonies related to the shootout, including killing NJ state trooper Werner Foerster, Shakur was indicted in six other criminal incidents that included murder, attempted murder, armed bank robbery, and kidnapping.Three of those charges were dismissed, and the remaining three resulted in Shakur’s acquittal.But law enforcement was out to get her, and, for a while, they did.And now they’re trying again. This is a brief glance into the bleak, racist mythos surrounding U.S. law enforcement conceptions of terror. The “Terror” Mythos The mythos that accompanies the concept of “terrorism” in this country is a product of the imagination of U.S. policy makers and police forces, and their colonial predecessors. A race-based imagination, centuries long in the making, that treats white people and people of color quite differently. An imagination that historically has construed people of color as intrinsically threatening, as terrorists amassing at, subverting, and seeking to destroy the borders of functional white supremacist control not only of major public and private institutions, but also public culture. It is an imagination that often relies on race, and subliminal, mythic associations of race, in the differential framing violence and people accused of doing violence, even as today, it asserts an official posture of “[color-blindness.”](http://www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-36-fall-2009/feature/colorblindness-new-racism) Timing is everything, and Assata Shakur’s mythic image as a terrorist of color serves several specific imaginative policing/national security state purposes at this particular moment. The First Woman on the “Most Wanted Terrorists” List The FBI chose to place Assata Shakur – whose story is known to relatively few people in this country – on the list just about a month after a new documentary,[Free Angela and All Political Prisoners,](http://blogs.indiewire.com/theplaylist/tiff-review-free-angela-all-political-prisoners-a-fascinating-chronicle-of-justice-strength-20120912)directed by[Shola Lynch](http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0528454/?ref_=tt_ov_dr), was released. In 1970, Angela Y. Davis, then a UCLA philosophy professor, Black Panther Party associate, and member of the Communist Party was placed on the FBI’s Most Wanted list and charged with conspiracy in kidnapping and murdering a California judge.Framed as a dangerous black radical who’d acquired guns and sought to overthrow the U.S. government, Davis was fashioned by law enforcement authorities as symbolic of race-based terror and disorder.Through the lens of Davis’ experience, the film reveals layer after layer of the government’s relentless effort to criminalize black dissent and rebellion. Davis was acquitted of all charges and is regarded by many as a progressive political icon.What does she, still a widely respected scholar and activist, think of the FBI’s placement of Assata Shakur on its Most Wanted Terrorist list? When the grandchildren of those who were active in the late ’60s and early ’70s are becoming involved in similar movements today, there is this effort to again terrorize young people by representing such an important figure as Assata Shakur as a terrorist. Before the Tsarnaev brothers were discovered to be the alleged perpetrators [of the Boston Marathon bombings], there was an attempt to present the person who planted the bomb as either a black man or a dark skinned man with a hoodie. This racialization of what is represented as terrorism is an attempt to bring the old-style racism into the conversation with modes of repression in the 21st century.–Angela Y. Davis Moreover, Assata Shakur is once more associated with other “dangerous” people of color. Even [liberal media](http://www.rollingstone.com/music/news/tupac-shakurs-godmother-added-to-fbi-most-wanted-terrorists-list-20130503) could not help but frame her by association (godmother, though many claimed she was his aunt) with the talented and well-known rapper, [Tupac Shakur.](http://www.2pac.com/) Of course, he was was often placed within a racist media/political frame of “thug/gang member.” But aunt, godmother, it all blurred together: Shakur now joined the pantheon of pathologized black women who produce young, criminalized black kin, either physically or spiritually. Criminalization of race and dissent is once again seamlessly blended into an image of menace.Finally, placement of Shakur as the first female on the “Most Wanted Terrorist” list comes at a time when there is increasing criminalization of young, black girls.Read more atand[The Feminist Wire](http://thefeministwire.com/2013/05/mad-science-or-school-to-prison-criminalizing-black-girls/).Using the Language of Colorblindness to Racialize Terrorism [FBI Special Agent Aaron T. Ford:](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WkQ6DbAACy8) Openly and freely in Cuba, she continues to maintain and promote her terrorist ideology. She provides anti-U.S. government speeches espousing the Black Liberation Army message of revolution and terrorism. No person, no matter what his or her political or moral convictions are, is above the law. Joanne Chesimard is a domestic terrorist who murdered a law enforcement officer, execution-style.Of course, Agent Ford is just plain wrong.Nice words, but without substance. The same “terrorist” frame and rule of law do not seem to apply to law enforcement officials, even when they shoot unarmed people of color or whose policies – such as NYC’s “Stop and Frisk”-seek to instill fear in communities of color. And, as it happens, Shakur apparently is only the second “domestic” terrorist to be placed on the FBI’s Most Wanted Terrorists list, which currently (and usually these days) is populated almost exclusively by people who are or are perceived to be Muslim and/or people of color.As we saw with the pursuit of the Tsarnaev brothers implicated in the Boston Marathon bombings, there was much media and public confusion at the intersection of “white” and “Muslim.”The result, as blogger[Chauncey DeVega](http://www.washingtonspectator.org/index.php/BREAKING-VIEWS/chauncey-devega-the-boston-bombers-and-why-white-privilege-hurts-white-america.html)writes, provides grimly fascinating insight into bogus constructions of race in a white supremacist society.“Muslim” serves as a qualifier that trumps “whiteness” in the social imagination, in effect turning the brothers into (my phrase) “failed white folks” within the white supremacist frame.And I’m not making this up; there’s historical evidence of such processes in motion, and the “average man” knows them “perfectly well.”[History Matters:](http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5076/)(h/t Chauncey DeVega) In its decision in the case of U.S.v. Bhagat Singh Thind (1923), the Supreme Court deemed Asian Indians ineligible for citizenship because U.S. law allowed only free whites to become naturalized citizens. The court conceded that Indians were “Caucasians” and that anthropologists considered them to be of the same race as white Americans, but argued that “the average man knows perfectly well that there are unmistakable and profound differences.” TheThinddecision also led to successful efforts to denaturalize some who had previously become citizens. This represented a particular threat in California, where a 1913 law prohibited aliens ineligible for citizenship from owning or leasing land.The Problem of White Folks’ Ideology & Violence in the Terror Frame For the most part, white people, even those responsible for bombings and mass shootings, are not framed as terrorists, even domestic ones.But the logic governing white people and terrorism is both twisted and bizarre.White people or predominantly white advocacy groups are sometimes considered terrorists – at least by the Right and often by law enforcement – if they advocate or commit violence, or sometimes even when they don’t.White people might be labeled “terrorist” if they:belong to such left-wing or anti-corporate environmental/animal rights groups, ranging from [EarthFirst](http://earthfirstjournal.org/) to [Animal Liberation Front](http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Actions-USA/ALF_USA-index.htm) to [Greenpeace and PETA](http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/greenpeace-peta-improperly-put-on-fbi-terrorist-watch-list.html) belonged to the [Weather Underground](http://www.pbs.org/independentlens/weatherunderground/movement.html) or similar groups of the late 1960s/early 1970s identify as [Muslim](http://www.politicalresearch.org/resources/reports/full-reports/manufacturing-the-muslim-menace/) hold [pro-LGBT views](http://dcist.com/2012/10/family_research_council_shooter_cha.php) [advocate peace](http://www.greenisthenewred.com/blog/homeland-security-says-timothy-mcveigh-isnt-a-terrorist-but-peace-activists-are/701/) and social justice Even though they areusuallyconsidered “loners, misfits, and lone wolves,” violence-minded white people harboring fervent right-wing beliefs [might have terrorist potential in the eyes of the federal government](http://thinkprogress.org/security/2013/01/18/1467741/west-point-study-right-wing-threat/?mobile=nc) when they target abortion clinics, mosques, and politicians and communities (queers, Muslims, Jews, people of color, immigrants) they hate. Oh, wait, no, scratch that thought.A report suggesting the same – timid as it was – [was withdrawn under right-wing pressure.](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/may/14/report-citing-vet-extremism-is-pulled/?page=all) Most of the time, white people are simply exempt from the terror frame – especially heavily armed white people who advocate stockpiling firearms and munitions and speak overtly and in coded ways about their willingness to engaged in armed revolution in the United States.Examples of the “white exemption” include:[The new president of the N.R.A.](http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2013/05/03/1958961/incoming-nra-president-calls-civil-war-the-war-of-northern-aggression/) The [libertarian talk show host](http://www.salon.com/2013/05/03/a_march_on_washington_with_loaded_rifles/) who says it’s time to abolish the “U.S. federal government” even as he attempts to organize a mass, “loaded rifles” show of civil disobedience in Washington, D.C. [Timothy McVeigh](http://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/04/22/whats-the-difference-between-mcveigh-and-tsarnaev/) White people who actually commit mass shootings or bombings are more likely to be called “mentally ill” or “extremist”.If they have not done actual violence, but wink at it and encourage discussion about armed revolution in the United States and are affiliated with the N.R.A., the Tea Party, or the Republican Party, they are considered “concerned American patriots.” There’s a reason the power structure in this country always prefers to make the Assatas and the Angelas the icons of danger and terror. Structural Violence is Never on the List The massive violence routinely embedded in “respectable” public and private institutions never appears on the “Most Wanted Terrorist” lists, though its many forms – including structural poverty, the violence of mass incarceration, the criminalization of immigrants, the brutality of the so-called “War on Terror (including [U.S. employment of torture](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/world/jan-june13/torture_04-16.html)), and widespread ecological devastation – not only threaten, but do real harm to countless individuals, families, and entire communities. And That’s Why Assata Shakur Is On the List She’s there to remind us about the “proper” racial frame for terrorism, and to help solidify the subliminal link between progressive political dissent, violence, and mass destruction in the social imagination. She’s there to caution younger folks against radical activism, and to remind us older activists who still care that we could be next. She’s there not only to distract us from structural violence, but to serve as a prop in strengthening it. The terror mythos offers us nothing but endless, intensified policing and war within a white supremacist framework. Let’s respond with greater courage and creativity. The answer is not to expand the terror mythos to get “more of the people we loathe” into it, but to deconstruct it. The task is to craft reform measures that lead toward dismantling the mechanics of mass fear and vengeance, and replacing it with practices that ensure community/societal accountability for violent and harmful actions within a broader framework of healing/transformative justice. And that accountability must be structural as well as individual. Our lives,those of our children and the generations following them, and the well being of all our communities depend upon it.