

Operant Subjectivity

Journal of the International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity

October 2004/January 2005 • Volume 28 • Numbers 1/2

•	•		
•	•		
		<i>Leonard J. Barchak</i>	1
		An End to Ideology	
		<i>William Stephenson</i>	13
		Theory and Methodology for Esthetics	
		<i>Daun R. Anderson</i>	33
		Female Executives in Biotechnology: A Contextual Approach to Understanding Their Work Environments	
		<i>Russell C. Hurd</i>	58
		<i>Steven R. Brown</i>	
		The Future of the Q Methodology Movement	
		<i>James C. Rhoads, Dennis F. Kinsey, Mark N. Popovich, Will Focht, Michael Stricklin, Philip Christman, and Kai-Hung Fang</i>	76
		Commentaries on “The Future of the Q Methodology Movement”	
		<i>Russell C. Hurd and Steven R. Brown</i>	93
		In Place of a Rejoinder: Embracing Factors A, B, C, and D	
		• •	
		•	
		•	
		•	
		•	
		•	

An End to Ideology

Leonard J. Barchak

McNeese State University

***Preamble:** A trilogy of ideologies is haunting the modern world—the trilogy of Marxist socialism, unencumbered individualism, and fascist religiosity. Should all the social scientific powers of old and new Europe as well as those of the Americas and their progeny enter into an alliance to hunt down and exorcise this trilogy? Perhaps it is high time that Q methodologists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet these nursery tales with a manifesto of their own. To this end, the collected works of William Stephenson and Steven Brown and those of the growing number of Q researchers, present and afoot, might be assembled and published in the major languages of the world. Now that would be a class struggle.*

Introduction

Even if imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, one can go too far with parody so let me draw the reins tight before this team of words escapes me.

I want to talk about ideology, some pressing issues of the day, and the intervention of Q methodology. Ideology in everyday life and in science can take us down a path that is an emotional live wire leading to a pool of dissolved prejudices in a cul-de-sac that traps all that travel the same route. We cannot easily turn around in such a space and go back to the place, so to speak, before the poet's two roads diverged in a yellowed wood—and we cannot stay in a cul-de-sac and still grow in human terms. Ceaselessly espousing or investigating our own ideologies can never help us to comprehend the selves of others; it cannot lead to understanding, agreement, or peaceful coexistence. Our objective as Q methodologists is, or should be, to find methods that assist in anticipating divergent paths of a dangerous or baleful kind. But we must likewise attempt to find ways to move toward ameliorating the problems that conflicting ideologies disgorge or engender. The aim is not just to understand problems but also to resolve them.

Author's address: Dept. of Mass Communication, McNeese State University, Lake Charles, LA 70609-0335; barchak@mneese.edu.

This paper is a revised version of the keynote address presented to the 20th Annual Conference of the International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, Sept. 23-25, 2004.

Operant Subjectivity, 2004/5 (Oct/Jan), 28 (1/2): 1-12.

Our own cow is in this ditch, as an old-country saying goes. Perhaps our pre-emptive actions can prevent social science research from going into history's dustbin of failed tools for human understanding as journalism, literature, film, and other media currently appear determined to do.

I wonder whether personal ideology is a result of personal biography. If so, is it mere mimicry or perhaps experience stood on its head? Do we become what we have experienced or, perhaps, a Bizarro opposite image? If either is the case, is social science research possible? Can the organic structure of who we have become ever be transcended? Can we ever see others as they encounter themselves? And act accordingly?

Not unlike others, I have had a life of rich and varied experiences. That, and the unfathomable encouragement of people like William Stephenson, suggests that something worthwhile might be said on the matter of ideology and biography. An intellectual desire over the past three decades to see vexing conflicts resolved leads me to address it now. It is also possible that the Q studies I have undertaken, alone and with others since 1975, aimed at journalism, conflict resolution, public policy, and public relations, reveal pieces of the answers. On the other hand, I have not followed up much on the philosophical promise my 1977 dissertation *Knowledge or Certainty* suggested unless you believe as I do, that the main project is to come to know subjectivity through the scientific instrumentality of Q methodology.

It would seem too much of a strain to leave knowledge on the gossamer hook of philosophical word parsing. Science seeks to substitute abductive experimentation for word games rooted in power struggles.

To this end, if you will indulge me, you shall have a directed accounting of pertinent professional and intellectual research; a look at methodological and social issues that have concerned me during my investigations; an introductory consideration of some current firestorm social issues that cry out for resolution; and, finally, suggestions how Q might be used to intervene—as well as where it might not be possible.

I begin with a brief personal note. It is the conceit of journalists and cultural historians of all kinds that the facts of one's life can be totaled up and—voilà!—a person's self can be explained or explained away. Following William James, Stephenson showed that to achieve anything at all in social science research, we must come to know the selves of others as they see themselves. There is no better instrumentality to do this than Q. Yet, the contradictory facts of my own biography (as with all biographies) are only the roughest guide to knowing me as I see myself. The story of my life does not predict who I am or what beliefs guide my research. Indeed, starting from the same biographical facts, I may have traveled a very different road.

Journalism, Conflict, Policy, and Public Relations Research

Stephenson's Q has been my general methodological approach. My abductive framework has been democracy, especially as understood by America's premiere 20th century philosopher John Dewey, who gave an incomparable understanding of the relationship of the governors to the governed in *The Public and Its Problems*. Applied to our national government, it goes something like this: Our president is not the country. Not even the congress and the president are the country. Rather, the country is the organization of the public[s] effected through officials for the protection of the interests shared by its citizens. Affecting all, these interests are public, not private, and arise from conjoint action that cause consequences that are enduring, extensive, indirect, and serious. It is the *indirect* nature of consequences that inhibits a public's ability to relate a problem to its cause or origin. Women's rights, ethnicity, religion, homosexuality, immigration, war, and so on are, as such, public issues. Helping the public become aware of its own conjoint existence is the democratic route to resolution of a problem. There is no avenue to do this in a democratic society other than through communication.

Although the bulk of my research has been carried out in a Q methodological framework, my interest in the democratic solution of problems stems from my life experience and my education and is signaled by my 1973 masters thesis on the *Reporting of the Bombing of North Vietnam: An Investigation of the USAF's Southeast Asian Information Organization, History, Function, and Credibility*. It was my conclusion that, at least in war, Congress and the President could best check the military information function. It was not yet time to rely on the media of communication—primarily the press—to bring the public to bear on the governors. This would change.

Journalism

By the time I came to be a *Missourian* city editor at the Columbia campus in 1977, I had finished my doctoral work with William Stephenson. In my philosophy of journalism graduate seminar, I edged then-popular existentialism aside and substituted Q methodology. Print and broadcast students were taught Q principles and encouraged to investigate audiences and their narratives. One Rhodesian student magnificently took up the problem of the varied views of South Africans on apartheid, but retreated from science and method at the last moment because he felt a computer in the field was unnecessary. An enterprising woman looked into the Menachem Begin and Anwar Sadat rapprochement with play theory as backdrop. Despite her courageous decision to spend the next term partly in Israel partly in Egypt, her brilliant prospectus was not put to the test. There were 20-30 other such partial investigations.

At the first Q conference in 1985, I borrowed from Charles Peirce the term retroductive—a synonym for abductive—and tried to lay out a practical theory of journalism. Portable computers with 64K were already available, and I

believed it was possible to move away from the monocular view of the news story. Brian D'Agostino's small rough program with visual rotation was available and adequate. Q would lead the way to complementarity news. The following year in Finland, I got my chance. I investigated an infamous incident of feces-throwing art students. Using Q, we asked all the "Jane Does" (the actual name was Anna Mäkinen) to sort what they thought about it, since that's who professionals said they were broadcasting to. It caught someone's attention. After convincing the researchers of Finland's National Broadcasting Company's (*Yleisradio*) long range planning staff about the possibilities of Q, I was given the chance of pitching my ideas to the journalists of their 60 *minutes*-type magazine show—*Timely Two*. Despite existing internal political struggles—the journalists were hard left, the long range staff was social democrat and centrist—we received the go ahead to develop story ideas with Q methodology. Working with a brilliant group of licentiate students (those writing a dissertation), we created visual storyboards for our discovered factors on such subjects as AIDS, glasnost, Finnish sports mania, children's place in society, and gender equality. Three of these were presented to the broadcast journalism staff, each a gem. Let's look at the AIDS study as an example. A licentiate student who was a Ph.D. economist had little sympathy for AIDS patients but threw himself professionally into the research. At that time, there were 12 AIDS patients in Finland. He got them all to participate in the study. The same with the AIDS doctors. He then covered the Thompson schema and set off for the national senate. There he sorted conservative, social democratic, centrist, and communist senators. Finally, he took up the challenge and sorted himself. Respondents with economics training—he, included—dominated one of the factors. He changed his mind about the patients, and his presentation to the hard-boiled journalists was filled with the self-awareness of one who was blind but now could see.

Conflict Resolution

In the early 1980s, there was an armed robbery of a LaSalle University nursing class by three black men with shotguns. The reaction to the robbery was waves of student protests and near calls for "guns on the parapets" to keep the surrounding black community away from the campus. It was an explosive situation with TV news trucks camped outside the college. I sent my students—black and white—to conduct non-directive interviews with all the regular subjects: student leaders, expert professors, the administration, campus security, and so on. But students also went to interview area business men, teenagers playing ball, mothers pushing baby carriages, and shut-in elderly white residents, who had not fled the inner city. Presenting the Q factors later to a symposium called by the university, black and white, young and old, student and resident confirmed that the understandings were on the money. A key factor in the success of the conference was the selection of the conference conveners. Analysis of the consensus statements suggested that all factors and factions accepted the university's Christian Brothers as above reproach. The

answer was in the zero pile, that ocean of no feeling. Suggestions that psychology, sociology, or communication professors conduct the conference could be put aside. Christian Brothers would take all the roles, and did, with success. Many broad issues were cleared.

A few years later, a female LaSalle Q student took up the problem of women, pornography, and violence with a twist. Though young and demure she picked up the gauntlet that I had thrown down. Instead of just haranguing those enamored of pornography, she would try to understand them, and regular women too, and feminists, indeed all who might have a hand in the conflict's resolution. She visited adult bookstores in seedy parts of Philadelphia and collected a Q-sample of images, no doubt frightening or repulsive to many. To these she added the kinds of images one finds in the gentler women's magazines. At the end, she flinched and turned her Q sort over to me. In the ensuing years, I've never found a feminist colleague who would consider such an investigation—and that's without showing the pictures.

In 1985, I finally presented my paradigm research on the belief systems of the scholars of communication to the Ferment in the Field International Communication Association (ICA) Conference in Hawaii. From the 4-foot long tail of paper-requesters attached to the final table copy, it is easy to conclude that my *Ferment or Sour Grapes?* was a hot item. It captured the four paradigms subscribed to by some of the most famous communication scientists, including people like William Stephenson, Colin Cherry, and founding father Paul Lazarsfeld. Three of the four paradigms shared a concern with error: methodological, philosophical, or scholastic. Only one factor subscribed to a paradigm extolling an absolutist faith in scientific research—holding that, when done correctly, science leads to perfect knowledge. Except for one Swede, all those on this factor were Eastern European communists—as evidenced by their writings. My paper was slated for a large plenary session on a choice day near the beginning of the conference. To the session, I invited several representatives of each factor to come discuss and perhaps resolve their incommensurate views. Don Brenner served as respondent. Prominent participants were secured. Then just prior to the conference, my plenary session was switched to the last day of the gathering in a small room out of the way under a stairwell. Only the absolutist factor representatives failed to show. My Q-based paper was omitted from the book born of the conference. The leadership of ICA had passed into the hands of the absolutists.

Most recently, I offered George Bush and Al Gore free Q-methodological advice on how to retain maximum support from the citizenry as their lawyers wrangled during late 2000. (Some quirk of human nature prevents people from valuing that for which they don't pay.) In any event, the innovation here was to show the impartiality of Q in conflict resolution, that the interpretations could be used to correct journalistic meanderings and prevent the candidates from digging a hole for themselves. Unfortunately for Al Gore, I did not actually deliver the information when he could have used it. Instead, without a

Q guidance system his advisors and native inclinations let him finally dig a hole too deep to get out of. Somehow George Bush had the sense to stop digging—actually to stop talking. All this was in the Q sorts.

Public Policy

In 1977, I was asked by one of the eastern European scholars who had been Q sorted for my *Knowledge or Certainty?* to contribute a chapter for a Yugoslavian book to be published in Croatia on the sociality of communication. I faced the “nationalities questions” that years later would lead to so many wars in that region. It was my suggestion—following Thompson and Stephenson—that all the pertinent parties participate in a grand Q study to include business managers from each republic and autonomous province; church officials from each of the three major religious denominations; praxis Marxists from each area; authorities; proletarians; peasants; technocrats; and the uninformed. In the hubris of youth, I also proposed that the president of the country—Marshall Josip Broz Tito—be gotten to perform a sort with my proposed Q sample. Following Dewey I gave process responsibility to the Yugoslavian socialist-journalist, exhorting him or her to go beyond the role of mass communicator to become a theorist and communication researcher as well. *Discovery of Socialist Opinion*, according to a prominent Serbian professor I later met, became quite well known in Yugoslavian academic circles. It is an indication of the solidity of Stephenson's Q theorization that the proposal of this American pragmatist was included in a volume that hosted a pride of famous Marxists and Communists. It is tragic that Yugoslavians did so little along Q lines.

While a Fulbrighter a decade later at the 340-year-old University of Helsinki, Finland, I was invited to advise the American ambassador. It was my part to assess attitudes toward America and Americans. Students in Finland, at that time, generally passed directly into the leadership tracks of their chosen fields, only relinquishing their hold at retirement or death. Q research, eventually published as *Two Faces Have I*, showed that the future media elite of Finland had two views of Americans, both negative: one, “A People Better than its Government” and an even darker, “The American Dream is Dead—or Ought To Be” factor. This came as quite a surprise, considering Finland was often called the most-Americanized country in Europe and the study had been conducted in the most pro-American media department in the country. This orientation by the future media leaders should have been a wake-up call for American diplomacy; their Q sorts presage the open and widespread European anti-Americanism of today.

Recycling was a campaign issue and then a governing decision for the mayor of my home city in Louisiana as the third millennium arrived. It also permitted Q an opportunity to reach an entire polity. Not only did the mayor provide a Q sort but so did each member of the city council, leading members of the local media, private and public recycling authorities, on-the-ground

trash collectors, and regular citizens from every part of town. It is the most complex of my studies with seven factors, including one bipolar. Statements about media use and recycling were embedded in the Q sample and yielded a provisional media profiling approach to complement the eight unique understandings. Different factors not only want their own message, however, they appear to favor one form of media over others. As with most of my Q discoveries, neither race, age, sex, nor social status suffices to explain individual understandings.

Public Relations

Q meshes remarkably well with modern public relations theory whose guiding principle is clearly democratic: *Public relations helps an organization and its publics adapt mutually to each other.*

Professional public relations was pushed to the back of my mind after my Master's thesis on the Vietnam war's PR apparatus, but when I returned to the United States after my 1986-87 Helsinki excursion, I was given teaching and organizational duties in that field. At the first opportunity, I undertook a marketing segmentation and public relations assessment with McNeese's Small Business Development Center for a prominent and politically connected family-owned lumber and hardware business. Q research showed four distinct habits of mind amongst contractors in dealing with a supplier: Strictly Business, Sociable Information Seeker, No Frills, and How About Some Help? An important finding came not so much from sorting the contractors as sorting the owner, who aligned his view of the business with a minor audience segment. What apparently saved the business plan was that actual contractor sales were conducted by a "rough-around-the-edges guy" that saw through the same eyes as the big contractors. A four-prong strategy was suggested to replace the limiting all-in-one approach.

Although results were not presented outside the Q community until just recently, I initially looked into the problem of growing audiences for a symphony orchestra as early as 1991. Commissioned by the liberal arts dean on behalf of the Lake Charles Symphony, I utilized a sophisticated group of women to conduct the Q research. In a two-day blitz, I trained more than a dozen board of directors volunteers to understand the principles of Q and to conduct, record, and transcribe non-directive interviews. I then launched the board members all over the county and had them follow up later with the actual Q sorting. Not only did the study provide long-range guidance, it had a natural (and powerful) constituency for its implementation. It was used to acquire many grants and has been utilized by symphony orchestras in Florida, Boston, and London.

A public relations study I presented in 1998 had as its central question the attitudes of students at a middle-sized university toward foreign language learning. It was the administration's guess that students were hostile to such learning so they throttled the university's foreign language requirement. The

Q research for the Department of Languages showed the administration was misguided. Q found two views and both were positive, one seeing foreign language training as "gaining another soul," the other as doggedly realizing that foreign language ability is a necessity in the modern world regardless of one's desires.

Insights gained from all these public relations studies were used to focus my mini Q seminar last year for professional public relations practitioners at the annual conference of the Public Relations Society of America. There were inquiries afterward from environmentalists, research companies, the US Air Force, and others.

A Firestorm of Social Issues

If we as Q methodologists are ready to overcome our biographies and our ideologies, we can sample the concourses, sort the people, and report the studies that can serve to truly understand the conflicts that so trouble us. If we can collaborate with journalists, creative artists of all kinds, professional communicators, and policy makers our studies might even get off their dusty shelves and into action. It will often mean taking into account, not just odd or foolish views but hostile or repulsive ones as well. It will require an insightful use of multiple conditions of instruction, single case studies, an eye on the zero pile, and a willingness to hear and understand one's *bête noire*.

Race

In the case of race relations between blacks and whites, for instance, the researcher might need to seek out Q statements that embrace racial epithets. Statements demanding group allegiance, reparations, or passionate preferences have to be considered. Pro-tem segregationist and race-baiting opinions cannot be overlooked. Calls for the dismantling or renewed construction of affirmative action must have their day in front of those who have an interest in the conflict. Opinions about facts that tend to differentiate—and isolate—the races on abortion, crime, and out-of-wedlock births need to be in play. Nor should calls to observe and resolve structural inequalities be systematically left out of the mix. Some statements will need to rise above mere general preferences and biases to explore definite beliefs and policies. None of this ravenous statement collection should be taken to support racism of any kind. Rather, it is a chance for the researcher—and more particularly the respondents—to grapple with their own ideology and biography and perhaps to set themselves outside it. This is the kind of growth experienced by the Finnish AIDS researcher. It was the aim of the proposed study on women and pornography, not to dismiss feminine and feminist concerns but to embrace men in a productive conversation about the matter.

Immigration

There is no consistent logic on any side of the question of unrestricted immigration across America's southern border. Those who argue for unrestricted access to America as a basic human right may very well be the

same who say that Europe and Asia of past centuries should not have sent teeming masses to overwhelm those peoples already here. Contrarily, those who seek to build impenetrable barriers are perhaps those who will one day feel most secure as the overwhelmingly Catholic southern populations are drawn into middle class life. They may well extol the enduring marriages and large families of their new allies. If these meanderings of logic can be captured in Q statements and set before special and class interests, as well as experts, existing authorities, and particularly the uninformed, perhaps we can do better than muddling through. No one can predict from where will come the synthetic understandings that prove to be genuine solutions. Yet their chances of being discovered without methodology are, as Peirce said, “one to infinity.” It is not impossible that like in the LaSalle study, the answer may be nestled in the zero pile—the area of no meaning for all factors.

Religion

Our constitution and basic rights in America are derived from the secularization of Christianity, a religion based on “turning the other cheek” but also on the fundamental equality of all humans. When not corrupted by earthly pursuits, Christians are all over the world ministering to the impoverished, the afflicted, and the powerless. Moreover, Christianity is not on the march anywhere with sword in hand; whatever its human history, pacifism is its main objective, and this is especially true of Catholicism. Such would seem to be quite in line with modern liberal thinking, but somehow Christian doctrine or ideology is the object of all progressive righteous wrath. One has to set this at the feet of Karl Marx, who not only exorcised the Christian God but lambasted other socialist groups as “dirty Jews of Negro blood.”¹ Focusing not on Marx’s expressed bile for innumerable groups and human beings but only on consanguinity, Mikhail Gorbachev had it about right when he said to a priest who had been his transatlantic seat companion that the priest was almost a communist.² Obviously, it could have been the priest who got the jump on Gorbachev and pronounced him almost a Christian. (Or in Q methodological terms, “We’re on the same factor.”) In either case, while their goals and beliefs are remarkably similar, they are separated by a commitment to absolutist non-scientific systems of discovery and are fruitlessly locked in their own

¹ Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich. *The Communist Manifesto*. Ed. Joseph Katz. NY: Washington Square Press, 1965, p. 21. Intentional hostile dishonesty is also a plan of Marx: “In Germany [Communists] fight with the bourgeoisie when it acts in a revolutionary way. . . . But they never cease to instill into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, in order that the German workers may straightway use, as so many weapons against the bourgeoisie, the social and political conditions along with its supremacy, and in order that, after the fall of the reactionary classes in Germany, the fight against the bourgeoisie itself may immediately begin.” (p. 115)

² Compare this with a famous quote from Mikhail S. Gorbachev: “Jesus was the first socialist, the first to seek a better life for mankind.”

http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/m/mikhail_s_gorbachev.html

ideologies. Not ignoring important differences like abortion rights, I ask whether there are Q methodologists who could help get these close relatives to visit each other’s house?

At the same time that liberals and Christians hyperventilate about kith and kin, there is only a one-sided concourse among the general public about the religion of Islam, proclaiming it a religion of peace. If it has become such since its 7th century birth, it is certainly not in the basic documents of that religion. Even a cursory reading of an unexpurgated version of the Koran or Hadith unveils a stream of murderous and sadistic invective against all who do not follow its teachings.³ Saudi Arabian Osama Bin Laden, Egyptian Ayman Zawahri, and the Jordanian Abu Zarqawi would seem to be true messengers not heretics. It might be important to take from the five holy books of Islam a concourse that will cover all of its attitudinizing. Joined to a suitable concourse of democracy and one of socialist teaching, a sample could be taken and administered in Sadr City, Kirkuk and Fallujah. Or could it? Americans, including American Muslims, might see value in such research, but I certainly have doubts. While I often cite James Baldwin’s observation that no problem can be solved until it is faced, I also recall his proviso that “not all problems we face can be solved.” Unfortunately, this is also the terminus of the entire field of conflict resolution that concludes one must be ready to defeat another who is bent on defeating you. Of course, the key is to know when this dreadful impasse is unavoidable.

The Second Iraq War

There is so much duplicity and self-serving rhetoric about this issue that building up a Q approach is quite demanding. Nevertheless, the sample of statements must draw from statements that support and reject all of the pertinent elements. None of the debatable “truths” should be left without opinion statements to represent them. In its American phase, the views of

³ For instance, *Qur’an* 9:5 “Fight and kill the disbelievers wherever you find them, take them captive, harass them, lie in wait and ambush them using every stratagem of war” (quoted by Winn). Craig Winn draws on the oldest surviving written evidence. He writes, “These official works include: the Sira, Ta’rikh, Hadith, and Qur’an. Ishaq’s Sira, or biography, called Sirat Rasul Allah, provides the lone account of Muhammad’s life and the formation of Islam written within 200 years of the prophet’s death. While the character, message, and deeds portrayed within its pages are the antithesis of Christ’s and his disciples, the Sira’s chronological presentation is similar in style to the Christian Gospels. The Ta’rikh is the oldest, most trusted and comprehensive history of Islam’s formation and Muhammad’s example, called Sunnah. . . . It begins with Islamic creation and ends with the acts of Muhammad’s companions. Tabari is a compilation of Hadith quotes and Qur’an passages. As such, it provides the best skeleton upon which to flesh out the character of Muhammad and the nature of fundamental Islam. A Hadith is an oral report from Muhammad or his companions. Muslims believe that Hadith were inspired by Allah, making them scripture. . . . Allah’s Book, the Qur’an, lacks context and chronology, so to understand it, readers are dependent upon the Sira, Ta’rikh, and Hadith.” Winn also provides a guide to the English translations of ancient Islamic manuscripts he uses in *Prophet of Doom*, for those who wish to read the complete texts.

people like those who attended the various recent political conventions must be sought but so must those of the marchers in the streets, and those in so-called flyover country. Certainly one needs to be able to attitudinize about the undiscovered weapons of mass destruction, but the 5,000 Saddam torture deaths a month must not be missing. There need to be statements about American military crimes and missteps, but Iraqi rape squads should not be spared nor the blood payments to suicide bombers. Let the respondents say whether the Shia and Kurd 80 percent majority should be sacrificed to the Sunni will to power. Let them also estimate whether President Bush is a fool to believe there is freedom in the hearts of all Iraqis. Let them gauge whether Iraqis are irrecoverable slaves to an ideology of religious serfdom. Let the financial dealings of the Germans and particularly the French come into play. Let them also consider the caution and accuracy of Hans Blix's reports. Have those performing the Q sort pore over the imminent collapse of sanctions and the rebuilding of weapons of mass destruction that was likely to happen. Let them contemplate whether the vaguely socialist Iraq of Saddam's Baathists would collaborate with the radical Islamists as Stalin did with Hitler. Will individual subjectivity line up with biography or ideology? Will ideal opinion correlate with status quo or with real opinion?

A Call to Research

"Read, read, read, work, pray, and re-read," had guided the chemist's inquiry until the 18th century. It is one of the chief reasons the scientific revolution in that field was delayed 300 years. No one could tell a compound from an element. Father of modern chemistry, Antoine Laurent Lavoisier—who was almost a modern scientist—instead took his mind into the laboratory and made beakers and flasks the instruments of his thought. He did this, according to Peirce, with his "eyes wide open, . . . manipulating real things instead of words and fancies" (in Buchler, 1956, p. 6). *Mutatis mutandis*, as Stephenson might say, this holds as well for Q methodology. But instead of the real things of physical science, we concern ourselves with discovering the stable factors of subjectivity. Moreover, our measurements are not made by the researcher but by the person doing the sort since only that person has access to his or her subjectivity. Q research is not biography, biology, or ideology though all may inform it. Q sets itself against the modern trilogy of ideologies if these are offered as final arbiters. Though it begins with broad abductions, Q refuses to become the lapdog of the historical method, philosophical speculation, self-righteous journalism, cultural musings, or encyclopedic accumulations. It expects indeterminacy, counts on probability theory, but refuses to submit to the disease of survey research that homogenizes subjectivity into a thick goo of averages. Its field of play is public policy, journalism, conflict resolution, public relations, and all the disciplines that are of concern to Q methodologists.

So, to conclude as we began—with tongue in check:

Q methodologists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the overthrow of all pre-scientific worldviews. Let the ruling ideologies tremble. Factors of atomic uniformity and limited independent variety have nothing to lose but their vagueness. They have a world to share.

Q METHODOLOGISTS OF ALL SOCIAL SCIENCES, UNITE!

References

- Buchler, Justus (ed). 1956. *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Winn, Craig. *Prophet of Doom: Islam's Terrorist Dogma in Muhammad's Own Words*, http://www.ProphetOfDoom.net/pod_toc.