

Professor Hayward R. Alker  
Office: VKC 324  
Seminar: Thursdays, 5-8pm  
Room: VKC204  
Irregular Lab : Thursdays, 8-9pm

School of International Relations  
Office Hours: Tues. 2-545pm;  
after class non-lab days, and by appointment  
Tel: 213-740-2152, alker@usc.edu  
Fax: 213-742-0281

### **SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH METHODS: INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH DESIGN (IR 513, Spring 2004)**

Purposes: This course is designed reasonably, historically and experientially to introduce the academically oriented graduate student of International Relations (IR) to the self-conscious, historical and social scientific research practices of their professional peers in history and the social sciences. Its multi-disciplinary character resonates with discussions within IR about “explanation vs understanding” research goals, “constructivist” vs “naturalistic” research methodologies and “theoretical” vs “historical,” “practical” or “policy-oriented” modes of inquiry. These practices of inquiry involve schools of thought, disciplinary and/or paradigmatic orientations, research programs, and knowledge interests embedded in research contexts. Linked to motivating “logics” or philosophies of inquiry, are qualitative and quantitative methodologies and designs implementing such logics. Competent practitioners can also provide situation-specific justifications for, and constructive criticisms of, such research practices, informed by an understanding of the relevant discipline’s history and traditions of research practice. Only such forms of competence justify the making of “rationally redeemable validity claims” (Habermas’ term) that help constitute general or particular bodies of knowledge justifiably described as “truthful,” situationally “adequate,” “historically accurate,” “mature,” “cumulative” or “scientific.” This course aspires to cultivate a moderate, yet discriminating level of competence in delineating, constructively criticizing, adapting and rationally using such research practices. Ph.D students are required as well later on to take a more specialized, advanced methodology course hopefully relevant to shaping their own dissertation research.

Philosophies of knowledge growth (epistemologies), methodologies of inquiry and research methods. Following Lakatos, the course treats methodologies as applied epistemologies, and research methods as replicable procedures giving form and content to these methodologies in particular theoretically and historically structured research contexts. Giving priority of place to the empirical, explanatory focus of “positive” or “naturalistic” social scientific inquiry, the first half of the course will review a variety of increasingly sophisticated modes of explanatory research practice, including Weberian historical sociocultural and socioeconomic inquiry. Weberian efforts to integrate interpretive and explanatory research logics will serve, after a brief look at constructivist approaches, to point us toward more humanistic or hermeneutically oriented historiographic literatures. This means that we shall next turn historical-philosophical lenses on history itself, i.e. on the nature of historical inquiry (the subject of Ringer’s and Igger’s and Hall’s required texts). Finally, we shall look at evaluative methodologies, paying special attention to the truth-uncovering and emancipatory potential of deliberatively oriented feminist social criticism. We thus explore and synthesize what Habermas would describe as the positive, hermeneutic and emancipatory scholarly knowledge interests, respectively, of: 1) discovering valid, perhaps causal, “explanations;” 2) clarifying meanings and “enhancing practical understandings;” and 3) facilitating “progressive, or enlightened, human development.” These deeply held concerns are at the heart of much debate about international inquiry.

LABoratory focus: Besides reading about and critically/constructively discussing research practices and procedures, we shall retrospectively engage in them. This means learning by doing, by actively participating in research efforts. Most of this work will be emulative attempts to understand, rehearse, reproduce, explore and extend select pieces of exemplary research. As should become apparent by the middle of the course, the laboratory

exercises are designed to help the student bridge some of the most challenging “gaps” identified in the IR literature: first, that between scientific (causal) explanation, and humanly oriented, shared “understanding” as the guiding purpose for socio-historical inquiry; secondly, that between Enlightenment-inspired theoretical or practical inquiry and skepticism about the genuineness of social scientific knowledge enhancement and/or its historically progressive contributions. Topically, we shall look at experimental, historical, participatory, and statistical efforts to provide causal explanations, “narrative intelligibility,” “practical knowledge about...,” “lesson drawing from...,” and “explanatory” or “emancipatory” “understanding”.

Additionally, starting from several outlines of a good research proposal, as modified by the remainder of course readings, the student will prepare a 10-12 page research proposal building on, and attempting to go beyond, an article, chapter or book assigned as required reading in IR500 or one of the 4 domain overview courses.

Appropriate background knowledge: This course is oriented towards students in the second term of an IR Ph.D program. An overview treatment of IR theories, such as in IR500, is assumed as background to define the characteristic foci of this rich, inter-disciplinary field of study; similarly, an undergraduate or graduate introduction to empirical/statistical/computational research methods (IR 511 on Multivariate Research Methods or an equivalent course) will this year also be presupposed.

Required work, purchases, grading. The grading will reflect the importance of both the PHISS readings and the LAB work. Evaluation formats will differ for these two parts of the course:

- Practice-suggestive summaries of one short and one long optional readings in this Syllabus, to be made available to the class on or before the day the reading is listed (except for the first two weeks). It is the student’s responsibility to find a copy of these items, which usually will NOT be placed on reserve. The readings should be from different sections of the course. 15%
- Mid term open book take home exam, 20%
- Lab exercises, 20%. ( Late labs will be reduced by at least one letter grade)
- student research proposal, 15%
- Closed book final exam, focused on Parts III -V of the Syllabus, 20%
- Class attendance and participation, 10%.
- 

Except for Lab exercises done jointly, all the written work in this course should be solely the student’s own work, with proper citations to the work of others.

Almost all required short readings will be available both in electronic and paper form in or through the Leavy Library. Generally, if several chapters or sections are assigned, it is my preference that the whole book be on reserve, as a way of encouraging further student browsing. Free handouts will sometimes be given out in class, but only there, and on the day they are first handed out. Books by Alker (if available in time), Lakatos and Musgrave, Elman and Elman, Weber, Ringer, Ackerly, Hall, Iggers, are to be purchased. Alker and Hurwitz’s monograph is available as an eBook within the USC/Leavy library resources. If you can’t afford any of these, individual copies of all required books should be on reserve in Leavy Library.

Students requesting academic accommodations based on disability are required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP when adequate documentation is filed. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me as early in the semester as possible. DSP is open Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00. The office is in Student Union 301 and their phone number is (213) 740-0776.

## I. Introduction and Overview

**January 15. Course Overview: Contemporary Social Scientific and Historical Methodological Perspectives Required:** 1) H. R. Alker, "On Curricular Perestroika," draft APSA paper, 2004.

2) H.R. Alker, "Introduction: Voyages of Rediscovery," pp. 1-20 of his Rediscoveries and Reformulations (hereafter, R&R), Cambridge U. Press, 1996; plus Table 2 (Elements of A Progressive Research Paradigm Complex) from Alker's "Logic, Dialectics, Politics," 1982;

3) H. R. Alker, Jr., "Historical Argumentation and Statistical Inference: Towards More Appropriate Logics for Historical Research," *Historical Methods* 17/3 (Summer 1984): 164-173. *Erratum*, Vol. 17/4: 270.

4) H.R. Alker, "The Dialectical Logic of Thucydides' Melian Dialogue," pp. 23-63, in R&R. A shorter version of this chapter appeared in the APSR, Vol. 82,3 (1988), available through Leavy (JSTOR).

5). Foreward (by Kenneth N. Waltz) and "Introduction: Appraising Progress in IR Theory," by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, in C. Elman and M. F. Elman, eds., Progress in International Relations Theory, MIT Press, 2003, Cambridge, pp. vii-xii, 1-20.

6). Georg G. Iggers, Historiography in the Twentieth Century, Wesleyan U. Press, Hanover, 1997, pp. 1-19.

7). John R. Hall, "Prologue," pp. 1-5, plus figures on pp. 176, 181, and 206 in his Cultures of Inquiry: From Epistemology to Discourse in Sociohistorical Research, Cambridge U. Press, NY, 1999.

8). Brooke A. Ackerly, "Silent voices and everyday critics," Ch. 1 of her Political Theory and Feminist Social Criticism, Cambridge U. Press, pp. 1-32.

**Optional:** Alker, "Logic, Dialectics, Politics, from his edited special issue on "Dialectical Logics for the Political Sciences," Poznan Studies, 1982; or his "Aristotelean Political Methodologies," in Rediscoveries and Reformulations, suggesting three Aristotelean disciplines of political inquiry: ethical, the synthesis of art and science, and cosmological.

**Laboratory, January 15, Due Jan 19<sup>th</sup>, 10am, in Alker's VKC330 Mailbox.** Graphing Arguments, Debates, Reasoning Processes. This will be an extension of items 3) and 4) above and Ch. 4 ("Argumentation Analysis") of Chris Hart, Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 1998. Alker will review the Hart and Alker readings in class January 15<sup>th</sup> during or before the lab hour.

## II. The Search for Scientific Explanations of Politics and International Relations

**January 22. Statistical/Large-N/Quasi-Experimental Approaches to Explanatory Causal Analysis**

This will largely be a review of some major points from IR511, which IR students should have taken by now.

**Required:** 1) H. Blalock, Causal Inference in Nonexperimental Research, pp. 1-30 (approx.), U. of N. Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1964.

2) H. R. Alker, "Causal Inference and Political Analysis," in J. Bernd, ed., Mathematical Applications in Political Science, II, SMU Press, Dallas, 1966. A synthesis of biometric, econometric, and Simon-Blalock causal inference techniques, linked to modern questions of political analysis.

3) D.T. Campbell, "Reforms as Experiments," in D. T. Campbell, Methodology and Epistemology for Social Science: Selected Papers, S. Overman, ed., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1988. This article is correctly famous for its creativity, its Popperian scientific acumen, and its suggestion of evaluation standards beyond those of statistical significance.

4) Wm. N. Dunn, "Reforms as Arguments," and D.T. Campbell, "Experiments as Arguments," Knowledge 3(1982), pp. 293-326 and 327-37. Campbell graciously concedes that experimental standards of inquiry, which are the foundation of the "hard" natural sciences and the analogical basis of his quasi-experimental approach to causal inquiry, are in fact structured argumentation practices. Toulmin's "jurisprudential" model of social scientific inquiry, somewhat similar to his "clinical" mode of inquiry, previously discussed, is also notable.

**Optional:** Skim or reread the philosophical parts of the main social science text used in IR511: Agresti and Finlay,

Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Prentice Hall, 1999 .

**Partly Required Examples**, one of which will form the basis for different versions of the following Lab:

B. M. Pollins, "Global Political Order, Economic Change, and Armed Conflict: Coevolving Systems and the Use of Force," APSR, Vol. 90,1(March 1996), pp. 103-117.

N. Choucri and R. North, Nations in Conflict: National Growth and International Violence, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1975, table of contents, pages on their basic simultaneous equation model, its fit to different countries, and the methodological appendix(pp. 25, 168f, 244-43, 258-66, 274f, 302-23).

Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, "The Effectiveness of Antiterrorism Policies: A Vector-Autoregression-Intervention Analysis," APSR , 87,4(December 1993): 829-44.

N. Sambanis, "Partition as a Solution to Ethnic War: An Empirical Critique of the Theoretical Literature," World Politics, 52,4(July 2000): 437-483.

**Laboratory Jan. 22, due Jan. 26, 10am, in Alker's VKC330 mailbox.:** Dynamic Graphs of Causally Oriented Explanatory Research Practices, Including Agresti and Finlay; Hollis and Smith; Rescher; D. T. Campbell; W. N. Dunn; Cortes, Przeworski and Sprague, etc.

### **January 29. Qualitative "Positivism," "Scientific Case Studies", and Their Alternatives.**

This class builds on and amplifies the distinctions and unifications suggested in Alker's "Logic, Dialectics, Politics," as initially reviewed the first week of class.

**Required:** 1) . Introduction, Ngaire Woods, Explaining International Relations Since 1945.

2) A. J. Ayer, "Introduction," in his edited Logical Positivism, Free Press, New York, 1959.

3) Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1995) "The Importance of Research Design in Political Science." American Political Science Review 89, No. 2 (June): 475–81. The table of contents, preface, and Chapter 1 of Designing Social Inquiry are available at <<http://pup.princeton.edu/titles/5458.html>>.

4) James Johnson, "Consequences of Positivism: A Pragmatist Assessment," APSA Annual Meetings, August 2003, draft made available by the author;

5) A L. George and T. J. McKeown, "Case Studies and Theories of Organizational Decision Making," in Advances in Information Processing in Organizations, 2(1985): 21-58; and Bennett, Andrew, and Alexander L. George. 1997. "Process Tracing in Case Study Research." Paper presented at the MacArthur Foundation Workshop on Case Study Methods, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA), Harvard University, October 17–19, available on Andrew Bennett's website at Georgetown University.

6) Albert R. Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin, The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning, University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1988, pp. 1-46. A "classical" conception of case study methods.

**Optional:** 1) A.L. George, "Case Studies and Theory Development," in P. G. Lauren, ed., Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy, Free Press, New York, 1970, pp. 43-68.

2) G. King, R. Keohane, S. Verba, Designing Social Inquiry, Princeton U. Press, 1994.

3) John Gerring, Social Science Methodology: A criterial framework, Cambridge, NY, 2001

4) Stephen Van Evera. Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1997; and his Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict, Cornell U. Press, Ithaca, 1999, esp. Chapter 7 on the causes of WWI, pp. 193-239.

5) J. A. Maxwell, Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 1996.

6) Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds., Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards, Rowman and Littlefield, forthcoming. Mss. Available from Prof. Alker.

7) Dwain Mefford, "Case-Based Reasoning, Legal Reasoning, and the Study of Politics," Political Behavior, 12(1990): 125-158)

8) For an authoritative and detailed overview of NSF-funded teaching of qualitative research methods used in the teaching of qualitative research methods in International Relations and Foreign Policy, see the Sjoberg volumes on reserve in Leavy library.

**February 5 and 12. Liberal Institutionalism, Offensive/Defensive Realism, Democratic Peace as Lakatosian Research Programs**

**Required:** 1) Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., U. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1970, Postscript, pp. 174-210.

2) I. Lakatos, "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs," pp.91-195 in I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave, eds., Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge, Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge, 1970.

3) Elman and Elman (pp. 1-11, 19-68), Keohane and Martin (pp.71-108), J. L. Ray (pp.205-244), and Robert Jervis (pp.277-310) in Colin Elman and Miriam F. Elman, eds., Progress in International Relations Theory, MIT Press, Cambridge, 2003.

**Optional:** 1) D.T. Campbell, "Evolutionary Epistemology," in P. A. Schilpp, ed, The Philosophy of Karl Popper, Open Court, LaSalle, IL, 1974, 413-63.

3) Paul Diesing, How Does Social Science Work?, U. of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 1991. A sympathetic, but different account.

4) Stephen Toulmin's chapter, pp.39-47, in Lakatos and Musgrave, eds., op. cit., and his Human Understanding, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972, one of the earliest and best book length treatments of evolutionary epistemology.

5) John A. Vasquez et al, "Forum" on "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative vs. Progressive Research Programs," pp. 899- 934, APSR, Vol. 91(December 1997).

6) Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Library of Unified Science, Chicago, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

7) Larry Laudan, Beyond Positivism and Relativism: Theory, Method, and Evidence, Westview, Boulder, 1996.

**Laboratory:** A librarian will help us to get familiar with the Social Science Citation Index and related bibliographic sources.

**February 12 and 19 Mixed Mode (Merton + March&Simon, Kuhn + Lakatos+ others) Assessments of Scientific Progress**

1) G. Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," APSR, Vol. 63, No.3 (Sept. 1969): 689-718;

2) H. R. Alker and R. Hurwitz, Resolving Prisoner's Dilemmas, APSA, Washington, D.C., 1980, Chs. 1 (Intro), Ch.2 (Paradigms, Paradoxes, and Scientific Progress), 3(The Game Learning Research Paradigm), plus tables summarizing the contributions of other "research paradigm complexes" from Chs. 4-6; Alker, "Beneath Tit-for-Tat," Ch.9, pp. 303-331, R&R; Both Kuhn's "disciplinary matrix" reformulation of his "paradigm" idea and Lakatos' "Sophisticated Methodological Falsificationism" and Habermas's "sponsorship-application contexts" are at the root of the research paradigm complex notion.

4) Stephen Walker, "Operational Code Analysis as a Scientific Research Program," Ch. 7, pp. 245-276, Jack Snyder, "Is' and 'Ought': Evaluating Empirical Aspects of Normative Research," pp. 349-80, and John Vasquez, "Kuhn vs. Lakatos," Ch. 13 in Elman and Elman, op. cit., pp.419-454.

**Optional:** 1) Alker and Hurwitz, "Reasons, Causes, Games, Lessons and Evolution in Inequitable Sequential Prisoner's Dilemmas", ISA paper, 2001; Rom Harré and P. Secord, The Explanation of Social Behavior, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, 1972, esp. Chapter 1; and Alker, Brassler, Mo, "Iterated Prisoner's Dilemmas as Moral-Political Dramas," ISA paper, 2003.

**Laboratory:** Using Michael Brassler's SPD Grapher program, the student will have a chance to explore a variety of perspectives for explaining SPD/IPD game behavior in the Alker-Hurwitz-Rothkin data sets.

**Midterm Take Home Exam, Due Monday, February 23rd, 10am, in Alker's VKC330 Mailbox.** The student will choose a way of assessing scientific progress based on the previously assigned course readings, justify its appropriateness for application to one of the substantive topics covered in IR500, a Domain course, or a chapter in Walter Carlsnaes, T. Risse, B. A. Simmons, eds., Handbook of International Relations ; Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2002. **(To be put on 2 hour reserve)** The exam should discuss the extent to which knowledge has cumulated in these terms. This exam should be done individually, WITHOUT collaboration.

#### **February 26: Weberian Socioeconomic History**

**Required:** 1) Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, introduction by Anthony Giddens. Entire book, including introduction. Alternatively, <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/Doc?id=2002712> .

2) G. Hernes, "The Logic of the Protestant Ethic," Rationality and Society, Vol. 1, No. 1 (1989): 123-162.

3) Randall Collins, "Weber's Last Theory of Capitalism," in his Weberian Sociological Theory, Cambridge U. Press, 1987, pp. 19-44.

4) N.G. Onuf 's discussion of Weberian political societies in Ch. 6 of Onuf's World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations, University of Southern Carolina Press, Columbia, 1989, pp.196-227.

#### **March 4. A Deeper Look at Weberian Theories of Social Interaction, Subsequent Philosophy on Intentional Action, Causation, and Social Constitution seen as Contextual/Processual Challenges to the Adequacy of Causal/Structural Equation Modeling**

**Required:** 1)Fritz Ringer, Max Weber's Methodology: The Unification of the Cultural and Social Sciences,. Harvard U. Press, 1997.

**Optional:** 1) H. Alker, "Are There Structural Models of Voluntaristic Social Action?," Quality and Quantity 8(1974), 199-246. Pay particular attention to the framework of analysis for resolving collective action problems, the Prisoner's Dilemma and Collective Security operational regimes/rules examples, and the dialogically structured conclusions.

2) Daniel Little, Micro-foundations, Method, and Causation: On the Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, 1998. Chap. 10 on causal realism is particularly suggestive.

3) G. Simmel , On individuality and social forms; selected writings. Edited and with an introd. by Donald N. Levine. U. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1971.

4) Alicia Juarrero, Dynamics in Action: Intentional Behavior as a Complex System, MIT Press, 1999 .

#### **March 11. Introduction to Social Constructivism**

**Required:** 1) N. G. Onuf, World of Our Making, Chapter 1 ("Constructivism"), Ch2. ("Law and Language"), "Regimes [including collective security and mutual insecurity maintenance through nuclear deterrence] (pp. 145-159), and the Liberal "Presumption of Anarchy" Ch. 5 (163-195). The pioneering book on contemporary constructivism, grounded in Austin-Wittgenstein-Searle speech act theory, the writings of Weber, Habermas, Kratochwil, etc.

2).R.B. Hall, "Applying the 'Self/Other' Nexus in International Relations," International Studies Review, Vol. 3,1(Spring 2001): 101-111.

3) G. Duffy, B. Frederking and Seth A. Tucker, "Language Games: Dialogical Analyses of INF Negotiations," International Studies Quarterly, 42,2 (June 1998), 271-294; and Frederking's paper on recent US interventions, "Constructing Post-Cold War Collective Security," APSR, 97,3(2003): 363-78, The first of these papers uses Rescher-Alker dialectical logic, speech act theory and Onuf's concept of a mutual insecurity system to explain the Gorbachev-Reagan INF breakthrough to agreement.

4) Alker, on Weber, Ashley, Habermas, Bull and Deutsch in "The Presumption of Anarchy in World Politics," pp. 362-393, in his R&R.

5) Review Wendt's articles from IR500 on causality and constitution, and on "Anarchy is What States Make of it", as needed; then read Alker's "Learning from Wendt," Review of International Studies, 26,1 (2000): 141-150.

**Laboratory.** We will focus on flow charting the research procedures in Duffy-Frederking-Tucker.

**Optional:** 1)Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, Preface and Introductions, pp. vii-34; Valerie Janesick, "The Dance of Qualitative Research Design: Metaphor, Methodolatry, and Meaning," pp. 35-56, and J.C. Morse, "Designing Funded Qualitative Research," pp. 56-85, and Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin, "Grounded Theory

methodology: An Overview,” pp. 158-183.in Denzin and Lincoln, eds., Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry, Sage Publications, Thousands Oaks, 1998.

2) John Odell’s “Bounded Rationality and the World Political Economy,” mimeo, matched with Douglas Walton’s flow charts of simple and complex satisficing practices in his, Practical Reasoning: Goal-Driven, Knowledge-Based, Action Guiding Argumentation, Rowman and Littlefield, MD, 1990.

3) John R. Searle, Rationality in Action, MIT Press, Cambridge, 2001.

4) Mark Turner, Cognitive Dimensions of Social Science, Oxford U. Press, New York, 2001.

5) Brian Frederking, Resolving Security Dilemmas: A Constructivist Explanation of the INF Treaty, Ashgate, Aldershot, 2000.

6) Either Ted Hopf, “The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory,” International Security, Vol. 23, 1 (summer 1998); or Emmanuel Adler’s chapter on Constructivism in the Handbook of International Relations.

### SPRING VACATION MARCH 15 - 21

### III. Historical Sources, Schools and Sociohistorical Discourses in 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Historiography

#### March 25. An Overview of Historiography

**Required:** 1) H. R. Alker, “Cliometrics Revisited,” APSA paper, 2002. (Collingwood, contrasted with KKV)

2) G. G. Iggers, Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge, Wesleyan Press/University Presses of New England, Hanover, 1997.

3) Carl G. Hempel. “The Function of General Laws in History,” reprinted variously, e.g. in M. Martin and L. C. McIntyre, eds., Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1994.

4) Review Alker’s version of Olafson’s “essence of history: historicity”, in his recasting of Deutsch’s comparative historical search for “pluralistic security communities,” in his R&R, 386-393.

5) Gay Tuchman, “Historical Social Science: Methodologies, Methods, and Meanings,” pp. 225-260 in Denzin and Lincoln, eds., Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry.

**Optional:** 1) Joyce Appleby et al, Knowledge and Postmodernism: in Historical Perspective Routledge, New York, 1996. OR her coauthored Telling the Truth About History, especially the discussion of Postmodernism.

2) B. Buzan and R. Little, International Systems in World History, Oxford U. Press, 2000., especially the methodological discussions of Neorealism, the English School, Wallerstein, and Braudel, pp.1-110.

3) H. Spruyt, The Sovereign State and its Competitors, Princeton U. Press, 1994.

4) G. Barraclough, Main Trends in History, expanded by M. Burns, Holmes and Meier, New York, 1991.

5) R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History, Revised Edition, with new material edited by Jan van der Dussen, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994.

6) Andrew Abbott, The Chaos of Disciplines, Chicago U. Press, Chicago, 2001, esp. Ch. 1 on fractal notions of disciplinarity; or his Time Matters: On Theory and Method, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2001

7) H. White, Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in 19<sup>th</sup> Century Europe, Johns Hopkins, 1973, pp.1-131, and one of his writers, such as Marx or Ranke or Nietzsche or deTocqueville.

8) J. L. Gaddis, The Landscape of History, Oxford U Press, 2002.

9) Prasenjit Duara, Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1995 (a richly suggestive “post-modern” book)

**Laboratory:** If it can be arranged, there will be an introduction to IR relevant historical research resources by a professional librarian.

ONE PAGE PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE STUDENT’S CHOICE OF A TOPIC FOR HIS/HER RESEARCH PROPOSAL DUE IN PROFESSOR ALKER’S MAILBOX BY 10am, MARCH 29th. (See assignment below.)

#### **April 1. The Causal-Historical Controversy over the End of the Cold War**

Papers by Wolford and English from International Security, plus an unpublished paper by Tannewald on the controversy. Professor English will help us discuss the issues involved. See also IR500 writings.

#### **April 8. Generalizing and Particularizing Historical Discourses**

**Required:** John R. Hall, Cultures of Inquiry, pp. 33-166, 169-228. (Start by reviewing his introduction to "The Third Path."). Were there more time, one could optionally read and discuss any of the numerous sociohistorical studies Hall mentions.

**Optional:** 1) Lynn Hunt, ed., The New Cultural History; V. Bonnell and L. Hunt, eds., Beyond the Cultural Turn, both University of California Press, Berkeley, 1989 and 1999 respectively.

2) S. Toulmin, Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity, U. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1990.

3) Consuelo Cruz, "Identity and Persuasion: How Nations Remember Their Pasts and Make Their Futures," World Politics, 52,3(April 2000): 275-312

4) James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences, Cambridge U. Press, New York, 2003.

5) Joan Scott and Debra Keates, eds., Schools of Thought: 25 years of Interpretive Social Science, Princeton U. Press, Princeton, 2001.

### **IV. Issues of Global and Local Governance**

#### **April 15. Deliberatively Oriented Argumentation and Cosmopolitan Political Theory**

**Required:** 1) Thomas Risse, "Let's Argue: Communicative Action in World Politics," International Organization, 54,1(Winter 2000): 1-40.

2) J. Habermas, The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory, edited by C. Gronin and P. De Greiff., MIT Press, 1999. Editors' Introduction, pp. vii-xxxii, and Part V, "What is Meant by Deliberative Politics," pp.239-264.

3) Brooke Ackerly, Political Theory and Feminist Social Criticism, review pp.1-32; read Chapter 2: "A Third World feminist theory of social criticism," pp. 33-72.

4) Inge Kaul et al, Executive Summary: Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization, Oxford U. Press, New York., for the UN Development Program, 2003. pp.1-79. Although its authors are analytically oriented political economists, consonant with the Hart and Wm Dunn-Donald T. Campbell readings, this summary, like Ackerley's feminist political theorizing, will be presented as a case of political argumentation.

**Optional:** 1) Postmodern/Postcolonial IR books by Sylvester, David Campbell, Connolly, Michael Shapiro, Der Derian, Ling, Marchand and Pappart, or Mohanty.

2) David Held's books on globalization and cosmopolitan democracy, especially: D. Held and A. McGrew, eds., The global transformations reader: an introduction to the globalization debate, Blackwell's, Oxford, 2000.

3) Paul Diesing, Reason in Society: Five types of decisions and their social conditions, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 1976(1962). A highly accessible, more general (and earlier) version of arguments about types of rationality and social action.

4) Stephen Toulmin, Return to Reason, Harvard University Press, 2002. An argument for "early Modern" practical reasoning.

#### **April 22. An Emancipatory Methodology of Constructive, Feminist, Social Criticism**

**Required:** 1) Ackerly, pp. 73-203.

2). Alker, "Emancipatory Empiricism," pp. 332-354 in his Rediscoveries and Reformulations.

**Optional:** Books by Benhabib, Mouffe, Nussbaum, Sen, Butler, Waltzer, as cited by Ackerly.

**Laboratory:** The lab hour may be used for some preliminary student research proposals (see below).

## **V. International Perspectives on Knowledge Cumulation, and Other Course-Related Conclusions**

### **April 29. Dialogical Perspectives on Knowledge Cumulation, plus Student Research Proposals**

First, in a short but important synthetic reading assignment, by way of comparative discussions vis a vis earlier naturalistic approaches to knowledge cumulation in International Relations (recall parts I and II of the course), the student should ponder the internationally oriented, dialogically inspired discussions in the March 2003 issue of the International Studies Review, 5,1: Andrei P. Tsygankov, "The Irony of Western Ideas in a Multicultural World," pp. 53-76; and G. Hellmann, F. Kratochwil, Y. Lapid, A. Moravcsik, I. B. Neumann, S. Smith, F. Harvey, J. Cobb, "Are Dialogue and Synthesis Possible in International Relations?", pp.123-153.

Secondly, with special reference to the outlines of research proposals in the Appendix of Hart's text, and Morse's Tables 3.2 and 3.3 (in Denzin and Lincoln), during the last two weeks of the course, students will orally, and in writing, present 10-12 page research proposals following one or more of the research methodologies outlined (and perhaps flow charted) in the required or optional readings of the course. The student may continue within the subject domain of his/her Take home midterm, but may also pick a new substantive focus related to material covered in IR500 or any of the 4 graduate domain courses. The research proposal should not be one written for another methodology course.

In the scheduled exam period, May 4-11, there will be a 2 hour closed book final exam. The exam will be focused as well on the higher level issues of assessing and promoting knowledge cumulation raised by the individual examples of student research proposals and the differing (overlapping?) views on this subject, and the standards appropriate for making such assessments, raised by the assigned reading for parts III, IV and V of the course compared with the literature in Parts I and II.