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A Crisis in Qualitative Political Science

- QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS IMPORTANT
  - 80% of comparative politics scholars and a plurality of (IR) scholars *primarily* utilize case studies
  - 90% of political scientists use *some* qualitative analysis
  - Most statistical work rests on qualitative coding
  - Qualitative work is often judged more policy-relevant

- BUT NOT SUSTAINABLE
  - Scholarship is rarely transparent or replicable, so good scholars cannot demonstrate excellence
  - Quality and rigor of scholarship, and intensity of debate, are sub-optimal
New APSA Professional Guidelines for Research Transparency

For evidence-based knowledge claims, researchers should achieve *research transparency*:

- **Data Transparency**: Provide direct access to data.

- **Analytic Transparency**: Explicate the links between evidence and descriptive or causal inferences.

- **Production Transparency**: Explain procedures employed to select data, theories, and methods.
One of Many Responses: Greater Transparency in Qualitative Analysis via Active Citation

- **ACTIVE CITATION**
  - Footnotes are hyperlinked to precisely cited, fully annotated source excerpts, placed in appendix

- **QUALITATIVE DATA ARCHIVERING**

- **EXPLICIT METHODOLOGICAL STANDARDS**
  (e.g. Case selection, counterfactuals, analytic narratives, etc.)
WHAT IS “ACTIVE CITATION”?

EXISTING FORMATS

CONTESTABLE KNOWLEDGE-BASED CLAIM (MAIN TEXT)

CITATION

NEW TRANSPARENCY APPENDIX

A SINGLE ENTRY IN THE TRANSPARENCY APPENDIX

1. ANNOTATION
2. SOURCE EXCERPT
3. FULL CITATION
4. SCAN OR LINK TO SOURCE (OPTIONAL)
Tommy Lee Jones on the Thirteenth Amendment

“The greatest measure of the nineteenth century was passed by corruption, aided and abetted by the purest man in America.”

…according to Steven Spielberg, who got it from historian Fawn Brodie (1959), who got it from popular lecturer James Scovel (1898), who may or may not have witnessed it 33 years before…
In Steven Spielberg’s recent film *Lincoln*, the abolitionist Representative Thaddeus Stevens (played by Tommy Lee Jones) returns home after the House of Representatives passed the Thirteenth Amendment (banning slavery). He utters the following striking phrase to his mulatto common-law wife, Lydia Smith, referring to Lincoln’s role in the passage of the amendment: “The greatest measure of the nineteenth century [was] passed by corruption, aided and abetted by the purest man in America.” The accuracy of this quotation has been questioned. An early written account, written 33 years after the fact, suggests that Stevens may have said this. Yet, if he did, it seems highly unlikely that he did so at home to his companion.

The first known reference to Steven’s “corruption” statement appeared in 1898. James M. Scovel, a former New Jersey politician and lawyer, recalled the striking statement as an ironic reflection on Lincoln having secured votes for the Thirteenth Amendment by delivering votes against a NY to Washington railway that Stevens favored. He claimed that Stevens had said this to him in the 1860s. Is he reliable on this point? On the positive side, Scovel qualifies as a possible eyewitness, since he had been a Washington insider and a confidant of Lincoln, working under him as a Commissioner. Nothing contradicts his claim to have known Stevens. Indeed, his account contains other plausible details, including a story Stevens allegedly told him about the passage of the Fifteenth Amendment and an anecdote about witnessing Stevens gamble. It was the type of pointed remark Stevens was famous for uttering. On the negative side, Scovel did not publish this quotation until 1898, at the age of 65. He was then making his living as a traveling evangelist and popular lecturer on Lincoln’s day, after having been driven out of law and politics, reportedly because of a reputation for shady dealing in both. Some historians cite the quotation without comment; others ignore it. In any case, Scovel’s account does not imply any connection between the quotation and Lydia Smith, Stevens’ alleged common-law wife, though she is mentioned in the text. Moreover, it is unclear how anyone except Smith herself, who was very discrete and left no memoirs, would have known if Stevens had said it to her alone.
To the writer of this sketch Mr. Stevens told the story of the legislation which gave to the black man his right to vote: ... [548]

His favorite amusement was...to spend the evening at Hall and Pemberton's Faro Bank...and over canvas-back and Veuve Clicquot champagne woo unmolested the goddess of fortune....Stevens was never a heavy player, although I have seen him win fourteen hundred dollars on a twenty-dollar gold-piece as his only stake... [549]

Influence from the White House secured votes against a favorite measure of Mr. Stevens for an air-line railway from Washington to New York, and...these same votes helped Mr. Lincoln's great amendment for emancipation. Of this legislative bargain Stevens said, ‘The greatest measure of the nineteenth century was passed by corruption, aided and abetted by the purest man in America.’

During the last thirty years of his life its unwritten romance was the unselfish and tender devotion with which Stevens was attended by Lydia Smith, a mulatto, who in her youth had great beauty of person. [550]
Influence from the White House secured votes against a favorite measure of Mr. Stevens for an air-line railway from Washington to New York, and, as the Rialto of Congress “hath its merchandise,” these same votes helped Mr. Lincoln’s great amendment for emancipation. Of this legislative bargain Stevens said, “The greatest measure of the nineteenth century was passed by corruption, aided and abetted by the purest man in America.”

During the last thirty years of his life its unwritten romance was the unselfish and tender devotion with which Stevens was attended by Lydia Smith, a mulatto, who in her youth had great beauty of person. Her fidelity to his interests ended only with his death. He left her five thousand dollars in his will, but she had improved her opportunities and by prudent investments in Washington real estate amassed a considerable fortune. She purchased Stevens’s old home in Lancaster, a two-story brick house, in which he lived till his constituents, grateful for his fidelity, returned him to Congress in 1859.
### Transparency: Traditional Footnotes vs. Active Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional Citation</th>
<th>Active Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Transparency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic Transparency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production Transparency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Citation: Benefits of Transparency

- **Accountability:** Readers can cost-effectively check, critique and debate research. ("one click")

- **Assessment:** Qualitative scholars can demonstrate substantive, theoretical and methodological excellence.

- **Pedagogy:** Students can learn these skills.

- **Public Goods Provision:** Evidence can be reused.

- **Interdisciplinarity and Policy Relevance:** Work with other fields can expand (history, law), and can better impact journalism and public policy.
Active Citation: Advancing the Agenda

- Secured NSF and other funding
- Published articles, developed proposals, held workshops and sponsored panel discussions to refine standard
- Worked alongside quantitative scholars to promulgate new APSA standards
- Integrated progress into summer training institute and graduate seminars
- Fully addressing legal, human subject, and logistical issues
- Creating demonstration website
  - 20+ scholars retrofitting “classic” articles and chapters
  - Younger scholars preparing new and forthcoming work
- Cooperating with journals to embed the standard
- Expanding training and outreach: Pedagogy and standard-setting
- Establishing interdisciplinary links and exchange with policy world
- Designing new plug-in software
ACE Word Add-in

OUTPUT:
- Word Document
- Web Document
- Database (Access, Atlas...)

Active Citation Editor

Annotation:

Source Summary:

Full Citation:

Add Source File  Add Source URL

Dallek 2003, 232.

8 ibid., 132-133.
Best Practices: Political Science

ALLIANCES AND WAR ESCALATION, 1950–51

Critiques reveal that the Soviets apparently believed that Zhou’s complaint about
Pyongyang’s intentional exclusion of Beijing from the decision process was quite
justified. In an initial draft of a September 20 telegram to China on the subject,
Gromyko criticized as “entirely mistaken” the North Korean leadership’s reluct-
tance to “conscientiously inform the Chinese Comrades of the military situation
and all the decisions the Korean commanders and political leadership made re-
garding issues arising in the course of military operations.” In this initial draft
Gromyko wrote that he believed that Kim Il-sung himself “must correct this
point.” Gromyko did not, however, transmit this draft to Beijing. The telegram
that was actually sent was quite different and was almost certainly geared toward
manipulation of the alliance to minimize China’s anger at Pyongyang and to
maximize the chance that Beijing would still come to its defense if and when
needed. In the revised telegram the situation is described more neutrally as “not
right” (or “abnormal”) but then is quickly explained away by reference to the
“weak links” that the central command in North Korea has with its front lines.
Gromyko says this situation arose because of technical difficulties not because
the “Korean Comrades are unwilling” to share information with the Chinese.38

---

38 “Geweiimi Guanyu Dui Zhou Enlai de Dafu Zhi Weishen Dian” [Gromyko’s Telegram to
Roshchin Regarding a Reply to Zhou Enlai], Sept. 20, 1950, in Shen, ed. Chaoyxian Zhanzheng, 2:542–
44. Shen offers full texts of both the telegram as sent and the original draft. Mansourov, “Stalin,
Mao, Kim,” 7, discusses only the final draft and describes it as a telegram from Stalin, rather than
Gromyko. Moreover he seems to take at face value the explanations of the “abnormal” conditions in
which Kim Il-sung is unable to inform his Chinese comrades of his activities. In the Chinese version
of the original draft, the situation is described as something Kim Il-sung can fix and as wanquan
cuowu de (totally mistaken), as opposed to the final version’s bu zhengque de (not right), translated
as “abnormal” by Mansourov.
Best Practices: Natural Science

Example: When did Polar Bears Evolve?

(Also OSTP)

Article

Supplementary Materials
For reasons that I will explain in this Essay, I believe that we may be undergoing a transformation that is every bit as fundamental as those that we once went through when first transitioning from hunter-gatherer forms of life (which did not yet have legal systems or engage a distinctive sense of legal obligation) to more sedentary forms of agricultural living with larger population densities, incipient domestic legal institutions, and—ultimately—an emergent distinction between morality and law. We are so used to where we are today, however, that we sometimes forget what it took to get us here, and it can be especially difficult to see what is happening when we are right in the midst of such a process. I have nevertheless made some recent efforts to reconstruct that earlier process, and my examinations suggest that the transformation was not likely based in reasoning alone, but rather emerged as part of a larger set of sociocultural and linguistic developments among a small handful of cultural traditions at first. These developments began the transition in the ancient world and then caused it to spread thereafter to many other regions. The relevant processes appear to have involved the slow coevolution of a specific and reciprocally reinforcing set of institutions and practical attitudes within these pioneering cultural traditions, which were sufficient to maintain distinctively new legal orders—along with a distinctive and emergent sense of domestic legal obligation to animate them—in equilibrium.

Over the last several centuries, an analogous transformation has—in my view—been taking place with respect to the emergence of international law. More specifically, I believe that the phenomena that Hethawy and Shapiro have recently called “outcasting” have been coevolving with, and helping to produce the emergence and stability of, a distinctive set of practical attitudes in us. These practical attitudes have, in turn, begun to infuse us with a social sense of international legal obligation, which is capable of animating both those same outcasting practices and an emergent international legal order. Although this process is not yet complete, it would appear to be picking up steam, and—given its importance to our contemporary world—we need to understand this transformation as the focus of current international legal scholarship in several crucial respects.

In Part I, I will employ contemporary devices in metaethics to study whether international law is law. Although some people might have asked if legal systems are law, the question would have undoubtedly seemed (and probably also been!) ridiculous to them. In many regions of the world, the domestic version of this is now, and I therefore want to get a better sense of what might be the answer to that question. Examinations of this kind can help clarify the nature of the question, not only in the case of domestic but also in the case of international law.

The metaethical discussions in Part I will isolate one distinctive aspect of law, which is an inheritor normative dimension because it is a dimension of law which is shared by other regulative social institutions—such as science, art, or politics. It is not a normative dimension that is unique to law. The following discussion turns to the nature of this kind of normative dimension, which is what is distinctive about law. It begins with a discussion of the nature of legal norms, which are the rules that govern behavior, and then turns to a discussion of the nature of legal duties, which are the obligations that individuals have to carry out their legal duties.

The metaethical discussions in Part I will isolate one distinctive aspect of law, which is an inheritor normative dimension because it is a dimension of law which is shared by other regulative social institutions—such as science, art, or politics. It is not a normative dimension that is unique to law. The following discussion turns to the nature of this kind of normative dimension, which is what is distinctive about law. It begins with a discussion of the nature of legal norms, which are the rules that govern behavior, and then turns to a discussion of the nature of legal duties, which are the obligations that individuals have to carry out their legal duties.

The metaethical discussions in Part I will isolate one distinctive aspect of law, which is an inheritor normative dimension because it is a dimension of law which is shared by other regulative social institutions—such as science, art, or politics. It is not a normative dimension that is unique to law. The following discussion turns to the nature of this kind of normative dimension, which is what is distinctive about law. It begins with a discussion of the nature of legal norms, which are the rules that govern behavior, and then turns to a discussion of the nature of legal duties, which are the obligations that individuals have to carry out their legal duties.
UN Secret Detention Report (Part One): The CIA’s “High-Value Detainee” Program and Secret Prisons

To complement my recent article, “UN Human Rights Council Discusses Secret Detention Report,” in which I explained how, two weeks ago, the UN Human Rights Council had — after some delays — finally discussed the findings of the Joint Study on Global Practices in Relation to Secret Detention in the Context of Counter-Terrorism,” a detailed, 186-page report issued in February (PDF), I’m posting the section of the report that deals with US secret detention policies since the 9/11 attacks, in the hope that it might reach a new audience — and provide useful research opportunities — as an HTML document.

I do, however, urge everyone to read the whole report, because the introduction and conclusions are important, as are the sections establishing the legal approach to secret detention and its historical context, the section detailing current practices in 25 other countries worldwide, and the annexes, which contain government responses to a questionnaire about secret detention, and a number of case studies.

Given the length of this section of the report (pp. 43-89), I’m publishing it in three parts. The first, published below, provides an introduction, and deals with “The high-value detainee programme and CIA secret detention facilities,” the second looks at “CIA detention facilities or facilities operated jointly with United States military in battlefield zones,” and the third looks at “Proxy detention sites.” “Complicity in the practice of secret detention” and “Secret detention and the Obama administration.”

Please note that I have inserted hyperlinks where possible. However, the original report contains footnotes, and not all of these provide links to websites. In most cases, I have added the information contained in the footnotes in square brackets, but for full details, please see the original.

Excerpts from the UN “Joint Study on Global Practices in Relation to Secret Detention in the Context of Counter-Terrorism,” February 2010

Prepared by Martin Scheinin, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Manfred Nowak, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Shaheed Ali, the vice-chair of the Working Group on arbitrary detention, and Jeremy Sarkin, the chair of the Working Group on enforced or involuntary disappearances.

IV. SECRET DETENTION PRACTICES IN THE GLOBAL “WAR ON TERROR” SINCE 11 SEPTEMBER 2001

98. In spite of the prominent role played by the United States of America in the development of international human rights and humanitarian law, and its position as a global leader in the protection of human rights at home and abroad following the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. on 11 September 2001, the United States embarked on a process of reducing and removing various human rights and other protection mechanisms through various laws and administrative acts, including the Authorization for Use of Military Force, the USA Patriot Act of 2001, the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005, the Military Commissions Act of 2006 (which sought to remove habeas corpus rights), as well as various executive orders and memoranda issued by the Office of Legal Counsel that interpreted the position of the United States on a number of issues, including torture. It also sanctioned the establishment of various classified programmes much more narrowly than before [A/HRC/6/Add.3, para. 3].

99. The Government of the United States declared a global “war on terror,” in which individuals captured around the world were to be held neither as criminal suspects, put forward for federal court trials in the United States, nor treated as prisoners of war protected by the Geneva Conventions, irrespective of whether they had been captured on the battlefield during what could be qualified as an armed conflict in terms of international humanitarian law. Rather, they were to be treated indiscriminately as “unlawful enemy combatants” who could be held indefinitely without charge or trial or the possibility to challenge the legality of their detention before a court or other judicial authority.

100. On 7 February 2002, the President of the United States issued a memorandum [PDF] declaring that “common article 3 of Geneva does not apply to either Al-Qaida or Taliban detainees,” that “Taliban detainees are unlawful combatants and, therefore, do not qualify as prisoners of war under article 4 of Geneva,” and that “because Geneva does not apply to our conflict with Al-Qaida, Al-Qaida detainees also do not qualify as prisoners of war.” This unprecedented departure from the Geneva Conventions was to be offset by a promise that, “as a matter of policy, the United States Armed Forces shall continue to treat detainees humanely and, to the extent appropriate and consistent with military necessity, in a manner consistent with the principles of Geneva.” This detention policy was defended by the Government in various submissions to the United Nations [See for example CCPR/C/USA/CO/3/Rev.1/Add.1, p. 3, A/HRC/4/41, paras. 453 - 455; and A/HRC/4/40, para. 12], including on 10 October 2007, when the Government stated that the law of war, and not the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, was the applicable legal framework governing the detentions of “enemy combatants” [CCPR/C/USA/CO/3/Rev.1/Add.1, p. 3],
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