Postmodernist Pedagogy's Effect on Doctoral Level
Political Theory Instruction and Curriculum

Brian M. Erskine

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Political Science

THESIS COMMITTEE:
PROFESSOR KAREN M. HULT, CHAIR
PROFESSOR CHARLES E. WALCOTT
PROFESSOR CRAIG L. BRIANS

May 4, 2009
Blacksburg, VA

Postmodernist Pedagogy's Effect on Graduate Level
Political Theory Instruction and Curriculum

Brian M. Erskine

ABSTRACT

Among the 123 political science programs listed by the American Political Science Association that grant Ph.D.s in political science, only seven require every student to complete some sort of political theory or philosophy course. Eighty-one offer students the opportunity to select political theory or philosophy as a concentration. Most surprising, 39 programs advertise no courses in political theory or philosophy at all.

Political philosophy, at the doctoral level, is being treated as an optional option. Given these findings about the lack of political philosophy and theory at the doctoral level, the study of all things theoretical or philosophical seems to be overshadowed by other subfields of research. The not so subliminal message being sent by this sort of phenomenon is that some subfields of political science have a higher priority than others.

In addition to identifying the number of political science programs that require coursework in political theory, this thesis explores the shift of the political theory offered away from traditional philosophical foundations and toward a postmodern pedagogical approach. This type of pedagogy can have the secondary effect of devaluing traditional notions of teaching and learning in favor of collaborative learning and learner centered teaching. Following the movement to reform the educational system in France after the student riots of 1968, narratives of morality were replaced by the idea that such social constructs ought to be abandoned for a focus on individualism and intertexuality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks go to many people. A piece of research of this magnitude simply does not happen without the aid, encouragement, and patience of others. This idea originated from a class assignment in Dr. Karen Hult's research methods class and over the course of several months has developed into what I hope is an impactful piece of research; for her guidance and expertise as my committee chair I am so grateful. Dr. Charles Walcott and Dr. Craig Brians also deserve a sincere thank you for allowing and assisting a somewhat unconventional idea to develop into a finished product and a similarly unconventional student to turn what started as a grievance into a piece of research.

Without the support of my loving family, this certainly would not have been possible and for that I say thank you and I love you all.

I struggled during this process and continue to struggle now with a lot of serious questions about my own political philosophy. I owe a great debt to the members of the Political Science Department at Radford University who pushed me to dive a little deeper in search of something that I did not exactly know how to find. I learned that the search is a quintessential part of the endeavor and that I am nowhere near being finished. Additionally, thanks go to Dr. Chad Lavin for reminding me that political philosophy (and philosophers) can be cool.

Most importantly, thank you to my loving and beautiful wife whose patience and guidance helped to put these ideas to paper. The best thing about marrying someone smarter than me is that the challenges never stop. Thanks to Sarah, there was someone to look over my shoulder and remind me that playing "Bubbles" was not serious research.

Unfortunately, what passes for "public philosophy thinking" today is a haphazard mix of musings, undisciplined by an overall concept of what constitutes the relevant field of ideas. Political science has yet to supply an account of the categories that need to be addressed and the major options that exist within each category. Until public philosophers become political scientists or political scientists become public philosophers, there will be no end to our troubles.

James W. Ceaser, "Foundational Concepts and American Political Development," 2006 pg. 83

CONTENTS

Tables

Appendices

Introduction

Postmodernism has raised questions about the existence of foundational concepts such as nature, liberty, religion, and knowledge. The categorical rejection of grand narratives such as truth or morality creates an educational environment in which there are no clearly articulated right or wrong answers, and instead concepts like "right" and truth exist only for individuals. For the purposes of this study, *postmodernism* will refer to a pedagogical approach.[1] One of the goals of this thesis is to investigate the existence and the tangible indicators of postmodern pedagogy that appear within doctoral level political theory instruction and curriculum between 1968 and the present.

The student riots that broke out in Paris in May 1968 represent a watershed moment at which students and workers rebelled against conservative value systems. Traditional notions of morality were replaced by liberal morality, which in France was embodied by rebellion against moral and legal authority, equality movements, and the overhaul of the education and employment systems. The focus of this study is the component of this movement that affected higher education in the United States. Beginning with the movement by progressives in Paris to reform education, established educational norms and teaching philosophies gradually were rejected throughout academe in favor of a new set of loose philosophies now referred to as Postmodernism.[1]

The significance of this thesis is its analysis of the state of political philosophy/theory education at the doctoral level. By examining the programs that grant degrees in political science, I hope to be able to offer an overall assessment of the challenges and opportunities facing the subfield. The pedagogical trends identified here may contribute to reforms that benefit both teachers and learners.

---

[1] Chapter One provides a detailed account of the definition of Postmodernism.

The purpose of the first chapter is to clearly define the terms and concepts being investigated in this thesis. Next, it discusses the study's hypothesis and objectives as well as the literature gap this thesis intends to fill. This section will be followed by some theoretical background and justification for the hypothesis that the thesis explores. This chapter concludes with a detailed section on the methods that were used.

The second and densest chapter will give some clarity to the foundations of postmodernism as they apply to pedagogy. First, a baseline will be established in order to describe what the postmodern writers were rebelling against. The next section of this chapter will include the writing of some of the most notable advocates of this school of thought. They will be consulted for their views on the problems associated with traditional pedagogical norms as well as their prescriptions for how to improve the art and science of teaching and learning. Then the chapter deals generally with the responses of critics of postmodernism and more specifically postmodern pedagogy. Analysis of these thinkers will be offered along with a restatement of the problem. Finally, one of the main themes of the thesis, the need for foundational concepts, will be explored further.

The third chapter will lay out the process and findings of the study from the screening of the political science programs to the analysis of the course descriptions and syllabi. After presenting the findings there will be some general discussion of the secondary findings that came about as a result of data collection. Finally, the findings will be presented with respect to their preliminary support for the hypothesis.

The fourth and final chapter will explicate some analytical conclusions from the data in chapter three. Additionally, some analysis will be offered regarding the implications and applicability of these findings to the broader context of the discipline of

political science. Next, the chapter will bring up a few additional limitations before the chapter is concludes with a few closing remarks.

The first task is to lay the conceptual foundation for this thesis. Defining the key terms and concepts will help to clarify the context of this study. Chapter one begins with these conceptual foundations and definitions.

Chapter 1:

Conceptual Foundations

In order to ask some probing questions about the presence and quality of political philosophy and theory in doctoral level political science, the first chapter will lay a conceptual foundation that clearly defines the terms, goals, and parameters of this thesis. The functionality of this thesis as a tool for better understanding doctoral level political philosophy and theory depends on concise and consistent use of specific words and concepts throughout. The first section of this chapter does exactly that, establish a common ground for the use of these words and concepts.

Definitions

A concise use of language was an essential of this project. Therefore, each of the dominant concepts of the thesis are defined here as a point of reference. Each of these definitions was established after deliberation over several possible choices and a careful consideration of the specific context this study required. Each definition also includes a direct justification in order to give the reader a clear purpose behind these somewhat complex and fluid terms.

Postmodernism- a) a theoretical approach that rejects grand narratives such as "right" and "truth."[2] b) "a style and concept in the arts characterized by distrust of theories and ideologies and by the drawing of attention to conventions."[3]

---

[2] Cited by Texas Tech University's English Department as "not a singular concept. It sometimes refers to an epoch beginning with student riots in Paris in 1968 and fully part of academia by the 1990s. The term often refers to objects or ideas as social constructions. It focuses on intertexuality and individuality. It is skeptical of grand narratives of truth or history and instead promotes contextualized mini or local narratives. It rejects boundaries between disciplines and recognizes the complexity and nonlinearity of our existence." www.faculty.english.ttu.edu/rickly/5320/glossary.htm
[3] Oxford English Dictionary, http://www.askoxford.com/concise_oed/postmodernism?view=uk
*The inclusion of the word "arts" in this definition is taken to mean the "liberal arts," not "fine arts."

Postmodernism as opposed to other schools of thought is a fluid and difficult to pinpoint stream of political philosophy. In most cases, postmodernism is an umbrella term that is meant to encompass not only different streams of political philosophy but also a powerful social movement full of its own occasional mutations and contradictions. As the next chapter will discuss, there is no primary author, text, or date to which postmodernism can be attributed or appended. The specific set of definitions above was chosen in order to demonstrate these complex linguistic dynamics.

Pedagogy- "the art and science of how students learn."[4]

This definition was chosen for its general clarity and its applicability to a twofold concern. First, how do students learn, and second, how do teachers teach? Ideally, in my view teachers should make their pedagogical choices based on the demands of the material and a "traditional" approach to education.[5]

Graduate Level- refers here only to the doctoral level.

The genesis for this thesis was to focus upon graduate level political science generally. However, including master's-level programs in this study was not an option because of the available data set. The APSA listing of doctoral granting institutions did not contain a separate list of masters' granting institutions. Since the aim of the thesis was to study all graduate education in U.S. political science, it is important to note that those institutions on the list also grant master's degrees, thus possibly making this differentiation unnecessary. It is also important to note that the APSA list did not include those programs that grant only the master's in political science.

---

[4] Manitoba Canada Department of Education http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/dl/wbc/wbcgloss.html
[5] This "traditional" approach will be expounded upon in Chapter Two.

Political Philosophy/Theory- The subfield of political science concerned with normative theoretical discussions

This term has been defined in this way in order to eliminate a possibly unnecessary distinction drawn by different institutions between the words "philosophy" and "theory." Although some political science departments offer courses in political philosophy, others offer similar courses differing in name only. By eliminating this distinction, the population of programs can be widened to include all of those on the APSA listing of institutions that grant doctoral degrees in political science,

Research Design:

Objectives and Hypothesis

This study attempted to explicate the importance of faculty literature choices and the impact of those selections on graduate political theory instruction. These choices contribute to students' academic training and the overall quality of their education. Problems may arise when faculty make assumptions about the utility of certain literature in the classroom and the familiarity of their students with what I refer to as the "classics" or the unofficial canon in this study. Contemporary literature is of great value, but in the context of political theory over the ages, contemporary works occupy only a select portion of that history.

Clearly stated, the primary objective of this study is to determine whether and to what extent political philosophy, across doctorate-granting institutions, is aligned more closely with traditional philosophical foundations, with those ideas that are categorized as postmodern, or with neither. This focus is multidimensional because two questions are being asked simultaneously. Is the field of political science mostly oriented toward

6

questions of a philosophical or an empirical nature? Second, if the orientation is philosophical, then which, if any, one school of thought dominates the political philosophy arena? On the latter issue, I hypothesize: *Among those institutions that grant doctorates in political science, the texts in required political philosophy/theory courses will be based more in postmodern theory than in traditional foundations. In my view this is because the overall direction of the subfield of political philosophy/theory in the U.S. is oriented more toward postmodern theory than traditional foundations.*

Oftentimes contemporary authors, just as their predecessors, write in reaction to or are at least influenced by their political environments. For example, Frantz Fanon wrote from the perspective of colonial Africa, which was dominated by the Europeans. Those European colonizers may have been inspired by the work of their own political theorists who were most likely educated by a previous set of political theorists. I do not expect that every political theory course can cover the entire history of political thought, but I argue that instructors have the responsibility to provide context when studying contemporary work so as not to present it in isolation. If the goal of the course is to understand and build from the work of a contemporary author, students must understand the context in which the works were written, including the theoretical foundation on which they are based and to which they react.

Another important justification behind the need for examining context lies in postmodernism. Although other streams of political philosophy offer variations of and relatively minor contradictions to established literature up to the time of Jean Jacques Rousseau, the collection of thinkers considered postmodern suggests radical and unprecedented changes to the status quo of their time. Not only do they offer reform and

variation, but their ideas seek to challenge the basic premises of over 1,000 years of writing in the field, dating back to ancient Greece. Stated another way, the argument for context is that in order to do justice to the work of contemporary writers, one must understand why they are writing.

Another important portion of this thesis will discuss the characteristics of Postmodern pedagogy and allow for future research as to whether and to what extent those attributes may have impacted graduate level political science instruction and curriculum. What are the fundamental differences between what the discipline as a whole looked like before and after 1968, and what sort of effect is Postmodern pedagogy proposed to have on that difference? This discussion will certainly take place indirectly because there is no single snapshot that describes the state of the discipline pre and post 1968. The history of the field of political science is one of the most contentious subjects in the discipline. From roughly the 1950s to the 1970s, the field was pulled back and forth between its traditional epistemological character and dominance by behavioralists who sought to make the science more "scientific."[6]

With regard to the basic pretexts of postmodernism and its accompanying pedagogy, my understanding is that concepts like right and wrong have been replaced by shades of interpretation where the most important conclusion is derived by the individual and is largely immune to evaluation and sometimes criticism. Although the next chapter will discuss this subject in greater depth, a basic parallel can be drawn here. Pre-1968 political science was aligned more with ancient and Enlightenment eras of political philosophy than is the current state of the field, which is more or less concurrent with

---

[6] Easton, Gunnell, and Graziano. "The Development of Political Science," pg. 20

postmodernism and the streams that converged to form it.

Research Justification

The distinctive part of this study is that little research existed on the state of political theory, especially at the doctoral level. Instead, I consulted several authors who have studied the related issues of curriculum and scholarship in political science An in-depth description of each of these authors' work can be found in the Annotated Bibliography. Additionally, studies involving undergraduate students serve, with some limitations, as textual support. Most of the existing literature focuses upon concerns such as a lack of foundational underpinning (McCormick, 2000), the importance of the subfield of political theory in the discipline of political science (Gunnell, 1988 and Germino, 1963), and issues of curriculum and critical thinking in political science (Ishiyama and Hartlaub, 2003). Additionally, such authors made some arguments regarding canons within political science and other disciplines. These subjects help complement the core topic of this study and, in the end, offered more opportunity for analysis than the quantitative results the study yielded. Although questions about the importance and the possible composition of a political science canon or standard curricula are important, this research is intended to explore whether there already are such standards and what shape those standards take.

Theoretical and Methodological Grounding

In my view, a diverse academic portfolio must contain a range of authors from different eras, often with dramatically different views. I argue this diversity is important for two reasons. First, focusing on one era or ideological view can create scholarly tunnel-vision and discourage students from viewing their studies in a broader context.

The context in which different theories were created is difficult to understand without a point of comparison. A successful pedagogical approach includes defining something by what it is not. In order to understand a concept such as socialism, one may seek a point of contrast such as capitalism. For these reasons, granting time and weight to a variety of thinkers should be an understood prerequisite for a well-rounded education in political theory at the graduate level. Spending time on a variety of thinkers as proposed here allows for each to be viewed as a possible choice instead of a dissenting opinion to a more established school of thought.

It is important to protect the liberty, more specifically the academic freedom, of faculty and students. That being said, presenting a perspective without acknowledging its alternatives is, in my view, academically irresponsible. Education's purpose is not just to impart knowledge, but more to foster an environment that encourages the quest for knowledge as well as understanding and critical inquiry. If an idea is presented as a *fait accompli*, students may have no reason to question it and investigate alternatives. This is meant to say that the theoretical grounding on which postmodern pedagogy is based is often taken for granted because postmodernists do not adequately explore the literature to which postmodernism responds. The expectation here is that in an effort to reform the subfield and accommodate some of the social movements of the 20th century (characterized by Postmodernism), a drastic overcompensation (Postmodern pedagogy) took place.

Additional Sources

The body of research that exists on this topic is somewhat limited in its scope. The series by the *American Political Science* Review on the "State of Discipline" is a

more holistic evaluation of the entire discipline instead of a specific analysis of any one level or subfield. In order to augment this and other works around the periphery of this thesis it was important to consult broader critiques that came from outside of the immediate discipline. Along with the annotated bibliography at the end of this thesis, a strong piece of foundational literature, Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind*, was consulted for its pointed criticism of Postmodern education in the United States. According to Bloom, the philosophical ties between order and society and their dysfunction in Postmodern education led to a hollowed-out educational shell. As well, similar narratives on order and society were consulted such as Eric Voegelin's collection on *Order and History*, James Ceaser's work on foundational concepts, and Bloom's mentor, Leo Strauss's work in political theory. Strauss's writing on postmodernism and political theory was especially important in this study because his ideas began a larger movement of criticism of postmodernism.

Methods

In what follows, I outline the pedagogical norms and characteristics that go along with Postmodernism. I will enter into an in-depth investigation into the foundational tenets of Postmodernist pedagogy. To what alternative/s is Postmodernism a response? What sort of general changes was Postmodernist pedagogy intended to exact on existing instructional/pedagogical norms? Both Bloom's and Strauss's work as well as historical references to the 1968 riots will be consulted for more detailed information regarding what the Postmodern movement sought to change about the education system.

The American Political Science Association (APSA) maintains a list of colleges and universities that grant the PhD in political science.[7] From the entire list of programs, a brief screening took place to determine whether each program had political theory course offerings and whether the program required political philosophy coursework as a component of its doctoral degree. From there, all of the programs were categorized according to three criteria. First, did the department offer political philosophy as a component of its doctoral degree? Next, did the department include political philosophy as part of its doctoral requirements? Last, did the department offer political philosophy as an option for concentration?

Once the list of institutions to be studied had been reduced to those requiring political philosophy coursework, syllabi and course descriptions were collected. Syllabi and course descriptions were selected only from doctoral political science programs that require political theory/philosophy. These documents then were analyzed in order to find any patterns that might be present, such as commonly used texts. Those courses that had syllabi available electronically were analyzed for patterns. From there, general observations were made regarding the literature being used in those courses. These observations were used in order to draw conclusions about the overall state of doctoral level political philosophy education in terms of the evident impact of postmodern ideas examined in Chapter Two.

Limitations

This study had several limitations that are important to note, but there is little concern that they affected the validity of the results. First, the documents that were analyzed came strictly from research institutions as opposed to liberal arts institutions.

7 http://www.apsanet.org/content_6947.cfm

The results may not be generalizable to all graduate level political theory instruction because graduate level political science education is not restricted solely to research institutions. There may be liberal arts institutions that grant the master's degree in political science. Next, the scope of this thesis is limited because of the source of the data. All of the syllabi and course descriptions came from publicly available electronic sources. This limitation is addressed in greater depth in Chapter Four. Additionally, not all of the syllabi and course descriptions came from common semesters. In cases where the particular course had not been offered in the recent past, the next available instance was sought. The most recent information that was available for each course was used. Lastly, for the purposes of this study, courses offered under headings of "political philosophy" were not excluded because of an ongoing discussion throughout the discipline regarding the appropriate designations for courses dealing with normative theoretical and philosophical issues. At times, the terms are used interchangeably to describe the same types of courses, so selection of syllabi included further considerations such as course descriptions when this conflict arose.

Chapter 2:

Postmodern Pedagogy

The first chapter made a few broad claims about the importance of the diverse academic portfolio and the value of understanding the evolution of postmodernism. One of the basic critiques of postmodernists in this thesis is that they are lacking in their understanding of the ideas they and their school of thought are criticizing. This chapter will begin by establishing a baseline to which postmodernism responds. Next is a presentation of postmodernism that traces it back to its roots. After that, there will be a similar discussion of the stream of criticism that responds to postmodernism and seeks to reestablish some of the traditional aspects of political theory and philosophy.

The Pedagogical Establishment

Until the 20th century, the predominant pedagogy had been loosely based on the Socratic Method. This structure for education had changed very little between the time of Ancient Greece and the end of the second millennium. Until Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Emile* or "On Education," in the late 1700s, the idea of organized or strategic education[8] had seen only limited exploration. Socrates's traditional structure (discussed below) is less a set of written rules and more a reflection of the methods he used throughout his conversation with others during the Socratic Dialogues.

In one of the first Socratic Dialogues, *Euthyphro*, Socrates enters into what is now referred to as a dialectical engagement with a claimed religious expert named Euthyphro. The purpose of this discussion was to find an appropriate definition of piety. Socrates employs a set of strategies throughout their conversation in order to find an appropriate definition and also to force his opponent to concede the error in his multiple definitions.

---

[8] Organized public schooling and the use of education as an organized means for social change

The process works something like this. A question is posed and then the person to whom the question was posed is required to offer some answer. Once offered, the answer is dissected and picked apart in order to flush out any inadequacies. If the answer is abandoned in favor of an alternative, the same process takes place once more. Throughout the process, Socrates will ask his opponent to define certain words or concepts in order to advance the discussion forward. In this give and take process, both parties exchange ideas back and forth and incrementally reach new stages of agreement and then disagreement until either the final answer is found or the question is abandoned.

In another of the Socratic Dialogues, *Theaetetus*, Socrates engages in a discussion about the meaning of knowledge. In this dialogue a valuable insight is offered into his method of inquiry:

> For men as well as women have pangs of labour; and both at times require the assistance of midwives. And he, Socrates, is a midwife, although this is a secret; he has inherited the art from his mother bold and bluff, and he ushers into light, not children, but the thoughts of men. Like the midwives who are 'past bearing children,' he too can have no offspring—God will not allow him to bring anything into the world of his own. He also reminds Theaetetus that the midwives are or ought to be the only matchmakers (this is the preparation for a biting jest); for those who reap the fruit are most likely to know on what soil the plants will grow.[9]

This comparison to midwifery says a lot about Socrates's role in his dialectic. He is not creating something new, but instead shepherding something that only needed guidance. The truth is already the truth; Socrates is simply helping people find it, or in most cases find what it is not.

The Socratic Method has two primary stages. First, people and their ideas are deconstructed or torn down. Once the person and the arena of ideas are vulnerable, Socrates is able to come in and guide the discussion to a more honest place. By asking a

---

[9] Plato, "Theaetetus." Pg. 22-23

series of probing questions and establishing common understanding, Socrates then reconstructs ideas and concepts for the benefit of both from the ground up. This reconstruction leads to one of the key aspects of the Socratic Method.

Socrates does not give himself sole credit for this venture. The only way for the process to work is for the other party to actively engage in the conversation. By offering new ideas and by being willing to make a mistake, people can learn. If the truth is simply told to them, they have the opportunity to deny it, but if they are forced to discover it on their own, they may actually believe what they find. The following passage is another passage from *Theaetetus* in which Socrates offers some insight into his method.

> It is quite clear that they never learned anything from me; the many fine discoveries to which they cling are of their own making. But to me and the god they owe their deliver. And the proof of my words is that many of them in their ignorance, either in their self-conceit despising me, or falling under the influence of others, have gone away too soon; and have not only lost the children of whom I had previously delivered them by an ill bringing up, but have stifled whatever else they had in them by evil communications, being fonder of lies and shams than of the truth; and they have at last ended by seeing themselves, as others see them, to be great fools.[10]

Once again, it is imperative to understand that Socrates's role is necessary for the process to happen. The teacher does not have to have all of the answers, but has to be willing to shepherd the discussion in the right direction. There is an element of control, and there are right and wrong answers. The presence of these seemingly rigid constructs is essential to the success of the Socratic Method. These same constructs are a point of contention for what comes in the 20th century with the rise of postmodern pedagogy.

The 20th Century and the Rise of Postmodern Pedagogy

There are two basic streams of opposition to the Socratic Method. Each is an indirect set of writing and influence that converged with one writer in the 20th century

---

[10] Ibid, pg. 111

and shaped the overhaul of the French educational system after the French Revolution and again after the French riots of 1968. These streams spanned continents and had equally impactful results all over the world.

The first significant signs of opposition to the Socratic Method came from Jean Jacques Rousseau and his fervent opposition to, among other things, a *tabula rasa* approach to education. As the chapter later discusses, the Socratic Method presumed that the learner needed assistance from a learned individual in order to acquire new knowledge. Such an assumption is also referred to pedagogically as the "banking principle." Both Rousseau and John Dewey wrote prolifically about the dangers of treating students as empty repositories in need of fulfillment by omniscient teachers. Although Rousseau and Dewey are not considered postmodern, they certainly are credited with some of the first modern critiques of the ancient Greek method of education. As one of the first educational manuals for children, the *Emile* also was one of the influences on Maria Montessori and her method of child-centered education. Their ideas established an educational philosophy that influenced 20th century theorists.

The second stream started with Antonio Gramsci and his work *The Prison Notebooks* in which he advocates the recognition and nurturing of intellectuals from all classes. According to Gramsci, intellectualism is not limited to any class; instead, all classes have their own intellectuals that ought to rise up and become leaders of the educational movements of their respective groups. Gramsci lays the blueprint for adult education that Frantz Fanon picks up in his work *The Wretched of the Earth*. Fanon, an Algerian anti-colonial organizer, advocated the creation of an education system that was born of native intellectuals as opposed to those of the colonial power. Instead of adopting

an education system set down by those he considered occupiers, Fanon saw the creation of a distinctive education system as a necessary step in developing a national identity apart from the colonial power. By relying on native intellectuals, an identity could be formed that would spark the overthrow of colonial power. Fanon also had a great deal of influence on the man that is considered to be the founder of critical pedagogy, Paolo Freire.

Freire was a Brazilian who spent most of his life as a teacher in the secondary schools of Brazil. As the founder of modern critical pedagogy, Freire held that oppression was the primary hindrance to education. Freire united the first and second streams into critical pedagogy. This pedagogical approach focuses on a constant challenge to anything and everything dominant. Social norms, societal constructs, and either state-sponsored or class-sponsored oppression are the main targets of these challenges. One of Freire's teaching partners, Ira Shor, defines critical pedagogy in this way:

> Habits of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning, first impressions, dominant myths, official pronouncements, traditional clichés, received wisdom, and mere opinions, to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, object, process, organization, experience, text, subject matter, policy, mass media, or discourse.[11]

In this passage, one observes that all things traditional or conventional are suddenly up for debate in a new and organized way. Freire also picked up on Rousseau's stream when he dedicated part of *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* to a critical analysis of the banking concept and a sharp rebuke of what he calls the "teacher-student contradiction."[12]

---

[11] Shor, "Empowering Education," pg. 129
[12] Freire, "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", pg. 59

Freire offers the following diagnosis of the state of education at the mercy of the *tabula rasa*. This passage gives some insight into Freire's disapproval of a system that he sees as fundamentally flawed in its pedagogical approach.

> A careful analysis of the teacher-student relationship at any level, inside or outside the school, reveals its fundamentally *narrative* character. This relationship involves a narrating Subject (the teacher) and patient, listening objects (the students). The contents, whether values or empirical dimensions of reality, tend in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified. Education is suffering from narration sickness…Narration (with the teacher as narrator) leads the students to memorize mechanically the narrated content. Worse yet, it turns them into "containers," into "receptacles" to be "filled" by the teacher. The more completely he fills the receptacles, the better a teacher he is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are.[13]

This rebuke of the banking system metaphor brings to a head the original criticism by Rousseau and also helps to shape Freire's critical pedagogy. The streams converge with Freire and critical pedagogy giving way to what I now refer to, roughly, as postmodernism and ultimately postmodern pedagogy.

A third and less structured organized stream of thought rounds out postmodernism, and this is what is most often called "continental philosophy." Continental philosophy represents the common philosophical thread running through all of the streams that culminate in today's postmodernism. This category is a general grouping of philosophical subsets: German Idealism, critical theory, deconstruction, nihilism, and Marxism.[14] Nihilism is best described as the belief that values are nonexistent. This complex rejection of any one "true" morality is the product of a loose stream of thought that began generally with G.W.F. Hegel's *Phenomenology of the Mind*

---

[13] Ibid, pg. 57-58

[14] Critical theory is most often associated with Jürgen Habermas, Theodor Adorno, and Max Horkheimer (The Frankfurt School). It is also the genesis of critical pedagogy. The term evolved from Emmanuel Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" and Karl Marx's "Das Kapital." Deconstruction is a form of philosophical analysis coined by Jacques Derrida in "Of Grammatology." Friedrich Nietzsche's nihilism is a total rejection of values as false inventions in "The Will to Power."

(German Idealism). This group of philosophers completely rejected Plato and all Western notions of the concept of being. Nihilism is a vital component of postmodernism that introduces the idea of total moral relativism. The relative support of nihilistic thought varies throughout the community of critical theorists.

> A nihilist is a man who judges of the world as it is that it ought **NOT** to be, and of the world as it ought to be that it does not exist. According to this view, our existence (action, suffering, willing, feeling) has no meaning: the pathos of 'in vain' is the nihilists' pathos — at the same time, as pathos, an inconsistency on the part of the nihilists.[15]

Each of these pieces is its own philosophical approach, but over time, the culmination of the general set of ideas came together under the term "postmodernism."[16]

Postmodernism came about as both a reaction to and an extension of modernism. Modernism first rejected enlightenment-era thinking such as that of the American founders as well as tradition in the form of religion and political constructs. The evolution toward postmodernism came from the rise of critical theory and nihilism. The overlap in these two philosophies is seen by way of Arthur Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Søren Kierkegaard among others.[17] It is fair to say modernism gave rise to postmodernism, and

in turn, postmodernism developed and reinforced modernism. Both of these groups reject tradition in the form of Ancient Greek concepts of "truth" and morality. This strong bond between the two serves as the key reason for the grouping of the two in Chapter Four.

---

[15] Nietzsche, Friedrich, "The Will to Power," section 585.

[16] The complexity of influences and links between each of these and many more authors cannot be overstated. There are several other streams and authors that influenced each of the ones in this thesis;, however, the ones that have been selected highlight the most instructive path to understanding modernism and postmodernism.

[17] Schopenhauer influenced existentialism with his rejection of the human will in "Will to Live." Kierkegaard also contributed to existentialism and the subjectivity of truth through his severe criticism of organized religion in "Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments."

The importance of the convergence of these streams (postmodernism and critical pedagogy) cannot be overstated. The first is a rejection of the teacher-student dichotomy that establishes authority in the classroom by defining the roles of the learned and learner. The *tabula rasa* approach asserts that the teacher has a commodity to offer to the needy student, and all the student needs to do is accept the gift. The rejection of this pedagogy and the adoption of critical pedagogy seek to shed power dynamics out of recognition of the dangers of "oppression." This is the link to postmodern pedagogy. The distrust of theories and ideologies is a hallmark of postmodernism. Seen as a means of control, concepts such as right and wrong, truth and untruth, are all distrusted.

This new philosophy was on display in the student riots in Paris during May 1968. Seen by some literary experts[18] as an educational, sexual, and societal revolution, these demonstrations gave way to the abandonment of traditional notions of morality, social order, and the social contract. One of the most prominent images from the period is a poster featuring a shadowed General de Gaulle with his hand over the mouth of a youth reading "Be young and be quiet."[19] This period of time also saw the further rejection of religion (organized or not), patriotism, and respect for authority. While the Paris riots were not solely about education, neither is postmodernism.

These riots were part of a larger social movement that was taking place around the world. In addition to the labor and education issues being disputed in France, the U.S. was host to its own set of cultural upheavals. A series of protests in the U.S signaled shifts in social relations. Along with the protests against American involvement in Vietnam and civil rights demonstrations, 1968 was also the year of the riots at the

---

[18] Based on Texas Tech University's definition of postmodernism from Chapter One.
[19] No attribution available.

Democrat National Convention in Chicago. These protests culminated in the anti-war protests at Kent State University in 1970.

Responses to the Shift

Freire's work gave rise to a new and ever evolving approach to education. By abandoning traditional teacher and student relationships as well as traditional Socratic pedagogical practices, an entirely new set of pedagogical norms was established. While authors such as Maryellen Weimer and Shor created extensions to Freire's work on pedagogical matters, others offered sharp criticism of his rejection of the Socratic Method. Both Weimer and Ira Shor expanded upon the importance of awareness about power dynamics and education as an instrument of social change. Criticisms of this type of pedagogy and tenets of postmodernism come from authors such as Leo Strauss, Allan Bloom, and Eric Voegelin. These advocates and adversaries have kept alive a debate about the purpose of education and the best pedagogy to be used.

One of the defining characteristics of the advocates of Freire's work is their penchant for using education as a way to reform society into a postmodern society void of traditional power dynamics and what they see (critically) as social constructs. One of Freire's teaching partners, Ira Shor, wrote a book entitled "Empowering Education" in which he advocates the installation of democracy in the classroom and the desocialization of students:

> Empowering education…is a critical-democratic pedagogy for self and social change. It is a student-centered program for multicultural democracy in school and society. It approaches individual growth as an active, cooperative, and social process, because the self and society create each other. Human beings do not invent themselves in a vacuum, and society cannot be made unless people create it together. The goals of this pedagogy are to relate personal growth to public life,

22

by developing strong skills, academic knowledge, habits of inquiry, and critical curiosity about society, power, inequality, and change[20]

Shor's insight into critical pedagogy brings to light his desire to use education as a tool for self and social change. Rather than viewing education in its traditional sense as lessons being learned, Shor seeks to turn education into a loose process whereby one finds out more about themselves through a process of personal growth than from enlightenment through knowledge.

As evidenced by the following passage, Shor emphasizes the importance of installing democracy in the classroom and abolishing the traditional roles of teacher and student. Rather than confront students with pressing problems and questions, he proposes to let students decide what they do and do not want to discuss.

> I tested topical themes in this class, knowing that it is the teacher's right to use them while it is the students' right to reject them. I did not insist on the race issue when the students persistently refused to discuss it. Students cannot be thought of as a captive audience. If they don't want to discuss a topical theme, they must not be forced to do so.[21]

The idea that the students may learn from the teacher is completely set aside in favor of a looser system of discussion and personal processing. In this example, Shor makes it clear that students ought to determine the course of their education, or growth experience, and the teacher has only the right to propose topics that students have the right to accept or deny.

One of the more contemporary followers of Freire's teaching is Maryellen Weimer. She specializes in methods for learner-centered teaching that take the focus away from everything besides the student. Weimer draws connections to Freire when she

---

[20] Shor, pg. 50
[21] Shor, pg. 66

writes, "Freire first and most definitively articulated what has become the central tenet of critical pedagogy: education can be a vehicle for social change."[22] Like Shor, Weimer reminds readers that the days of using education as a means to impart knowledge are over and that instead, young people should learn how to exact social change. In one of the most direct statements on the new purpose for education, Weimer draws from another set of learner-centered teaching scholars:

> Education's role is to challenge inequality and dominant myths rather than socialize students into the status quo. Learning is directed toward social change and transforming the world, and "true" learning empowers students to challenge oppression in their lives.[23]

The gravity of this statement should not be overlooked. Not only is education's purpose no longer to impart knowledge and help to create a learned society, but this new mission seeks to use education as a vehicle for effecting social change, and it views all things societal as oppressive and worthy of being thrown off by these bourgeoning change agents.

Among those who reject this new postmodern pedagogy was Allan Bloom. Bloom laments the overall state of the American educational system as it was after the cultural turmoil of the 1960s. Bloom summarizes the 1960s college experience this way:

> A partial list of the sacrifices made by the students to their morality will suffice to show its character: they were able to live as they pleased in the university, as *in loco parentis* responsibilities were abandoned; drugs became a regular part of life, with almost no interference from university authorities, while the civil authority was kept at bay by the university's alleged right to police its precincts; all sexual restrictions imposed by rule or disapproval were overturned; academic requirements were relaxed in every imaginable way, and grade inflation made it difficult to flunk; avoidance of military service was a way of life and a principle. All of these privileges were disguised with edifying labels such as individual responsibility, experience, growth, development, self-expression, liberation,

---

[22] Weimer, Maryellen. "Learner Centered Teaching," pg. 8
[23] ibid

concern. Never in history had there been such a marvelous correspondence between the good and the pleasant.[24]

Bloom's often bruising rhetoric was meant to give an account of the university experience that came about as a result of multiple streams of social and political upheaval arising from what he also refers to as a student revolt. Students were so displeased with what they were being taught, and with what they were not being taught, that they staged an academic "coup" against traditional education.

Bloom also had a great deal of disdain for educators who sought to reform the American educational system in the 1960s by enacting a set of looser guidelines that placed a premium on fairness and streamlining instead of struggle and accomplishment. Throughout the 1960s, the "old curriculum" as Bloom calls it was slowly eroded away in favor of nothing.[25] This was his real objection: not that the old system was replaced with something new, but instead that it was replaced with nothing. When pressed by another member of the faculty about why he had stopped objecting to deleting the curriculum, Bloom answered: "It was because they *[the remains]* were, I said, a threadbare reminiscence of the unity of knowledge one must know about if one is to be educated."[26]

> The reforms were without content, made for the "inner-directed" person. They were an acquiescence in a leveling off of the peaks, and were the source of the collapse of the entire American educational structure, recognized by all parties when they talk about the need to go "back to basics."[27]

The inner-directed pedagogy Bloom referred to was another branch of the pedagogy advocated by postmodernists. Notice that he did not say the system had been altered or transformed, but instead that it was destroyed.

---

[24] Bloom, Allan. "The Closing of the American Mind," 1988, pg. 328-329
[25] ibid pg. 320
[26] ibid
[27] ibid pg. 321

In an effort to restore some of what was lost through the dismantling of the American educational tradition, Bloom hoped to find solace in Europe's power to produce the knowledge of philosophy. During the 1950s, the great scholars of Europe and elsewhere had been lured to The United States by universities that yearned for "authentic" or primary sources of philosophy. Once the 1960s had passed, the wealth of original literature and philosophical knowledge was severely depleted. Bloom mourns the loss of this wealth of knowledge, writing:

> That was never a native plant. We were dependent on Europe for it. All of our peaks were derivative, with full self-awareness and without being ashamed of it. In the meantime, Europe itself, on which we could count if we faltered, has undergone an evolution similar to our own, and we cannot go there to train ourselves as we once could. Short of great new theoretical and artistic impulses rising up on their own here to replace the West's legacy to us, there is no way but tradition to have kept us in contact with such things. And one cannot jump on and off the tradition kike a train. Once broken, our link with it is hard to renew. The instinctive awareness of meanings, as well as the stores of authentic learning in the heads of scholars, are lost.[28]

One of the most serious problems with disregarding Bloom's traditional system is that scholars are no longer seen as sources of knowledge or experience and are instead viewed by postmodern pedagogy as facilitators students use in order to self-actualize their own paths to fulfillment. Viewing these rare scholars and intellects as commodities to be shared is seen as demeaning to the student whose lack of knowledge is said to be just as valuable. In order to give students control of the classroom, teachers also had to give them control of the material. When students were no longer interested in the painstakingly difficult philosophy offered by their mentors, they could simply reject it altogether. When new generations of American philosophers were no longer being

---

[28] ibid

produced by these authentic sources of knowledge, the fragile and organic connection

with European philosophy was damaged.

As one of the leading Platonists in the world, Bloom told a brief story about one

of the demonstrations that broke out at Cornell during a semester that he was teaching

The Republic. A group of his students was so frustrated with the madness going on below

them that they copied a passage out of *The Republic* and went down to the masses to

distribute what they thought was a telling account of what was going on[29]:

> And may we not say, Adeimantus, that the most gifted minds, when they are ill-educated, become pre-eminently bad? Do not great crimes and the spirit of pure evil spring out of a fullness of nature ruined by education rather than from any inferiority, whereas weak natures are scarcely capable of any very great good or very great evil? There I think you are right. And our philosopher follows the same analogy—he is like a plant which, having proper nurture, most necessarily grow and mature into all virtue, but, if sown and planted in an alien soil, becomes the most noxious of all weeds, unless he be preserved by some divine power. Do you really think, as people so often say, that our youth are corrupted by Sophists, or that private teachers or the arts corrupt them in any degree worth speaking of? Are not the public who say these things the greatest of all Sophists? And do they not educate to perfection young and old, men and women alike, and fashion them after their own hearts?[30]

At least generally, this passage could be taken to convey a few different points. The

public, in this case the protesting students and their supporters, is saying that traditional

norms in education are no longer acceptable and that they believe they have been

corrupted by them. In actuality, they do not understand that they are the ones causing the

real corruption and sowing new and evil seeds. The system that they are rebelling against

was only ever designed to nurture their education and steer them in the right direction,

while the new system they so long for will give them exactly what they want instead of

---

[29] Bloom, pg. 332-333

[30] Note: I chose not to use the same translation of the passage from *The Republic* as did Bloom. Instead I used a somewhat less cryptic and more straightforward translation from Benjamin Jowett, pg. 491e-492b.

27

what they actually need. Unable to see the forest for the trees, these students only thought they were being duped when in all honesty there was nothing more authentic than the methods they had known for so long.

Bloom's mentor, Leo Strauss, wrote a great deal about nihilism and the destruction of morality in the modern American state. Strauss divided nihilism into two types. The first is an attempt to destroy all things traditional, accepted moral and ethical standards, and conceptions of history.[31] The second type is more "gentile" and is characterized by hedonism and "permissive egalitarianism."[32] Absent any concrete definitions of right and wrong, Strauss was deeply concerned that American society had been damaged by this occurrence. In addition to the threats posed by nihilism, Strauss advocated a strong grounding of political philosophy in the Ancient Greek sources:

> Socratic rhetoric is meant to be an indispensable instrument of philosophy. Its purpose is to lead potential philosophers to philosophy both by training them and by liberating them from the charms which obstruct the philosophic effort, as well as to prevent the access to philosophy of those who are not fit for it. Socratic rhetoric is emphatically just. It is animated by the spirit of social responsibility. It is based on the premise that there is a disproportion between the intransigent quest for truth and the requirements of society, or that not all truths are always harmless. Society will always try to tyrannize thought. Socratic rhetoric is the classic means for ever again frustrating these attempts.[33]

This point by Strauss about the necessity of the Socratic dialogues is an interesting one. Imagine for a moment an art history student who does not know Leonardo Da Vinci or a mathematician unfamiliar with the Pythagorean Theorem. These entities are staples of their respective fields; however, this is only half of the point Strauss is making. Not only

---

[31] Leo Strauss, *On Tyranny* (New York: Free Press, 1991) pg. 22–23, 178

[32] Leo Strauss, "The Crisis of Our Time," pg. 41–54 in Howard Spaeth, ed., *The Predicament of Modern Politics* (Detroit: U of Detroit P, 1964) pg. 47–48
Leo Strauss, "What Is Political Philosophy?" 9–55 in Leo Strauss, *What Is Political Philosophy? and Other Studies* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959) 18–19.

[33] Strauss, "On Tyranny," pg. 26

is Socrates a staple of political philosophy, but he is an essential tool to understanding

philosophy. The political philosophy student unread in the writings of Socrates may not

be a philosopher at all.

Another major critic of postmodernism was Eric Voegelin. Voegelin was an

ardent opponent of all relativism and the nihilism that resulted from what he saw as a

disorder or pathology of society. The destruction of philosophy by a group of sophists

was one Voegelin's greatest concerns:

> After the destruction of philosophy through the sophists, its reconstruction had to
> stress the *Deus-mensura* of the philosophers; and the new philosophy had to be
> clearly a "type of theology." The great achievement of the sophists in the material
> organization of the sciences of education, ethics, and politics must be recognized
> quite as much as their decisive philosophical deficiency unless the sudden
> magnificent unfolding through Plato and Aristotle shall appear as a miracle
> beyond historical causality.[34]

The objection Voegelin shared in this passage is to something loosely referred to by

authors in the late 20th as scientism. Influenced by nihilism, the rejection of all things

theistic and intangible was a necessary step to the rise of "hard" science as a means of

solving all problems.

Scientism is a view that holds natural science as the authority on all things, also

referred to as scientific imperialism.[35] According to this concept, social sciences are

useless because all human behavior can be understood from a biological viewpoint. All

matters such as philosophy and religion are said to be false constructs that would be

easily resolved through the application of natural science. Both Friedrich von Hayek and

---

[34] Eric Voegelin, "Order and History: The World of the Polis," pg. 349-350
[35] Oxford English Dictionary Online defines "Scientism" as the "excessive belief in the power of scientific knowledge and techniques," http://www.askoxford.com/concise_oed/scientism?view=uk

Karl Popper wrote extensively about the dangers of scientism.[36] The problem is not that science should not be a part of the discussion, but that it should be just that, a part. Along with philosophy and reason, scientific study can be used to solve problems, but in Hayek's view, scientism had taken over the social sciences and had replaced the use of philosophy and reason in the process of research discovery. Scientism contends that the use of religion, philosophy, or reason to solve problems is a contaminated scheme and thereby invalidates whatever results are found.

> It seems to me that this failure of the economists to guide policy more successfully is closely connected with their propensity to imitate as closely as possible the procedures of the brilliantly successful physical sciences — an attempt which in our field may lead to outright error. It is an approach which has come to be described as the "scientistic" attitude — an attitude which, as I defined it some thirty years ago, "is decidedly unscientific in the true sense of the word, since it involves a mechanical and uncritical application of habits of thought to fields different from those in which they have been formed."[37]

The second part of the broader point Hayek was trying to make was that the "scientific method" should not be separate from philosophy and moral reason. The "scientific method," in his view, had been perverted to include only those things that can be mathematically measured and explained. The danger arising from this sort of method is that there are phenomena that cannot be measured or explained in the context of the scientific method. In this same speech, Hayek went on to say that, "This means that to entrust to science - or to deliberate control according to scientific principles - more than scientific method can achieve may have deplorable effects."[38] Using the wrong tools to

---

[36] Hayek unpacked his objections to scientism in "The Counter-Revolution of Science: Studies in the Abuse of Reason," 1952 and then again "Degrees of Explanation" and "The Theory of Complex Phenomena."
[37] Hayek, Friedrich, "The Pretence of Knowledge," Lecture given December 11, 1974. "Scientism and the Study of Society," *Economica*, vol. IX, no. 35, August 1942, reprinted in *The Counter-Revolution of Science*, Glencoe, Ill., 1952, p. 15 of this reprint.
[38] ibid

explain a phenomenon jeopardizes the validity of the findings as well as the future of science as a whole. An expectation may be (and ultimately has been) created that only the results born from scientism are believable to the public and that all things philosophical or based in immeasurable terms are suspect.

As with most theoretical discussions, neither scientism nor its critics have managed to win complete acceptance over the other. What has emerged from this discussion is some melding of the two. The next section of this chapter will explore the current character of pedagogy within graduate level political philosophy/theory.

Analysis of the Current State of Affairs

This section undertakes two primary tasks. The dense nature of all of the information requires some sort of unifying statement and then a discussion of the system that has been created from these dueling philosophies of postmodernism and tradition. Postmodernism is its own container comprised of complex and sometimes contradictory conceptions of being and knowing. The pedagogy that has been born out of postmodernism also had a significant role in shaping this fluid school of thought.

It is of the utmost importance that one understand that postmodernism is not a singular event, or a discrete philosophy. There is no one person that wrote the book on postmodernism; nor is there a founder *per se*. Postmodernism formed as a result of many different philosophies that were produced as a response to established norms of education and philosophy. The tenets of postmodernism made it conducive to a logical fusion with critical pedagogy. Notice that many of the contributors to postmodernism were completely unaware of the ultimate destination of their work. Most of these thinkers were adamant opponents of established norms, most specifically the work of ancient

31

philosophers like Plato and Socrates. In order for critical pedagogy, nihilism, and scientism to work, an absolute rejection of the Socratic Method was required. The Socratic Method relied upon an inclusion of both physical science and philosophical discussion to arrive at the "truth," but postmodernism largely rejected the ability of philosophy to clearly discern right and wrong answers. By picking apart the pieces comprising the system of the time, these authors were able to recreate pieces that would ultimately be united under one banner. Similarly, the responses outlined above are objections to postmodern pedagogy by way of the specific provisions of postmodernism.

There are noticeable differences between the grievances of these two camps. While the founders of postmodern pedagogy advocated the elimination of the status quo and the creation of a new and more fluid system of educational philosophy, the respondents did their best to explain why these "reforms" were actually damaging to both education and philosophy. Their unifying goal was twofold: return to the use of the Socratic Method and shed light upon (and ultimately eliminate by mass movement) what they saw as destructive forces such as nihilism, scientism, moral relativism, and critical pedagogy. The major task undertaken by defenders of traditional views was to dispel some of the most unfair criticisms of traditional education and philosophy. Bloom and Hayek demonstrated a level of frustration over this predicament through their writing that was often palpable. Frustration arose from what is a fundamental misunderstanding by the postmodernists of what they were criticizing. The two main points of misunderstanding are the banking concept and the traditional notion of the classroom.

Defenders of traditional views saw Rousseau's discussion of the banking concept as corrupt at its core. Young people have one thing in common: potential. Young children

are not born with knowledge of mathematical methods or an understanding of human social dynamics. What they do have is the potential to learn those things from someone who is in a position to teach them. In a basic sense, children certainly are empty banks, but they are not broken banks. Until their development into adolescence, children possess only the limited capability of filling this bank on their own, let alone screening and processing the material that goes in. Without the guidance of someone else, be it a parent, teacher, or someone, these children would fill their banks with whatever they wanted, regardless of the things they may need in order function as adults.

The charges of both Rousseau and his contemporaries were not limited to the specific content being put into these banks, but also to the notion that society had any business putting anything in them at all. As it relates to the concept of the tabula rasa, Socrates did one thing carefully and that was not to boast an all-knowing superiority to those with whom he argued. There were things that he knew with certainty and at the same time there were things he thought could only be learned through the dialectic process. Socrates did not hold classes where he gave lectures to groups of people yearning for answers. He engaged in discussions that guided people to find the answers on their own, helping them develop what traditionalists refer to as critical thinking and reasoning skills. If Socrates had believed he knew all of the answers, he would have had no need to engage with others to find new and better answers. While he may certainly be accused of occasional haughtiness, never once did Socrates claim to know anything for certain. Perhaps the criticisms of those who were offended by the Socratic Method were

misplaced and instead belonged to Cephalus for boldly and contently claiming that he had all of the answers he needed.[39]

The opposition to the banking concept is directly tied to Freire's attempt to turn the classroom into a power free zone where both student and teacher came in on an equal playing field. Having shed the notion that teachers had anything of value to offer to the unlearned, teaching was transformed into a facilitator role by which students were allowed to freely guide their own inner-directed education; this approach is most closely akin to letting the inmates run the asylum. There are several serious problems with this idea. First, if one were to accept the premise that students do not need to be filled with knowledge, then organized education is completely unnecessary from the start. If the inmates were fit to independently manage their own affairs, then there would be no need for the asylum. Crude as this comparison sounds, it stands the test of reason. Although children may benefit from interaction with others, there would be no need for this interaction to take place in a controlled environment. Following the logic of the postmodernists, the word student is also invalid because students are taught, and according to Freire there is no one to be doing the teaching except the self. Instead, the term learner may be used.[40] The problem with this term from the traditional perspective is that it has no parameters because every person is engaged in some experiential learning regardless of their age or position in life.

The logical endpoint of postmodern pedagogy is to eliminate the organized education system altogether. However, its advocates did not choose to do this because the

---

[39] In Book I one of "The Republic," Cephalus briefly engages with Socrates and says that justice is speaking the truth and paying one's debts. Once pressed by Socrates, he quickly leaves the discussion totally uninterested in the possibility that his statement was either incorrect or incomplete.
[40] Weimer indeed does eliminate the term student in favor of learner in "learner centered teaching."

traditional role of teacher and student *has to* exist since there are some who know and even more that do not. Left to their own devices, children would not learn the things necessary to operate in a society of educated adults. By sustaining at least some semblance of the organized classroom, there is an automatic acknowledgement that power dynamics *must* exist for a classroom to exist.

Take for a moment the hypothetical that a completely postmodern educational system could be created. Play the scenario to its logical conclusion and what is found is frightening. If the generations of learned adults were to eventually be followed by self learned people, then the world would eventually be dominated by ignorant fools. Since no one learned to read (because no one taught them), literature is dead. Additionally, no one has the knowledge required to calculate mathematical problems; therefore, technological advancement dies. Medicine ceases to exist because no one is trained to be a doctor. With the fall of organized governments comes the total anarchy of human beings and a return to some sort of a primitive state of nature. This thought experiment may sound apocalyptic, but it is simply a logical continuation of a system doomed to fail. Keeping the results of the thought experiment in mind, one unexpectedly finds a suspiciously convenient result. Among the chief projects of Rousseau and his contemporaries was a return to none other than the state of nature. By eroding the maxim that knowledge is power, one sees the certain unraveling of human progress.[41]

Having played through the opposition, it is useful to run a similar thought experiment with the traditional system. Start with the reminder that this traditional system helped Rousseau and Freire develop as intellectuals. From there, take the lesson from

---

[41] It is worth mentioning that the thought experiment has an ironic side effect. When humans return to the state of nature, what exactly would happen; perhaps, the same thing as before? The cycle would simply restart.

Socrates's discussion with Menos.[42] Menos asks Socrates how someone can look for something that they do not know is there to be found. Socrates uses one of Menos's slaves to demonstrate that knowledge is not acquired, but recollected. The uneducated slave had no idea how to answer a geometry puzzle Socrates had asked because the slave had never been taught geometry. Once Socrates taught him something, he was able to apply what he had learned, then come back and do it again. This passage became known as Menos's Paradox because the question naturally arises, how did the teacher learn? The process of discovery (often by accident) turns up some new information that could not have been found if it had been sought because the searcher knew not what they were seeking. Instead, someone tested and probed the subject to gather all of the information possible and then that person became the teacher. Without the teacher, knowledge is not passed on to a new generation.

Another one of the unintended consequences of the postmodern system is the elimination of expertise. Consider the first tenet of Freire's classroom. In order to create an environment for learners, there cannot be any significant difference between the facilitator and the learner. Bringing an expert on medieval era philosophy to teach a medieval philosophy course would be out of the question because the learners may feel intimidated by the presence of someone who is more knowledgeable. The natural power dynamic that would be created between the expert and the non-expert would prevent the environment from being learner-centered.

The last and most theoretically burdensome argument against the reign of postmodernism is the fundamental rationale behind political science, which is that at its inception, politics was a study of normative political theory and philosophy.

---

[42] Plato. "Meno," 80d-81d.

For Aristotle, the science of politics was not synonymous with the contemporary connotation of "science" as it pertains to the so-called "hard sciences." Socrates drew directly from physical science in his rhetoric, but only used it as one of the many tools in his dialectic. Before the behavioral revolution of the 1950s, the study of politics (not political *science*) was about more than complex statistical models and predictors of human political behavior. Political problems were studied and debated with the help of foundational literature instead of strictly statistical means; there were clearly correct and incorrect answers in the philosophical arena. Postmodernism (and behavioralism) labels normative questions about what should and should not be as "value" laden and beyond the scope of political science.

Foundational Concepts

The analysis of opposing viewpoints thus far has left one vital element untouched. In order for this concept to be properly understood, one must come to terms with the critical differences between postmodernists and traditionalists or "foundationalists." The hypothesis from chapter one, along with the lion's share of the criticism directed at postmodernism reflects its lack of traditional constitution, which now will be reframed using a more substantive and cohesive phrase, "foundational concepts."

The Alexis de Tocqueville Lectures on American Politics was a series of lectures that took place at Harvard University in 2004. The inaugural lecture was presented by Dr. James W. Ceaser, Professor of Politics at the University of Virginia. In this lecture, Ceaser introduced the seemingly benign phrase "foundational concept" in order to

explain his general dissatisfaction with the field of political science and offer some

opportunity for reconciliation of the most basic tenets of politics.

In the foreword to Ceaser's lecture, Dr. Theda Skocpol, Director of American

Political Studies at Harvard, defines Ceaser's foundational concept this way:

> Foundational ideas involve first premises—about nature, history, or religion—that are not argued, but rather provide basis for argument in contests among theories of governance or party programs.[43]

In their simplest form, these foundational concepts are literally the basis for everything

that comes next. Without agreement over these foundations, legitimate arguments cannot

take place in a meaningful way.

Picking up the thread from the discussion of the current state of political science

from earlier in the chapter, Ceaser makes an interesting diagnosis regarding the tendency

of modern political scientists to dismiss, or at least shy away from those things that

cannot be measured.

> Of the different kinds of ideas at work in American politics, foundational concepts pose the greatest challenge to the political scientists. While many political scientists acknowledge in principle the importance of foundational ideas, they shy away from treating them, considering these concepts to be either too remote from ordinary practical affairs or too difficult to operationalize. There is an unfortunate tendency to think that what is not measurable or repeatable does not exist. It is easier to create an index of changing party strength in congressional voting than to devise a measure of shifting public support for the law of nature.[44]

The charge made here is twofold. First, even for those who acknowledge the existence

and importance of foundational ideas, the intangible is avoided because of the difficulty

related to tapping and explaining it. Second, when in doubt, the tendency is to simply

ignore what cannot easily be numerically measured. Regardless of the approach, the

political scientist is avoiding his or her responsibility in both cases.

---

[43] James W. Ceaser, "Nature and History in American Political Development," pg. viii
[44] ibid, pg. 9

In addition to lobbing a charge at political scientists, Ceaser carefully warns

against political philosophers trying to make theirs an exclusionary subfield:

> Political scientists have also been discouraged from venturing into this area by philosophers and political theorists, thinkers rarely known for their modesty. Because of the overlap between foundational concepts and theoretical ideas, these lofty thinkers have recently taken to asserting an exclusive right to treating all questions relating to foundations, letting it be known in no uncertain terms that they intend to handle the big stuff, while ordinary political scientists should confine themselves to matters such as post offices and maternity benefits. It is the study of politics that suffers, since philosophers rarely show much interest in examining how foundational concepts function in political life, preferring instead to use the appearance of these ideas as an opportunity to engage in theoretical dispute and promote their own favored positions.[45]

The idea Ceaser proposed here was to eliminate, or at least ease the strict demarcation

between political scientists and political philosophers, *in the interest of both.* According

to Ceaser, in order to be a political scientist, one must first be a political philosopher;

similarly, political philosophers have a responsibility to demonstrate the practicality of

their lofty ideas.

Albeit a sufficient reason for a political scientist to be invested in political

philosophy for its own sake, Ceaser posits another reason that speaks directly to the

modern ethos of the political scientist:

> It is important, therefore, to restate why political scientists should study foundational concepts. The reason has nothing to do with indulging an impulse to get a sneak peek at Spinoza or Hegel under the guide of analyzing American politics; it derives instead from the simple fact that foundational concepts are encountered as tangible political phenomena that are in play in the practical political world. As much as the economic conditions or political situation, foundational concepts form part of the context in which statesmen must act. They constitute a potential variable—if not an independent one, then at any rate an intervening one—and isn't it the political scientist's duty to protect every degree of variance?[46]

---

[45] ibid
[46] ibid

While this rationale could be mistaken for condescension, Ceaser is trying to appeal

directly to the nature of the political scientist. In the practical world of politics where data

are collected and theories formed, the theoretical element is an inescapable variable

underlying the entire enterprise. The affirmation at the end of this passage reminds the

political scientist of the responsibility to either control for every possible variable or

explain the effect of that variable in the outcome. In a results-oriented culture, this sort of

appeal ought to carry a great deal of weight.

Finally, Ceaser admits the road ahead is uncertain, but the journey is necessary all

the same. The potential that the study of "real world" phenomena could be combined

with the phenomena of "out there" is unsettling in a profession that has been so effective

at separating the two completely.

> This duty admittedly leads here into strange territory. American politics, for better or worse, is not a self-contained universe. Phenomena in the political realm "down here" –a realm of practical matters such as constitutions, wars and elections—are linked to phenomena in the in the philosophical and metaphysical realm "out there." These links also bring under the scope of political analysis an unusual set of actors: those who play a role in spreading and producing these ideas. It is impossible to treat foundational concepts without considering the public intellectuals who import them into political discussion and the theorists and philosophers, perhaps far removed from ordinary politics, who are their originators.[47]

The crux of this argument is rather simple. In order to do justice to either kind of

analysis, one must be willing to step outside of his or her comfort zone. Political actors

such as states or statesmen have motivations that may only be understood by

unconventional means. Separating the "science" from the "foundation" is mutually

destructive to both.

---

[47] ibid

This chapter, although necessarily cumbersome at times, is the link that is needed to understand the most difficult element of the hypothesis. *The antithesis to postmodernism and postmodern pedagogy is the notion of the foundational concept*. The identifying characteristic of postmodernism is its rejection of establishment and tradition along with the denial of the moral absolute in exchange for moral relativism; put another way, the transcendence of the political. Truth is not something to be taught or learned, but a destination to be decided solely on the individual level, free of any influence or direction.[48]

---

[48] The essence of inner-directed learning results in postmodern pedagogy.

Chapter 3:

Findings

The previous chapter dealt directly with the different streams that converged into what is now postmodern pedagogy as well as the theoretical arguments for and against that type of practice in the classroom. The purpose of this chapter is to describe my more empirical exploration of the extent to which postmodernism has influenced graduate political theory instruction. The chapter begins with the data collection process, then moves to the analysis of those data and the subsequent findings. After presenting the findings from the analysis of the APSA listing of institutions that grant doctorates in political science, it explores the literature choices of those departments that require political philosophy or theory of all of their doctoral students.

Data Collection

A total of 123 institutions are listed on the APSA's Web site under the heading of "Institutions that Grant Ph.D.s in Political Science."[49] Each of these was included in the analysis. In addition to the analysis of the political philosophy and theory content being offered, a need for additional analysis came to light. All told, this study uncovered more than one valuable set of trends in the subfield of political philosophy and theory. The data collection unearthed findings that I did not originally expect.

By using the list compiled by the APSA, several potential conflicts were avoided. At first, I considered relying on other organizations' lists or rankings of political science departments that grant doctorates in the field. I ultimately decided against this because of the possible biases involved in the composition of such lists and rankings. The APSA list was more helpful to this study because it was a simple alphabetical listing of programs

---

[49] http://www.apsanet.org/content_6947.cfm

without any other kind of sorting. The actual listing was nothing more than a set of live Web links to each institution's main political science department Web site. In the event that the hypothesis was supported, this comprehensive list provided a greater chance for generalizability and accuracy.

Data collection was necessarily a two-step process. In order to gather the data required to explore the main hypothesis, the APSA listing had to be narrowed. If the listing had been analyzed without any type of screening, the variability of the data would have been difficult to overcome, and any findings would have been difficult to generalize. After careful thought and consideration, a single criterion was chosen in order to filter the data. It stands to reason that those political science departments that require political philosophy and/or theory courses of all of their students have the most serious investment in the structure and content of those courses. Therefore, the unit of analysis was narrowed to only those departments with political philosophy and/or theory requirements.

The first round of analysis resulted in the creation of a spreadsheet (see *Appendix A*). This spreadsheet screened each program based on three criteria. First, did the program's political science department offer any graduate level courses in political philosophy or theory; the heading of this column (column B) labeled "Theory Offering?," and was filled with either a "yes" or a "no." From each department's main page, I navigated to the graduate section of the Web site, often entitled "Graduate Program" or "Ph.D. Program." From there, the list of departmental subfields was consulted for any courses under the heading of political philosophy, theory, and in some cases "political thought." If one of these headings existed, the institution was marked with a "yes," or a

"no," if no such heading was present. If the answer was "yes" then question two was posed; if not, then the analysis of that institution was complete.

The second question was whether the institution's political science program required all of its doctoral students to complete at least once course in political philosophy or theory. This column (column C) was labeled "Required of All?" In order to make this determination, I navigated to the published requirements for the doctoral degree. These requirements were most often found on pages entitled "Ph.D. Requirements" or in separate documents called "Graduate Manual." Each of the programs clearly spelled out the required and elective courses for each of its degrees. In addition, potential transfer students were given clear direction about the kinds of courses that could be transferred in for credit. This set of requirements normally started with a list of courses that each student must complete in order to earn the degree, followed by a list of subfields available for concentration. In cases where at least one political philosophy or theory course was required, a "yes" was recorded. Similarly, a "no" was marked when no theory or philosophy requirement was present. It is important to note that the type of political philosophy or theory course was not considered at this stage.

From here the third and final question on the spreadsheet was analyzed. This third column (column D) was entitled "Elective Subfield." This column was not contingent upon the previous column. Often on the same page of degree requirements, each department indicated whether political philosophy or theory was available as an elective subfield of study or concentration. In order to fulfill this requirement, the department not only had to offer courses in the subfield, but it had to offer doctoral students the opportunity to choose it as a possible subfield of study. Each department had

a simple list of subfields available for concentration, such as "American Government"
and "Comparative Politics." If one of these available subfields was political philosophy
or theory, a "yes" was marked. This question completed the collection of data for the
spreadsheet and paved the way for the collection of syllabi and course descriptions.

Once the spreadsheet was completed, I found that only seven of the 123 political
science departments required at least one political philosophy course of all of their
doctoral students.[50] From these seven institutions I gathered course syllabi and course
descriptions.[51] This process, although tedious, was relatively straightforward. In order to
collect syllabi and course descriptions, I revisited the degree requirements section of the
departments' Web sites. These pages offered the specific course numbers that satisfied
the political philosophy and/or theory requirement. When available, both the most recent
syllabi and course descriptions were taken into consideration so that each course was
represented in the most complete possible manner.[52] In the rare event that neither the
syllabus nor the course description was available, the respective university catalog was
consulted for course information. The next section of this chapter will briefly discuss the
course makeup of each of the seven institutions mentioned above.

In regard to those programs that did not offer their syllabi or course descriptions
online, I made the explicit decision not to contact the department for more information.
The first reason behind this decision is because I wanted to collect the data in a uniform
manner. Contacting someone for more information would have introduced the possibility

---

[50] The normative implications of this figure will be addressed later in this chapter under the heading
"Additional Findings."

[51] The seven institutions in this category were (in alphabetical order) Catholic University of America, Duke
University, University of Maryland, Michigan State University, Northern Arizona University, University of
Rochester, and Western Michigan University.

[52] See *Appendix B*, "Seven Institutions Requiring Political Theory."

that I may have received either insufficient or unreliable data compared to those programs that did offer their information electronically. The second reason I made this decision was because of the availability of the two different tools used to analyze the courses. Having both syllabi and course descriptions, I was provided with two sources of information that could augment one another in the event that one was lacking in some way.

Required Philosophy and Theory

For the sake of presentation, the seven programs requiring philosophy or theory are presented here in alphabetical order just as they are listed on the APSA Web site. Presenting the data in this way makes the creation of another set of categories such as "least difficult" or "most difficult" unnecessary. The stringency and breadth of each do not directly coincide. Although some programs had several alternatives and only required one course, other had several, all of which were required. Comments regarding both the difficulty and the breadth of the requirements are discussed along with each program.

The first in this list of political science programs that require political philosophy or theory at the doctoral level is Catholic University of America (CUA). CUA has one of the two most extensive standards for political theory, requiring all students to complete two mandated courses. These courses, entitled "Political Theory I and II," are designed as surveys that span political theory from Ancient Greece to the turn of the 20th century and are recommended to be taken in sequence. The first of these courses names specifically Plato, Aristotle and other ancients as its chief source of material. The objective of the course is to examine "fundamental issues of politics" in the context and with the aid of

this set of political theorists.[53] The second course begins with the era of Thomas Hobbes and concludes with Karl Marx and the turn of the 20th century. CUA offers no other courses to fulfill this requirement, making it in this sense the strictest of the seven.[54]

The next set of courses is from Duke University. Duke offers five different courses that fulfill its requirement of one course in political thought.[55] The first of these courses is "Political Thought in the U.S," which is a survey of political theory starting with the colonial period. In addition to the literature of the period, this course includes cultural and other creative writing from the American tradition of political writing such as Thomas Jefferson and poetry from Walt Whitman. The next course, "Ancient Political Theory," is referred to as an "intensive" examination of political philosophy beginning with Plato; it also explores themes such as tragedy, war, and morality. The third course is called "Modern Political Theory" and is an examination of the writing of authors such as Rousseau, Marx, and Nietzsche that explores the character of "modernity" and the "critical reactions to early liberal political thought." Another course is "Theory of Liberal Democracy" in which authors like John Rawls and William Connolly are read in order to investigate topics such as "social justice." The last course, "Social Theory/Social Practice," had no description or syllabus available and (according to the schedule) has not been offered in the past decade. The political science program offers students five courses from which they only have to complete one; this makes Duke one of the most lenient in its requirements.

---

[53] Course information for the CUA courses was found at
 http://politics.cua.edu/courses/courses.cfm
[54] The relative difficulty involved in completing each program's requirements is not a variable in this thesis.
[55] Course information for Duke University found at
http://fds.duke.edu/db/aas/PoliticalScience/gradcourses.html

The University of Maryland is the next department that requires at least one political philosophy course of all of its doctoral students. This program requires one out of three possible courses in the field, the first of which is "Ancient and Medieval Political Philosophy."[56] This course is intended to use texts from a broad range in history to analyze the "persistent" questions of political philosophy. The second of these courses is "Modern Political Theory" and ranges from the period of Machiavelli through Marx. The purpose of this course is to investigate "the influence of the Enlightenment on political thought." The last of the three courses is "Contemporary Political Theory," which includes writers from Nietzsche to the present day. These authors are read for their conclusions about the "apparent failure of the Enlightenment to usher in an age of peace and reason." Little other information is available for these three courses beyond the course descriptions and scant examples of texts to be used.

The next two departments also require only one political philosophy course of their doctoral students. Michigan State University requires one course entitled "Proseminar in Political Philosophy." This course is a general class that has a simple description: "Major political philosophers. Major themes of political philosophy. Consideration of the relationship between political philosophy and other fields of study in political science."[57] Similar to MSU, Northern Arizona University requires one common philosophy/theory course. This course is called "Philosophical Perspectives," and its description reads: "Surveys political concepts in both historical and contemporary

---

[56] Course information for the UMD was found at
http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/courses/gvpt.htm
[57] Course information for MSU was found at
http://www.reg.msu.edu/Courses/Request.asp

political thought, studied from a variety of philosophical perspectives."[58] Neither of these two programs offers syllabi from past courses past; nor does either university catalog offer any more detailed description.

The political science department at the University of Rochester requires its doctoral students to complete one out of a list of five courses in political theory. Rochester is unique in the sense that it does not necessarily require students to fill the philosophy requirement with a traditional philosophy course; its course descriptions are unlike the others. For example, the first option is a course called "Scope of Political Science" and is also available for undergraduate students. It is described this way: "We use basic concepts in the philosophy of science to explore a range of specific examples of research in the discipline with the aim of discerning more clearly what it means to say that social and political inquiry is scientific."[59] The next course's title is "Art and Politics," and it was designed for students across the humanities. Its description includes "Drawing on art history, literature and political theory, we will explore the ways that politics and the practices of artistic representation intersect. Much of the course will treat questions of race and identity. Our focus will primarily include French and American examples, including but not limited to the representation and theorization of torture, forced migration, lynching, globalization and racial categories. Students will be expected to look at art, read poetry and literary texts, analyze and understand political theory …" The next choice is an alternating topics course entitled "Philosophical Foundation of Political Science" in which students are expected to "explore a wide variety of efforts to

---

[58] Course information for NAU was found at
http://www4.nau.edu/academiccatalog/2007/courses/P/PoliSciGradCourses.htm
[59] Course information for the university of Rochester was found at
http://www.rochester.edu/college/psc/courses/newdescriptions.php#PSC480Johnson

represent broadly political phenomena and events such as famine, epidemics, torture, migration and so forth across a broad spectrum of media. The aim of our explorations will be to cultivate a broadly instrumental view of how vision and representation figure in the art of politics."[60] The last choice for doctoral students at the University of Rochester is a course called "Culture and Politics." This interdisciplinary course includes the following description: "Social scientists often claim that there is an intimate relationship between culture and politics. They, unfortunately, have made scant progress in elaborating the theoretical resources needed to analyze that relationship. This has led several observers to conclude that the 'systemic study of politics and culture is moribund'. Our aim in this seminar is to remedy this sorry state." Note that none of these courses falls under strictly "political" headings; nor do they occupy the traditional parameters of a course in political philosophy or theory.

The last department on the list that has a political philosophy or theory requirement for its doctoral students is Western Michigan University. This department requires its students to choose two of the following three courses in order to fulfill the requirement. The first is "Political Philosophy I," which includes literature from ancient Greece through the period of the Renaissance and includes this statement in its description: "A synthesis of the history of political philosophy and the formal analysis of those positive and normative concepts and processes [is] necessary to the understanding of political systems."[61] The next course in this sequence is called "Political Philosophy II," described as "A synthesis of the history of political philosophy from the seventeenth

---

[60] ibid

[61] Course information for Western Michigan University was found at http://catalog.wmich.edu/content.php?catoid=10&navoid=246

century to contemporary times." The last choice is a course called "Democratic Theory." This course is different from the others because of its focus on a narrower part of political theory including modernism and social movements. It is described as "A comprehensive survey of the main currents in modern democratic theory, including elitist, participatory, deliberative, agonistic, feminist and radical perspectives. The course will also cover important topics within each of these currents, such as theories of representation, identity politics and social movements."[62] Along with CUA, Western Michigan University has one of the most time intensive political philosophy requirements.

Categorizing Courses

In addition to the information in the previous section, I looked more in depth at each of the courses offered by the seven different doctoral programs in political science. Having read the general course descriptions for each of the 20 courses offered by these institutions, the next step is to explain the process by which I examined each course's material in order to make some normative categorizations of the courses (*see Table 1*). Then each course will be identified in *Table 1* along with some brief explanation of its placement.

The development of a method for classifying the required political philosophy and/or theory courses was essential to examining the hypothesis from the first chapter. In the interest of full disclosure, these criteria are unavoidably subjective because no strictly objective manner exists for categorizing assigned literature and course subjects. My objective in creating these categories was to articulate clearly the criteria that I used and to let the course descriptions (above), course syllabi (*Appendix C*), and the foundations from the second chapter serve as justifications. When the general course description did

---

[62] ibid

not offer sufficient information for these classifications, the most recent syllabus for each course was sought by way of each department's schedule of courses and available online syllabi. The courses in *Appendix B* were placed in alphabetical order and then broken into four basic categories (Table 1).

The first category is comprised of courses that meet the following criteria: literature that is primarily Classical (Ancient Greek and Roman) and/or based in "traditional" political philosophy literature (natural rights, early American, and early democratic theory). The criteria for Category 2 include literature that is primarily rooted in modernism and/or contemporary (post-1800), subjects that are mostly modern and/or postmodern including critical pedagogy.[63] The third category includes courses that appear to incorporate a fairly equal focus on both Category 1 and Category 2. The last category is reserved for those few courses that either did not offer enough information to be classified or did not appropriately fit in the other categories.

For example, Course A in Appendix B is "Political Theory I." This course was placed in Category 1 because it uses as its primary selected literature the work of the ancient Greek philosophers. Category 2 includes classes such as Course E, which focus on writers such as Marx and Nietzsche and seek to provide "critical reactions to early liberal political thought." Along with courses such as Course F that clearly coincide with contemporary political theory and predominately postmodernism, Course E involves modernism which, as I discussed in the second chapter, includes the various streams that converged to form postmodernism in the mid to late 20th century. This relationship of ideas is the tie between the two, not necessarily the era in time.

---

[63] As opposed to identifying an era (modernity) the texts in (Category 2) include those that cover topics in modernism that provide a basis for what is now postmodern.

Table One

Categorization of Required Doctoral Courses in Political Theory/Philosophy[*]

	Classical/Traditional	Postmodern/Contemporary	Equal Mixture of Both	Cannot be Categorized
Courses	A	E	C	G
	B	F	K	M
	D	I		
	H	J		
	R	L		
		N		
		O		
		P		
		Q		
		S		
		T		
Total	5	11	2	2

[*]Author's classification based on syllabi and course descriptions.

Examination/Exploration of Hypothesis

To best offer some analysis of Table 1, it will be helpful to restate the hypothesis from Chapter 1.

Among those institutions that grant doctorates in political science, the texts in required political philosophy/theory courses will be based more in postmodern theory than in traditional foundations. In my view this is because the overall direction of the subfield of political philosophy/theory in the U.S. is oriented more toward postmodern theory than traditional foundations.

Having categorized each of the 20 classes from the political science programs that require political philosophy/theory of their doctoral candidates, there is textual evidence to support the hypothesis that the literature selections of these courses are more inclined to come from postmodernist and non-traditional backgrounds. Out of the 20 courses, 25

percent focused upon the Classics and traditional political philosophy literature, while 55 percent favored more postmodern backgrounds. This seemingly large gap between Categories 1 and 2 sheds some light on the apparent disparity between these two different choices. The other 20 percent was equally split between those that could not be appropriately classified and those that offered a more or less equal representation of both traditional and contemporary literature.

The expectation going in was that some sort of imbalance would be found, but it was not expected that there would be such a disproportionate representation of Category 2 over Category 1. The implications of these findings will be explored further in the concluding chapter. In addition, the secondary findings that came unexpectedly out of the data collection process are noteworthy, to say the least.

Additional Findings

While the primary findings were intriguing on their own, the unexpected additional findings that came as a result of the tabulation in Appendix A may be more interesting still. Among the 123 institutions listed by the American Political Science Association that grant Ph.D.s in political science, only seven require every student to complete some sort of political theory or philosophy course. Another 81 programs offer doctoral students the opportunity to select political theory or philosophy as a concentration. Most striking is the group of 39 institutions offering no courses in political theory or philosophy at all.

Thus, fewer than six percent of all institutions granting the PhD in political science require students to complete any kind of political philosophy or theory course. With respect to the hypothesis, this means that out of those programs that have the

requirement, only 25 percent of the courses offered are based primarily in Classical and traditional political philosophy; this proportion is staggering. Additionally, out of the 123 doctoral programs, nearly one-third offer no political philosophy or theory courses at all within political science. Although the results of this tabulation were not intended to be a point of analysis at the inception of the study, the findings were too noteworthy to omit. Both sets of findings as well as the possible implications will be explored in the concluding chapter as will important limitations that should be considered when interpreting these findings.

Chapter 4:

Conclusions

The previous chapter discussed the collection and analysis of data. This chapter has two basic purposes. First, I present some of the implications that arise from the findings in Chapter Three. Next I offer some ideas for future research that could come as a result of this thesis. At the end of the chapter, I offer some concluding remarks on this project.

Possible Implications

The implications arising from the findings presented in the previous chapter fall into two categories: the lack of doctoral level education in political philosophy education, and the questionable focused nature of that already limited educational opportunity. The impact that these findings could have, or could have already had, on political science is real and lasting. Political science is a diverse discipline full of different subfields that could and sometimes do constitute their own academic department. The danger of losing meaning and purpose arising from the apparent lack of philosophical foundations in a discipline that began with the philosophical foundations is disturbing.

The first concern comes from the additional findings of the previous chapter. Consider for a moment that there are only 123 institutions of higher education in the United States that grant the doctoral degree in political science. In 2003, the Census Bureau reported that there were over 4,000 institutions of higher education in the U.S., 2,363 of which are four year institutions.[64] This means that roughly three percent of institutions of higher education in the United States offer a doctoral degree in political

---

[64] These numbers are not limited to comprehensive, doctoral institutions.
http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/02statab/educ.pdf

science. Out of this three percent, only six percent require their doctoral students to complete some sort of political philosophy or theory before obtaining the degree. One has to consider the message that this statistic sends.

It may be that the importance placed on political philosophy by the programs in this thesis is negligible because there is negligible importance placed on producing political philosophers and theorists. As a discipline, we are not producing enough people to teach our undergraduates and graduates about the basic principles of politics.[65] While this study did not attempt to gauge the support of the other subfields, it stands to reason that the other 116 institutions that have doctoral programs in political science probably require some sort of common course(s) of their students (if that requirement is not political philosophy, then what is it, statistics?). While requiring any kind of course is in itself a contestable issue, 39 departments that evidently have so little capacity for graduate level instruction) in the foundations of their discipline that they do not offer even an elective course in political philosophy. Aside from how disconcerting this is to professionals in the field, what message does it send to students and future faculty?

The message is highly charged and is one of the unspoken perceptions of many political philosophers across the discipline. First, only a few select institutions value the subfield enough to employ political theorists. Next, even fewer hold it in high enough regard that all students are required to study it. Last and most discouraging is that even if one were to earn the doctoral degree in political philosophy or theory, the chances of finding a faculty position are remote at best. This cyclical discouragement of an entire

---

[65] In 2006, Leanne Sedowski and Michael Brintnall for the American Political Science Association produced a document entitled "Trends in the Political Science Profession: Political Science Job Listings in APSA's eJobs 1 Listing Service." This document demonstrates a trend of a lack of positions for political theorists.
 http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/EJobsWriteUp%2012%202006.pdf

segment of political science and its practitioners is alarming and could be considered insulting.

The second implication really complicates and deepens the first. This study took some care in tracing the lineage of a few different prominent streams in political philosophy. These different streams offer drastically different conceptions of morality, human nature, and education. The dominance of an already small subfield of political philosophy by one particular school of thought is a sign of two different problems. Doctoral students are not being exposed to the traditional foundations of political philosophy, but are being disproportionately exposed to contemporary and postmodern streams. While students likely have had some exposure to these underrepresented thinkers during their undergraduate careers, the academic prowess of a graduate student is far different than that of an undergraduate. If the literature that is primarily linked to undergraduate political science is being taken for granted at the graduate level, a disservice is being done both to the material and to the students. Graduate students are the basic pool from which faculty are cultivated, and if those students are not actively engaging with this material at a graduate level, then their knowledge of and the interest in the Classics will be (and arguably has been, according to Bloom) lost over time.

Additionally, with respect to critical pedagogy and postmodernism, the fundamental way of teaching and learning, especially within political science is quickly changing.[66] The authors that were studied in this thesis present clear depictions of pedagogy before and after the rise of critical pedagogy and postmodernism. These new schools of thought take conceptions of right and wrong apart at the seams and replace

---

[66] Gunnell, Germino, and McCormick- Each of these authors wrote about the importance of "traditional" foundations in political science education. Their work progresses from the 1960s to 2000 and shares as a common theme the lack of literary foundations or core curricula.

them with individual notions of what is personally preferred. Freire, Weimer, and Shor write that the traditional roles of student and teacher ought no longer to exist because teaching is akin to condescension; so now learners and facilitators should be left to inner-directed academic pursuits and activities that promote personal growth. In my mind the most fitting term to describe this trend is dilution. Although it may be difficult to study empirically, the dilution of traditional notions of pedagogy and morality may well have some impact on the academy and society more generally. Such an impact could be the debasing of the value of education and a disregard for acceptable social behavior.

It is striking that all of these implications of the findings are inherently philosophical in nature. Questions about what is theoretically best or what ought to be cannot and never have been answered by the science of politics, but instead the philosophy of politics. Although the population of students and teachers familiar with tradition and the Classics is currently surviving, these generations have the responsibility to reproduce academically and ensure that discourse in academe and the process of scholarship is not left exclusively to critics of the thousands of years of political philosophy that came before.

Limitations

Along with the basic limitations discussed in the first chapter, several additional words of caution came to light after the collection and the analysis of the data. These comments are more informational than they are necessarily limiting to the generalizability of the findings. While most of the courses in Appendix B gave adequate descriptions and examples of literature, a few did not. This could be because the course was left up to the broad interpretation of each instructor across different semesters or

because the information simply was not published online. In order to account for this potential conflict, each and every course was held to a common standard and was not classified without consistent information. University course catalogues, departmental course descriptions, and individual syllabi were all consulted in order to gather the information needed to classify each of the courses.

Another important general limitation is the use of primarily Web-based material for this study. There is always the potential that documents could be outdated or incomplete. As I indicated in the data collection portion of Chapter Three, the decision to gather the information electronically was made for two reasons, the first of which was uniformity. If course descriptions, syllabi, and other information had been sought directly from departments, additional conflicts may have arisen. Departments may have been reluctant to provide this information for a study that sought to evaluate a portion of its program. The other conflict would have been the introduction of another potential layer of human error. The documents that each department may have chosen to send may not have accurately depicted the information for that institution. The complexity, cost, and time involved with requesting such a deep breadth of information from 123 academic departments would have been daunting. Aside from the difficulties in collecting this information, the other justification behind this decision was the utility of the syllabi and the course descriptions in providing thorough information about each course. With the exception of one course from Duke University, every course came with some kind of online description.

Analyzing the syllabi and course descriptions for evidence of normative works in political philosophy/theory comes with a notable limitation. The lack of a political

philosophy/theory subfield does not necessarily negate the possibility that other normative types of courses are present. This is to say that ontological questions are not exclusive to philosophy/theory and the answers are not always contained in courses in that subject. Other subfields may very well employ normative means of analysis and explore topics that also could fall within philosophy/theory. Additionally, these data only help to explain pedagogical norms in one segment of political science, and not the entire discipline.

The last potential limitation was the categorization of the courses outlined in Chapter Three. Although this was addressed earlier, it is important to mention once more. There is indeed the possibility that one or more courses could have been categorized incorrectly or differently; however, this error would have to be drastic in order to alter the findings of the study. Also, the potential error could have affected the results in a way that either detracted from or reinforced the eventual findings. When a subjective system of classification is used in this way, the best course of action is to carefully construct that system, justify the decisions that were made, and concede the possibility that the system may not be fool-proof.

Future Research

Several possibilities for future research would either add further context to this study or serve as extensions. To generalize the findings further, it would be helpful to recreate this study by using undergraduate political philosophy and theory courses. It may be useful to know how many strictly undergraduate political science departments offer political philosophy and theory courses to their students. Additionally, the presence of

and descriptions of philosophy/theory requirements may give some insight into the entire subfield of political philosophy/theory instead of strictly the graduate level.

It may also be worth examining to what extent professional political scientists focus on traditional and Classical literature or postmodern and contemporary literature in their own research. Is there still active research being done on ancient Greek literature, or is political philosophy/theory oriented more toward postmodern studies or contemporary issues and thinkers? These answers may go a long way toward answering some questions about the prominence of political philosophy/theory in the job market and publishing world.

Other questions deal with the presence and prominence of political philosophers in their respective departments and their ability relative to other subfields to draw research grants. It may also be interesting to know what kind of representation political philosophers have on departmental faculties compared to other subfields. With respect to the literature in the *Annotated Bibliography* by Mickelson, it may be worth investigating whether or not an official or unofficial canon or standard curriculum may be appropriate in political philosophy.

Concluding Remarks

This study served as both an exploration of the state of doctoral level political philosophy education in the U.S. and, more generally, of the nature of pedagogy in a specific segment of the discipline. Although pedagogical practices vary between individual departments, subfields, and specific instructors, this thesis was intended to shed some light upon the general trends and possible implications of a turn away from one kind of pedagogy and toward something new. The original idea for this study yielded

several different possibilities for research and this thesis is only one piece of what could prove to be a productive stream of research. Hopefully, the provocative nature of these findings will bring about a serious discussion about the state of the discipline and the future of its beginnings.

Theory Spreadsheet

Name of Institution	Theory Offering	Required of All	Elective Subfield
The University of Alabama	Yes	No	Yes
American University	No	No	No
American University at Arizona State	No	No	No
University of Arizona	No	No	No
Auburn University	No	No	No
Auburn University at Montgomery	Yes	No	No
University of Baltimore	No	No	No
Baylor University	Yes	No	Yes
Boston College	Yes	No	Yes
Brown University	Yes	No	Yes
University of California Berkeley	Yes	No	Yes
University of California Davis	Yes	No	Yes
University of California Irvine	No	No	No
University of California Los Angeles	Yes	No	Yes
University of California Riverside	Yes	No	Yes
University of California San Diego	Yes	No	Yes
University of California Santa Barbara	Yes	No	Yes
University of California Santa Cruz	Yes	No	Yes
California Institute of Technology	No	No	No
Carnegie Mellon University	No	No	No
Case Western Reserve University	No	No	No
The Catholic University of America	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Chicago	Yes	No	Yes
University of Cincinnati	No	No	No
Claremont Graduate University	No	No	No
Clark Atlanta University	No	No	No
University of Colorado Boulder	Yes	No	Yes
Colorado State University	No	No	No
Columbia University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Connecticut	Yes	No	Yes
Cornell University	Yes	No	Yes
CUNY Graduate School	Yes	No	Yes
University of Dallas	Yes	No	Yes
University of Delaware	No	No	No
University of Denver	No	No	No
Duke University	Yes	Yes	Yes
Emory University	Yes	No	Yes
Florida International University	Yes	No	Yes
Florida State University	No	No	No

University of Florida	Yes	No	Yes
George Washington University	Yes	No	Yes
Georgetown University	Yes	No	Yes
Georgia State University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Georgia	Yes	No	Yes
Harvard University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Hawaii Manoa	Yes	No	Yes
Howard University	Yes	No	Yes
Idaho State University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Idaho	No	No	No
University of Illinois Chicago	No	No	No
University of Illinois Urbana	No	No	No
Indiana University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Iowa	Yes	No	Yes
Johns Hopkins University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Kansas	Yes	No	Yes
Kent State University	No	No	No
University of Kentucky	No	No	No
Louisiana State University	Yes	No	Yes
Loyola University Chicago	Yes	No	Yes
University of Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Massachusetts Amherst	Yes	No	Yes
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes	No	Yes
Miami University	No	No	No
University of Michigan	Yes	No	Yes
Michigan State University	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Minnesota	Yes	No	Yes
Mississippi State University	No	No	No
University of Mississippi	No	No	No
University of Missouri Columbia	No	No	No
University of Missouri St. Louis	Yes	No	Yes
University of Nebraska Lincoln	Yes	No	Yes
University of Nevada Reno	Yes	No	Yes
University of New Mexico	No	No	No
University of New Orleans	No	No	No
New School University	Yes	No	Yes
New York University	Yes	No	Yes
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	Yes	No	Yes
North Carolina State University	No	No	No
University of North Texas	Yes	No	Yes
Northeastern University	No	No	No
Northern Arizona University	Yes	Yes	No
Northern Illinois University	Yes	No	Yes
Northwestern University	Yes	No	Yes

University of Notre Dame	Yes	No	Yes
Ohio State University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Oklahoma	Yes	No	Yes
University of Oregon	Yes	No	Yes
Pennsylvania State University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	Yes
University of Pittsburgh	Yes	No	Yes
Princeton University	Yes	No	Yes
Purdue University	Yes	No	Yes
Rice University	No	No	No
University of Rochester	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rutgers University	Yes	No	Yes
University of South Carolina	Yes	No	Yes
University of Southern California	Yes	No	Yes
Southern Illinois University	Yes	No	Yes
Stanford University	Yes	No	Yes
SUNY Binghamton University	No	No	No
SUNY Stony Brook	No	No	No
SUNY University of Albany	Yes	No	Yes
SUNY University of Buffalo	No	No	No
Syracuse University	Yes	No	Yes
Temple University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Tennessee Knoxville	No	No	No
University of Texas Austin	Yes	No	Yes
University of Texas Dallas	No	No	No
Texas A&M University	Yes	No	Yes
Texas Tech University	No	No	No
Tulane University	No	No	No
University of Utah	Yes	No	Yes
Vanderbilt University	Yes	No	Yes
University of Virginia	Yes	No	Yes
Washington State University	No	No	No
Washington University	No	No	No
University of Washington	Yes	No	Yes
Wayne State University	Yes	No	Yes
West Virginia University	No	No	No
Western Michigan University	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee	Yes	No	Yes
University of Wisconsin Madison	Yes	No	Yes
Yale University	Yes	No	Yes
TOTALS	**Yes= 83**	**Yes= 7**	**Yes= 81**
	No=40	**No-116**	**No= 42**

Appendix B:

Seven Institutions Requiring Political Theory of All Doctoral Students

1) Catholic University of America-
Requires **two** political theory courses of every Ph.D. candidate:

POL 651: Political Theory I   (COURSE A)
Examines fundamental issues of politics with special reference to seminal thinkers from Plato to modern times. Part I gives particular attention to Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Augustine, Aquinas, and Machiavelli.

POL 652: Political Theory II   (COURSE B)
Examines fundamental issues of politics with special reference to seminal thinkers from Plato to modern times. Part II emphasizes such figures as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Burke, and Marx. These courses can be taken separately but are structured to be taken in sequence. Particularly students without background in political theory are advised against taking them out of sequence. Required for students in the Ph. D program.

http://politics.cua.edu/courses/courses.cfm

2) Duke University
Requires **one** of the following courses of every Ph.D. candidate:

POLSCI 218, 223, 224, 229, 260

218- Political Thought in the U.S.   (COURSE C)
This course surveys the development of political theory in the United States (hence the title) from the colonial period of the seventeenth century to (almost) the present day. Leading figures in the tradition include Jefferson, Madison and Hamilton, Tocqueville, Emerson, William Graham Sumner, and W. E. B. DuBois. Like all political theory, though, the political thought of the U.S. often finds its best expression in art and popular literature—so we'll also examine some of the great figures in the American cultural and literary tradition, including Whitman, Ellison, and Horatio Alger.

223- Ancient Political Theory   (COURSE D)
Intensive analysis of the political philosophy of Plato, Aristotle, and other ancient theorists.
The course will focus on five interrelated themes: agency and tragedy; violence power and morality; theory's relationship to politics and as a practice; democratic politics and democratic culture, political speech and political silences.

224- Modern Political Theory   (COURSE E)

This course is a survey of the fundamental and competing ideas that inform modern political life. Through an examination of some major texts of political philosophy (e.g., writings of Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, Nietzsche) we will investigate the different strains of modern political thought that have come to define the parameters of political possibility in our time. We will focus our considerations on the alternative political implications of the various conceptions of nature, human nature, reason, freedom and history found in these works. In addition to our efforts to understand the thought of each author, we will explore the linkages between them in order to examine the character of "modernity," the rise of liberalism, and the critical reactions to early liberal political thought. The course will be run as a directed discussion.

229 Theory of Liberal Democracy   (COURSE F)
Reading, discussion and criticism of leading arguments in the area of contemporary liberal and democratic theory. Readings include works by John Rawls, Robert Nozick, Michael Walzer, Richard Rorty, William Connolly, and others. Topics include social justice, the debate between foundationalists and conventionalists, the question of liberal "neutrality", the relevance of norms of community and civic virtue to liberal regimes, liberal strategies for dealing with social and cultural pluralism, and deliberative democracy.

260- Social Theory/Social Practice   (COURSE G)
No description available

http://fds.duke.edu/db/aas/PoliticalScience/gradcourses.html

3) University of Maryland

Requires **one** of the following courses of all Ph.D. candidates:

GVPT 741 Ancient and Medieval Political Philosophy (3 credits)   (COURSE H)
Three hours of discussion/recitation per week. Prerequisite: permission of department. Major writings from the tradition of ancient and medieval political philosophy are studied. The goal is to identify and critically analyze the perennial or persistent questions about political life posed by philosophers in divers times and places.

GVPT 742 Modern Political Theory (3 credits)   (COURSE I)
Three hours of discussion/recitation per week. Prerequisite: permission of department. Recommended: GVPT 741.
The influence of the Enlightenment on political thought, beginning with Machiavelli and ending around the time of Mill and Marx, in which the Enlightenment worked itself out in the hopes and fears of these and other authors.

GVPT 743 Contemporary Political Theory (3 credits)   (COURSE J)
Prerequisite: Graduate Standing.
Theorists from Nietzsche (1884-1900) to the present will be covered with a focus on the apparent failure of the Enlightenment to usher in an age of peace and reason.

4) Michigan State University

Requires the following course for all Ph.D. candidates:

PLS 803: Proseminar in Political Philosophy   ((COURSE K)
Major political philosophers. Major themes of political philosophy. Consideration of the relationship between political philosophy and other fields of study in political science

5) Northern Arizona University

Requires the following course of all Ph.D. candidates:

POS 607 Philosophical Perspectives (COURSE L)
Surveys political concepts in both historical and contemporary political thought, studied from a variety of philosophical perspectives

6) University of Rochester

Requires **one** of the following courses of all Ph.D. candidates:

480 Scope of Political Science   (COURSE M)
The aim of the seminar is to encourage students to examine political science in a reflective, disciplined, critical way. It is primarily designed for entering Ph.D. students, but may be appropriate for undergraduate seniors considering graduate work in political science. We use basic concepts in the philosophy of science to explore a range of specific examples of research in the discipline with the aim of discerning more clearly what it means to say that social and political inquiry is scientific.

482 Art and Politics   (COURSE N)
This course on the interactions between art and politics in the twentieth century will be conducted as an intensive and advanced seminar. Drawing on art history, literature and political theory, we will explore the ways that politics and the practices of artistic representation intersect. Much of the course will treat questions of race and identity. Our focus will primarily include French and American examples, including but not limited to the representation and theorization of torture, forced migration, lynching, globalization and racial categories. Students will be expected to look at art, read poetry and literary

texts, analyze and understand political theory and participate in a series of speakers and symposia outside of the class. This course has been designed for students from across the humanities and the social sciences.

484 Democratic Theory   (COURSE O)
This advanced course in political theory focuses on various topics in democratic theory such as the relation between democracy and other basic political principles (liberty, equality, justice), whether democratic institutions should best be aggregative or deliberative, and the role of referenda, lotteries and new telecommunications technology in democratic decision-making. Readings are drawn from both advocates and critics of democratic politics and will encompass historical and contemporary theorists. The class format will combine lecture and discussion.

581 Philosophical Foundations of Political Science (COURSE P)
This seminar addresses different topics in different years. This year (2007) the broad focus is on the role of vision and representation in politics. We will start be reading the debate between John Dewey and Walter Lippmann in order to identify why vision and representation are central to democratic politics. We then will explore a wide variety of efforts to represent broadly political phenomena and events such as famine, epidemics, torture, migration and so forth across a broad spectrum of media. The aim of our explorations will be to cultivate a broadly instrumental view of how vision and representation figure in the "art" of politics.

583 Culture and Politics   (COURSE Q)
Social scientists often claim that there is an intimate relationship between culture and politics. They, unfortunately, have made scant progress in elaborating the theoretical resources needed to analyze that relationship. This has led several observers to conclude that the "systemic study of politics and culture is moribund". Our aim in this seminar is to remedy this sorry state. More specifically, we will try to identify the theoretical resources that might allow more cogent analyses of the relation between culture and politics. In the process we will range across disciplines, with readings drawn from anthropology, economics, history, philosophy, political science and sociology. The course is run as a seminar, which means that all students must participate actively.

http://www.rochester.edu/college/psc/courses/newdescriptions.php#PSC480Johnson

7) Western Michigan University

Requires **two** of the three following courses for every Ph.D. candidate:

PSCI 6620 - Political Philosophy I   (COURSE R)
A synthesis of the history of political philosophy and the formal analysis of those positive and normative concepts and processes necessary to the understanding of political systems. The course covers the period from classical Greece through the Renaissance. Superimposed on the overall chronological format are critical inquiries into basic concepts and processes

PSCI 6630 - Political Philosophy II   (COURSE S)
A synthesis of the history of political philosophy from the seventeenth century to contemporary times. The course also includes a formal analysis of applicable positive and normative concepts necessary to the understanding of political systems. Superimposed on the overall chronological format are critical inquiries into basic concepts and processes.

PSCI 6650 - Democratic Theory   (COURSE T)
A comprehensive survey of the main currents in modern democratic theory, including elitist, participatory, deliberative, agonistic, feminist and radical perspectives. The course will also cover important topics within each of these currents, such as theories of representation, identity politics and social movements.

http://catalog.wmich.edu/content.php?catoid=10&navoid=246

Appendix C

Political Philosophy/Theory Courses Required by PhD Programs

<u>**SYLLABUS L**</u>

POS 607 Political Theory

Spring 2009   Dr. Joel Olson, instructor
Class #9750   joel.olson@nau.edu
Tues. 6:00-8:30   Office phone: 523-8514
SBS 213   Office: SBS 236
Credit Hours: 3   Office Hours: TTh 11:00-12:15, T 4:00-6:00,
                                                      & by appt.

Description of the course
Official description: "Surveys texts and concepts in the political theory canon and in contemporary political thought." One purpose of this course is to introduce you to some of the key texts and debates in the subfield of political theory. Another is to critically evaluate the role of normative theory in the study of politics, especially the study of conflict, power, justice, and democracy.

Readings
The following books are required and available at Amazon.com:

1. Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. C.D.C. Reeve (Hackett 1998).
2. Machiavelli, *The Portable Machiavelli*, trans. Peter Bondanella, (Penguin 1979).
3. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. Macpherson (Penguin Classics, 1982).
4. John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, ed. C.B. Macpherson (Hackett 1980).
5. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (International 1948).
6. Karl Marx, *Capital* volume I. (International, 1967).
7. Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals/Ecce Homo*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (Vintage 1989).
8. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (Grove 2008).
9. W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (Dover 1994).
10. Hannah Arendt, *The Promise of Politics* (Schocken 2007).
11. Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978* (Picador 2009).
12. Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford University Press, 1998).
13. Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender* (Routledge, 2004).
14. Romand Coles, *Beyond Gated Politics: Reflections for the Possibility of Democracy* (University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
15. Roxanne Euben, *Enemy in the Mirror: Islamic Fundamentalism and the Limits of Modern Rationalism* (Princeton University Press, 1999).

I recommend that you buy the above editions and translations, but it's not necessary. Total cost of the books is about $200 new on Amazon. To order the books, go to Amazon.com/listmania, and under "Search Listmania" at the top, enter "POS 607 Political Theory," then click on that link. (There's a link to the list at the Vista course shell.)

There are also several required articles, as indicated in the "Course Outline and Schedule of Readings," below. They are available on Vista (http://vista.nau.edu).

Course objectives
My goals in the course are the following:
- To introduce you to the subfield of political theory
- To make you familiar with some of the key authors, texts, and debates in the field so you can be conversant in them with other social scientists or humanities scholars
- To develop your interest in political theory
- To provide you with tools to integrate political theory into your research agenda if you are interested

Expectations of the course
I expect you to attend and fully participate in every seminar meeting, to have done all the readings prior to each meeting, to consider carefully all questions posed to you about the texts, and to exert your absolute best effort in all assignments. Expect to read about 300-350 pages for most meetings, plus writing assignments. If you must miss a meeting, please inform me in advance, if possible. If you miss more than two meetings, I may ask you to drop the course. You are responsible for all material missed due to absences.

Assignments
1. A 5-page paper, due **January 20** (10%)
2. Weekly critiques (20%)
3. Facilitation of two seminar meetings (5%)
4. Two 10-12 page papers OR one 20-25 page research paper (60%)
5. Seminar participation (5%)

- **Critiques**: Every week (starting with week 3) you will turn in a 2-3 page critique (typed, regular font size and margins) of the texts we are discussing at that week's meeting. In each critique, I encourage you to analyze the a) thesis, b) strengths, c) weaknesses, and d) "best big idea" of the text(s). Feel free to incorporate previous texts we've read in your analysis. The purpose of the critiques is to help you understand the main argument of the texts and develop your critique of them. Critiques are due at the beginning of each meeting. I will count the best ten critiques of out thirteen possible toward your grade.

- **Facilitation**: Each person will facilitate two seminar meetings. Each meeting will have one or two facilitators. Facilitators will post their critique(s) and 4-5 discussion questions on the readings to all seminar participants on the Monday *before* their scheduled seminar. This will enable other students to read and consider facilitators' critiques and questions before the meeting. (Critiques may be posted to the discussion board on Vista or emailed to all seminar participants.) Facilitators are then responsible for initiating the discussion for that seminar meeting. They should begin with a 10-15 minute presentation introducing the key issues of the texts. The discussion will then be opened up to everyone. Facilitators are encouraged to help me keep discussions on track and summarize conclusions and debates when appropriate. Facilitators are

expected to meet with each other in advance of their meeting to discuss the materials and how they'll present them. I also recommend that facilitators meet with me prior to their seminar.

• **Papers**: Everyone will write a five-page paper early in the semester. You can then choose to write either two 10-12 page papers on course texts (one due at mid-semester, the other at the end of the semester) or one 20-25 page research paper (due at the end of the semester). You are responsible for defining your own topic for each paper. You must turn in a research question, tentative thesis, and preliminary bibliography for each paper, which I must approve. I am happy to help you come up with an appropriate paper topic. In fact, I recommend discussing your paper topic ideas with me before you write up your research question. I also recommend that first-year students write the two papers instead of the research paper.

• **Participation**: Five percent of your final grade will be based on your active participation in seminar meetings. By "active" I mean that your comments are regular but not overbearing (i.e. be aware of how much time and space you take up). I am *not* looking for comments designed to please me or that are said with the primary intention of making you look smart. Instead, I expect comments that are tied to the texts and that genuinely seek to understand them and their relevance. As such, I always welcome experimental and untested comments and usually prefer them to pat declarations and smug statements. Think of the seminar as a laboratory, not a contest. The purpose of a lab is to test new ideas in a safe setting. If you have everything figured out already, why meet?

• **Preparing for the profession**: One of the functions of graduate school is to start socializing you into academia and the political science profession. To help with that socialization, the beginning of each seminar meeting will be reserved for your questions about writing and finishing the dissertation, the job market, developing a research agenda, publishing, teaching, service, or any other questions you may have about the profession.

• Course content may vary from this outline to meet the needs of this particular group.
• Please turn off all cell phones and other electronic devices when in class.

OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE OF READINGS
Please have the day's assignment read *before* class. Your ability to participate and do well in the seminar depends on it.

(V) = Available on the Vista course shell for POS 607 Political Theory. Please note that these readings are *not* supplementary but required. We will discuss everything assigned below.

I. Introduction

Week 1 (January 13): Plato and the Western tradition of political thought
- (V) Plato, "Apology"
- (V) Plato, Books II, IV, and VII of the *Republic*
- (V) Wendy Brown, "At the Edge," *Political Theory* 30, no. 4 (August 2002): 556-576.

II. The canon: Aristotle to Nietzsche

Week 2 (January 20): Aristotle and political conflict
- **5-PAGE PAPER DUE**
- Aristotle, *Politics* books I-III, V-VII
- (V) Jacques Ranciere, *On the Shores of Politics* chaps. 1 and 4
- (V) Adolph Reed, "Introduction: Du Bois—Afro-American and American Political Thought," in *W.E.B. Du Bois and American Political Thought* (Oxford 1997), 3-13.

Week 3 (January 27): Machiavelli, power, and deception
- Machiavelli, *The Prince*, in *The Portable Machiavelli*
- Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, in *The Portable Machiavelli*
- (V) Arlene Saxonhouse, "Niccolo Machiavelli: Women as Men, Men as Women, and the Ambiguity of Sex," in *Women in the History of Political Thought: Ancient Greece to Machiavelli* (New York: Praeger, 1985).
- (V) Mary G. Dietz, "Trapping the Prince: Machiavelli and the Politics of Deception," *American Political Science Review* 80, no. 3 (September 1986): 777-799.

Week 4 (February 3): Hobbes, the state of war, and the social contract
- Hobbes, *Leviathan* books I and II

Week 5 (February 10): Locke, liberalism, and the social contract
- Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*
- (V) The Declaration of Independence
- (V) James Farr, "'So Vile and Miserable an Estate': The Problem of Slavery in Locke's Political Thought," *Political Theory* 14, no. 2 (May 1986): 263-89.
- (V) Carole Pateman, "Contracting In" and "Contract, the Individual and Slavery," in *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988).

Week 6 (February 17): Marx and the critique of capitalism
- Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*
- Marx, *Capital* Volume I, chaps. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14 (sections 4 & 5 only), 15, 19, 23, 24, 25 (sections 1-4 only), 26-32

Week 7 (February 24): Nietzsche and the critique of morality
- **PAPER TOPICS DUE**

- Nietzsche, *Genealogy of Morals* and *Ecce Homo*

III. Key twentieth century theorists

Week 8 (March 3): Ontology and the problem of a Black humanity
- Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*
- Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, Forethought, chaps. 1, 3, 13, 14

Week 9 (March 10): Arendt and the political
- **FIRST PAPER DUE**
- Arendt, *The Promise of Politics*
- (V) Mary Dietz, "Hannah Arendt and Feminist Politics," in *Feminist Interpretations and Political Theory*, ed. Mary Shanley and Carole Pateman (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 232-252.

Week 10 (March 17): NO CLASS—SPRING BREAK

Week 11 (March 24): Foucault and power
- Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*

IV. Contemporary issues and thinkers

Week 12 (March 31): Biopower and the state of exception
- (V) Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political* trans. George Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), chaps. 2, 3, 4, 8.
- (V) Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology* trans. George Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), chaps. 1, 3.
- Agamben, *Homo Sacer*

Week 13 (April 7): Summary and synthesis
- (V) Sheldon Wolin, "Political Theory as a Vocation," in Martin Fleisher, ed., *Machiavelli and the Nature of Political Thought* (New York: Atheneum, 1972).
- Other readings and critique assignment TBA

Week 14 (April 14): Gender, social construction, and the political
- **PAPER TOPICS DUE**
- Butler, *Undoing Gender*

Week 15 (April 21): The possibility of radical democracy
- Coles, *Beyond Gated Politics*

Week 16 (April 28): Western rationality and Islamic fundamentalism
- (V) Sayyid Qutb, *Milestones* chaps. 2, 4, 7, 10, 12
- Euben, *Enemy in the Mirror*

Week 17 (May 5):
- **FINAL PAPER DUE**

SYLLABUS M

POLITICAL SCIENCE 380/480: SCOPE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
Professor G. B. Powell (gb.powell@rochester.edu)   fall, 2007

  This course is designed to familiarize new Ph.D. students with some fundamentals of the philosophy of science and their implications for political science research. It may also be appropriate for undergraduate seniors (PSC 380) considering graduate study in

political science. However, all undergraduate students should see me before proceeding with the course.

We shall use a three-fold approach. We begin with examining some critical basic concepts in the philosophy of science, especially as these apply to social science research. We shall then consider some specific works in several areas of political science, applying general philosophy of science concepts, especially the idea of scientific "progress" to examples of research in these areas. We then turn more explicitly to problems of design and criticism of political science research, considering first the general problem of determining observable implications of social science theory and then the (slightly) more specific problems of sample, measurement and interpretation of evidence. We explore these problems further through consideration of specific works in contemporary political science. Finally, we attempt to apply our concepts at both levels to the construction of an original research design.

Students will be evaluated in terms of their performance in all three aspects. The first assignment and the midterm consider applications of the philosophy of science to the problem of making "progress" in some specific areas of political science. The second assignment considers applications of inference problems to evaluation of specific works in political science. The final assignment combines these in the proposal of an original research design.

We are most likely to make useful sense of these abstract concepts of philosophy and inference if we examine them in the context of political science work that is of personal interest. I have chosen some areas of political science that fit with my interests. I am open to altering one of these to fit more closely with collective interests of the class. I hope also to allow each student to tailor the broad concerns even more closely to his or her personal interests by selecting specific political science articles to critique and individual topics for proposed investigation.

General responsibilities of seminar participants: (1) first assignment 15%; (2) examination 30%; (3) second assignment 15%; (4) research design paper 30%; (5) class participation 10%! You should not expect to take an incomplete in this course.

Books to Purchase (in Bookstore, but I suggest getting used copies from the internet):
Hempel, Philosophy of Natural Science 1966.
Kuhn, Structure of Scientific Revolution   1970 (2nd ed) or later.
Little, Varieties of Social Explanation 1991.
Scott, Weapons of the Weak 1985.
Olson, Logic of Collective Action   1965-Revised.
King, Keohane, Verba, Designing Social Inquiry 1994.
Przeworski, Democracy and Development 2000.

 2
  SYLLABUS - **PSC 380/480**   fall, 2007

THE CLASS MEETS ON Tuesday 12:30 - 15:15, Harkness 329

Week	Discussion Theme	Readings
Sept.4	Class organization and introductions.	Syllabus.
Sept.11	Political Science Research: Intuitive Standards of Evaluation	Choose one article published in the *APSR* in 1996-2006. Be prepared to present the

contents

and

science.

System,"

766.

and to discuss its strengths

weaknesses as political

Riker, "The Two-Party

APSR, Dec. 1982. 753-

| Sept.18 | Scientific Knowledge and Scientific Progress Natural esp. Ch.1-6. | Hempel, Philosophy of Science 1966, All, |

Ch.1-8

Kuhn, Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd, 1970,

| Sept.25 | Scientific Knowledge and Scientific Progress | Kuhn, Ch. 9-13 & Postscript. Imre Lakatos, |

"Falsification..."

Scientific

8-52,

of

"Comparative.

886-908

in The Methodology of

Research Programmes pp.

86-101; also 103-108.
Kevin Clarke, "The Necessity

Being Comparative,

Political Studies July 2007

| Oct. 2 | Explanation in Social Science Explanation | Little, Varieties of Social |

1991, Ch. 1-4.

Description," | Clifford Geertz, "Thick

of | Ch. 1 in The Interpretation

| Cultures,1973.

1985, | Scott, Weapons of the Weak,

| esp. Ch. 1 and 2.

Oct. 9 Methods of Explanation | Little, Varieties, Ch. 5-7,9-11. Esp. Ch. 6, 7, 11.

ALSO TODAY
  FIRST ASSIGNMENT DUE: Consider arguments about progress in and explanation in social and natural sciences applied to your APSR article. Keep in mind at least the two possible viewpoints: Hempel(& Little) v. Geertz (and Scott?) Maximum 5 pages, double spaced, with decent margins.

3

Oct. 16   Example I: International Relations Models," | Allison, "Conceptual

       and Political Crises. | *APSR*, Sept. 1969; and

Essence | of Decision, 1971, Ch. 2, 4. Bendor &

Hammond,"Rethinking | Allison's Models" *APSR*,

June 92. | Signorino, *APSR*, 1999,279-

98.

Oct. 23 Example II: Collective Action and | Olson, Logic of Collective

       The Study of Groups | 1965, esp. Ch. I, II, V, VI,

Appendix | King and Walker, *Journal of*

Politics, | May 1992: 394-426.

Oct. 30 | **In-class EXAMINATION**: Applying the philosophy of science questions to political science research.

Nov. 6 No class meeting this week.

Nov. 13   Problems of Inference and Causality   King, Keohane & Verba, Designing Social

Inquiry,1994,

Ch. 1-3.
Fearon, "Counterfactuals," *World Politics* 43 1991:169-

185.

Brady & Collier, Rethinking Social Inquiry, 2004, pp. 3-

20.

Nov. 20 Is the test prediction true?   King, Keohane & Verba, Ch. 4-6.
     true? The devilish auxiliary hypotheses   Gerber & Green, "Canvassing"
     of Sample, Measurement, Specification   *APSR* 94 2000:653-663.
        (omitted variable bias, endogeneity)   Scott, Weapons of Weak, Ch. 8.

Gerring, "Case Study," *APSR*

98

2004:341-354.

Nov. 27 Example III: Economic Conditions   Przeworski, *et al*, Democracy
     and Democracy   and Development 2000
(esp.
   (POSSIBLE SUBSTITUTION OF   Ch. 1 & 2.
     ALTERNATIVE EXAMPLE)   Reuschemeyer, et al,
Capitalist

Development &

Democracy 1992,

75-121.

Dec. 4 **SECOND ASSIGNMENT DUE** : Analyze the sample, measure, specification problems
in your (or an) *APSR* article from 1996-07. Five page maximum, etc., as per assignment #1. Be
prepared to present and discuss in class.

Dec. 11   Be prepared to discuss your proposed research design project.

 4

Research Design paper Due on Thursday December 13.

The research design paper should be a self-conscious application of course materials. You
should choose a topic of personal interest to you. This paper may build on any of your previous
work or may be completely new.

In a 10-12 page (double spaced), paper you should do the following: (1). Sketch a research
project that involves normal science within political science, and which includes collection of
new empirical data. The sketch should indicate the previous research to which it is related, the
contribution that it will make, the methods of the study, the types of empirical data to be
examined, the mode of analysis, the nature of conclusions anticipated. This section should be 7-
8 pages. (2). Provide an analytic critique of your design, indicating its strengths and weaknesses
in contributing to progress in political science. This section should be 3-4 pages.

Sources.

The books by Hempel, Kuhn, Little, Scott, Olson, Przeworski, King-Keohane-Verba are
available for purchase at the bookstore. It may be less expensive to order them on line. Other
articles and chapters will be available in the political science lounge. Please either make your
own copy or be sure not to keep these too long, as others will need them.

Note that you are required to choose an article from the *American Political Science Review*
(1996-2007) and discuss it several times with the class. The *APSR* is available in the library's
electronic journals online; current issues are also in the periodical reading room; older issues are
also in the stacks. Several other journal articles are also assigned; you can find them through the
library's electronic journals.

Choice of Example III.

In one of the first class meetings we shall consider whether to substitute another example of
empirical political science research for the one currently shown as Example III: economic conditions and democracy. For example, we might consider election rules and party systems,
looking at the kind of work introduced in the Riker article in Week 2; political party competition
and campaign promises; party identification in American voting behavior; government stability
in parliamentary systems; political culture and democratic performance; election rules and
(mis)representation in democratic elections. Or.....? I am open to your interests and ideas.

SYLLABUS N

Art and Politics
FR 269/CLT 231F/PSC 282/AAS 269
Spring Term 2005
Kimberley Healey
Lattimore 411 Tel 5-4355
hely@mail.rochester.edu
Office hrs: Tues/Thurs 12:20-1:20
Jim Johnson
Harkness 312 Tel 5-0622
jd.johnson@rochester.edu
Office hrs/ Tues. 9:30-11:00
This course on the interactions between art and politics in the twentieth century will be conducted as an intensive and advanced seminar. Drawing on art history, literature and political theory we will explore the ways that politics and the practices of artistic representation intersect. Much of the course will treat questions of race and identity. Our focus will primarily include French and American examples including but not limited to the representation and theoretical discussion of war, torture, forced migration, lynching,

globalization and racial categories. Students will be expected to look at art, read poetry and literary texts, analyze and understand
political theory and participate in a series of speakers and symposia outside of the class. This course has been designed for students from across the humanities and the social sciences.

Course Grade:
35% Participation (including attendance to play, make-up classes and several presentations); More than 2 unexcused absences will result in a lowered grade; 5% Short (3 page) writing assignment;
20% Take-home midterm; 15% Oral presentations to be done in small groups of roughly 10 mins; Each student also must turn in annotated bibliography showing that you have read the sources used in the presentation (The group can use same sources but notes must be your own – – at least a few sentences per source) – you must cite
at least 3 non-internet sources; 25% A 15 page independent research paper or project (topic must be approved by both faculty members by March 3 – this option is required for those taking the course for the Political
Science "W" requirement) *or* take-home final (3-4 specific essay questions, 10-12 written pages). We will provide complete, detailed instructions for each assignment. NOTE: We have not ordered books for this course. Most of the readings will be on electronic reserve at Rush Rhees Library. But We will ask you to purchase several texts which should be available at your favorite on-line used book purveyors.

Mon.	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Fri.
			13 **Introduction** Distribute syllabus; What is art? What is politics?	14
17	18 **Introduction** READ: Karl Marx "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy"; Michel Foucault "What is an Author"; Hannah Arendt, "The Crisis in Culture"; John Dewey *Art and Experience* (Ch 1); Walter Benjamin "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (520-7)	19	20 **Introduction** READ: John Hutton "Pieties and Impieties" (74-82); August Endell excerpt "The Beauty of Form"(59-61); Kandinsky "Concerning the Spiritual" (82-89); Anthony Appiah "Postcolonial and the Aesthetic"(374-379); Clive Bell "The Aesthetic Hypothesis"(107-110); Klingender "Content and Form in Art" (437-9).	21
24	25 **Introduction** *First writing assignment* – what is art? what is politics? READ: Edouard Glissant "The Black Beach"; Diego Rivera "The Revolutionary Spirit"(421-424); Maya Lin "Untitled Statements" (524-5); Arthur Danto "The Abuse of Beauty" ; Clifford Geertz "Art as a Cultural System" (109-18).	26	27 **Migrations** READ: Stephen Castles. "The International Politics of Forced Migration"; Michel Foucault "Governmentality" and "'Omnes Et Singulatim': Toward a Critique of Political Reason"; Hannah Arendt "The Perplexities of the Rights of Man".	28

February

	1 **Migrations** Sebastiao Salgado *Migrations* (Selections). READ: Elaine Scarry *On Beauty and Being Just* (pp. 58-93). Derek Walcott *The Fortunate Traveler* (Selections); Adam Jagajewski "Refugees".	2	3 **Migrations** Jacob Lawrence "The Migration Series." READ: Anne Rice, ed. *Witnessing Lynching* (Selections); Carol Stack *Call to Home* (Selections).	4	
7	8 **Migrations/War** FILM: "Marooned in Iraq" READ: Aaron McGruder *The Right to Be Hostile* (Selections);	9 Aaron McGruder visit	10 **War** READ: Marguerite Duras *The War* (Section 1); Futurist manifesto at http://cscs.umich.edu/~crshalizi/T4PM/futurist-manifesto.html; Adorno from "Commitment" (779-783) art after Auschwitz.	11	
14	15 **War** Pablo Picasso "Guernica"; Robert Motherwell "Elegy for the Spanish Republic"; Jacob Lawrence "The War Series". READ: Maya Lin "Landscapes and Memorials"; Critical Art Ensenble "Electronic Civil Disobedience" and "Resisting the Bunker"	16	17 **War** Golub, mercenaries; Purple Hearts photo essay by Nina Berman. READ: Golub interview (241-244); Jorg Immendorf (255-257); Rosenquist (347-349) CA Sourcebook, Gustav Metzger pp. 8-19, manifestoes (401-4) CA Sourrcebook.	18	

21	22 **War** – Mouloud Feraoun reflections on French-Algerian War (Selections).	23	24 **NO CLASS** Play; Take Home Midterm; READ: Artaud *Theatre of Cruelty*, both versions	25 Play *Major Barbara*

March

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
	1 **NO CLASS** Arts Library Orientation READ: Douglas Crimp *Aids Demographics*	2	3 **Art In the Streets** READ: Martin Luther King, Jr. "Letter from Birmingham City Jail"; Elizabeth Spelman "Anger: The Diary"; Critical Arts Ensemble "Recombinant Theater & Digital Resistance"	4
7 spring break	8 ---- **READ** Sanford Levinson *Written in Stone*	9 ---------	10 -----------------	11 ----------------
14	15 **Art In the Streets** Barbara Kruger; Jenny Holzer; Krzysztof Wodiczko. READ: P. Phillips "Creating Democracy: A Dialogue with Krzysztof	16	17 **Art In the Streets** group presentations	18

	Wodiczko"; Keith Haring (369-71) CA Sourcebook			
21	22 **Art In the Streets** group presentations	23	24 **Torture** The Abu Ghraib Pictures. READ: Susan Sontag "Against Interpretation"(249-255); Susan Sontag "Regarding the Torture of Others"; Mark Bowden "The Dark Art of Interrogation"	25
28	29 **Torture** – group presentations – READ: Simone de Beauvoir on Djamila Bouchala; Jean-Paul Sartre 'The slow death of Andreas Bader' at http:// www.marxists. org/reference/ archive/sartre/ 1974/ baader.htm	30	31 **Torture** – Elaine Scarry *The Body In Pain* (Chs. 1&3).	

April*

Monday	Tuesday	Wed	Thursday	Fri
4	5 **Torture** – group presentations	6	7 **Thinking In Color** READ: Anthony Appiah "Race, Culture, Identity"; Ludwig Wittgenstein *Remarks on Color* ; Patricia Williams *Seeing a Color-Blind Future*. READ Jeff Donaldson "Ten in Search of a Nation"(366-9) CA Sourcebook	8
11	12 **Thinking in Color** READ: Coco Fusco & Brian Wallis *Only Skin Deep* (Selections)	13	14 **Thinking in Color** – group presentations READ: Edouard Glissant 'The Relative and Chaos' and "Distancing, Determining"	15
18	19 **Thinking in Color** – group presentations	20	21 Do Art & Politics Necessarily Intersect Around Events? Readings TBA	22
25	26 last class	27	28	29

* 2 Thursday evenings in April – make-up class for oral presentations.

<u>**SYLLABUS O**</u>

Political Science 284/484: Democratic Theory
Fall Semester 2001   Instructor: James Johnson
Office: 312 Harkness Hall   275-0622   jjsn@troi.cc.rochester.edu
This course is an intensive critical survey of difficulties involved in thinking about democracy. In particular we will take up two related topics. We will assess whether and, if so, how democracy might be normatively justified. And we will examine the vicissitudes of establishing and operating democratic institutions. Although prior course work in political theory may prove helpful, I do not expect students to have such a background. The only prerequisite is a willingness to work hard and to confront head on some important, difficult political issues.

This course is not for the faint-hearted. First, the reading assignments are difficult and heavy - they are not drawn from pre-digested textbook presentations. It is imperative that you the students keep up with the reading. Writing assignments draw explicitly and extensively on the assigned readings. Second, class meetings will combine lecture and discussion. I will regularly solicit student questions and comments on the assigned reading. From this it follows both that class attendance is *not* optional and that I expect students to be prepared to participate actively. While the bulk of your grade will be based directly on your performance on written assignments, at the margins your grade will reflect your attendance and participation. Furthermore, you
certainly will find it difficult to do well on written assignments if you do not attend class. If you need to miss class please be prepared to explain why.

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS
The first, most important point is that assignments must be submitted on time. You have more than enough time to prepare the assignments. *I will not accept late assignments*. So *please* take note of the due dates specified below. **If for any reason you anticipate problems getting in an assignment on time please speak with me *before* it is distributed so that we can make alternative arrangements**. There are two written assignments. Each will cover material from the assigned readings and class lectures and discussion. You can anticipate having to write 10-12 typewritten pages on both the mid-term and final. For grading purposes they will be weighted equally.
Assignment #1: I will distribute a take-home mid-term in class on Tuesday October 9th and is due in class on Thursday October 18th This assignment will cover material from the first half of the course. *Assignment #2*: I will distribute a take-home final exam in class on Thursday December 6th. It is due in my office on Tuesday December 18th at noon. It will cover the second half of the course but will also require that you connect this material to themes discussed in the first half of the course.

REQUIRED READINGS
Books (marked *) are available at the University Bookstore. A few of the remaining readings are available on the web and I have indicated where you might find them. The rest are on two-hour Reserve at the Library. Given the class size, this may create some bottlenecks. So please plan ahead and be considerate of other students. We will read the assigned material roughly in the order that I list it here. I will alert you to where we are on the list as the course progresses.

* Jean-Jacques Rousseau. *The Social Contract.* Penguin.

Carole Pateman. 1989. *The Disorder of Women*. Stanford
[Ch. 4 - "Women & Consent," pp. 71-89].

Hannah Pitkin. 1989. "Representation." In *Political Innovation & Conceptual Change* ed. T.

Ball, et al. Cambridge. pp. 132-54.

Bernard Manin. 1994. "The Metamorphoses of Representative Government," *Economy and*
Society 23:133-71

* John Stuart Mill. *On Liberty and Other Essays*. Oxford.

* William Riker. 1982. *Liberalism Against Populism*. Waveland.

Bernard Grofman & Scott Feld. 1988. "Rousseau's General Will, *"American Political Science*
Review 82:567-76. (Available online via JSTOR).

David Estlund, *et al.* 1989. Democratic Theory and the Public Interest," *American Political*
Science Review 83:1317-40. (Available online via JSTOR).

Walter Lippman. 1925. *The Phantom Public*. Transaction. [Part I]

Micheal Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It*
Matters. Yale. [chs. 1,2,4,6]

Lynn Sanders. 1999. "Democratic Politics and Survey Research," *Philosophy of the Social*
Sciences 29:248-80.

* John Dewey. 1927. *The Public and Its Problems*. Swallow Press.

John Dewey. 1939. "Creative Democracy: The Task Before Us." In *The Essential Dewey: Volume*
1 - Pragmatism, Education, Democracy. Ed. L. Hickman & T. Alexander. Indiana University
Press.

Mark Warren. 1992. "Democratic Theory and Self-Transformation," *American Political*

Science
Review 86:8-23. (Available online via JSTOR).

Jane Mansbridge. 1999. "On the Idea that Participation Makes Better Citizens." In *Citizen*
Competence and Democratic Institutions . Ed. S. Elkin & K. Soltan. Penn State Press.

Robert Westbrook. 1996. "Public Schooling and American Democracy." In *Democracy,*
Education and the Schools. ed. Roger Soder. Jossey-Bass.

Marion Smiley. 1999. "Democratic Citizenship: A Question of Competence?" In *Citizen*
Competence and Democratic Institutions . Ed. S. Elkin & K. Soltan. Penn State Press.

Jack Knight & James Johnson. 1994. "Aggregation & Deliberation: On the Possibility of
Democratic Legitimacy," *Political Theory* 22:277-96.

Lynn Sanders. 1997. "Against Deliberation," *Political Theory* 25:347-76.

Mark Warren. 1996. "Deliberative Democracy and Authority," *American Political*
Science
Review 90:46-60. (Available online via JSTOR).
* William Keech. 1995. *Economic Politics: The Costs of Democracy*. Cambridge.
Joshua Cohen and Joel Rogers. 1983. *On Democracy*. Penguin. [Chapter 3].

Przeworski, Adam. 1996. "A Better Democracy, A Better Economy," *Boston Review*
 (April/May) 9-15. (Available online at http://bostonreview.mit.edu/archives.html)

SYLLABUS P

Political Science 581 * Spring Term 2008
Instructor: Jim Johnson
Harkness 312 * x 5-0622 * jd.johnson@rochester.edu
Office Hours ~ By Appointment
This year the seminar will focus on topics in democratic theory. Throughout the term we will
examine a variety of approaches to the question of how we might analyze and justify any set of
political arrangements generally and democratic arrangements in particular. In the process will
take up a number of issues central to democratic theory - issues of representation, the virtues and
difficulties of decision making mechanisms such as aggregation and deliberation, the competence
of citizens, and the role of authority and expertise in democratic politics. We will read a number
of canonical authors from the history of political thought. We also will encounter several

methods of political theory ranging from abstract modeling to conceptual analysis. Moreover we

will see how permeable are the often exaggerated boundaries between political theory and the

remainder of the our discipline.

Class Organization: In *Monty Python & the Holy Grail* there is a famous scene where King

Arthur engages in heated debate over the notion of sovereignty with very contentious, muddy

peasants. The peasants announce that they belong to an "autonomous collective," a "selfgoverning

anarcho-syndicalist commune" and so have little regard for the pretenses of centralized monarchical authority. (See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Xd_zkMEgkI if you

are unfamiliar with this canonical argument.) This course will operate as just such a collective.

Each week you students will "take it in turns" (by some method of your own devising) to insure

the availability for the following week of any of the relevant reading materials not available

through the library via e-journals. This will require that the chosen ones ascertain which readings

are not easily available on the web, obtain those readings from me, copy them (at my expense),

and make sure that they are placed on electronic reserve at Rush Rhees Library.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Students in the Political Science PhD Program Please Note: For better or worse this seminar is a

required component of the graduate curriculum. You should treat it as such. Interlopers: Those of

you who are *not* in the Ph.D. Program have no fear, the themes of the course are general and, I

think, interesting!

Class Format: The course will run as a seminar. Given the nature of the undertaking it is imperative that students be active participants in class. That means that I expect students not only to keep up with the reading but to read with care and to demonstrate this in class discussions. **Participation will count for 20% of your grade**. Over the course of the term I will keep track of who speaks, who doesn't, who speaks with intelligence and insight, and who doesn't. I encourage intelligent participation in the following way. Each week, during class, I ask one or more students (selected at random) to initiate and help direct the discussion for that day. This

will require that she or he be able to identify and raise critical questions about the major points of the assigned readings. Each student should anticipate being asked to do this more than once during the course of the semester but, as should be clear, you will receive no forewarning of when that will be.

Written Assignments: The most important thing about these assignments is that you complete them on time. **I will *not* entertain *any* requests for extensions or incompletes except in the most dire of circumstances.** That said, there are two written assignments for the course. Please mark your calendars now. Each exam will be worth 40% of your grade. A mid-term take home exam will be distributed in class on *March 19th* and is due in class on *March 26th*. A take-home final will be distributed in the on *April 30th* is due on *May 7th.* I will provide detailed instructions/parameters when I distribute the exam questions. You can anticipate having to produce 15-18 pages (typed, double-spaced) for each exam. And you also should anticipate that the exams will presume you've done virtually all the reading. Fair warning.

READINGS

Background: Many of you will have little background and perhaps even less interest in normative political theory. You no doubt will be dismayed to learn that the secondary literature on nearly all of the theorists and topics we cover (and this course is far from comprehensive) is immense. Unlike virtually every other sub-field in the discipline not everything of relevance to the study of democratic theory has appeared in the past three decades. Two reference sources that students unfamiliar with political theory may find useful are:

i. Miller, David, ed. 1987. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. (Blackwell).
ii. Goodin, Robert and Phillip Pettit, eds. 1993. *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. (Blackwell).
These volumes contain relatively brief, usually reliable, discussions of a wide variety of important theoretical topics and political thinkers. There are also several recent introductory
texts that sketch broad themes in contemporary political theory in a brief, accessible way. You
may find any of the following reliable and helpful:
iii. Hampton, Jean. 1996. *Political Philosophy*. Westview.
iv. Kymlicka, Will. 2001. *Contemporary Political Philosophy*. (2nd Ed.) Oxford UP.
v. Wolff, Jonathan. 1996. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. Oxford UP.
vi. Ian Shapiro. 2003. *The Moral Foundations of Politics*. Yale UP.
vii. Raymond Geuss. 2001. *History & Illusion in Politics*. Cambridge UP.

Required: What follows is a list of required readings for the course. You will notice that the
reading load is moderately heavy. Moreover it is the sort of material to which you likely have had
scant exposure. Virtually none comes from a textbook. Given the nature of the exams for the
course it is imperative that you do the readings. Given the plan for how the course will operate as

sketched above it will be prudent for you to do the readings prior to class.

I have not ordered books through the bookstore so you will be responsible for obtaining the

books (marked **^**) on the required list from the Library or via your favorite e-purveyor. You

should be able to find virtually all of the books cheaply and/or used on-line. Other readings are

available electronically from the Library either via the e-journals links on Voyager (for *unmarked*

items) or on electronic reserve (for items marked *****).

16 January ~ Three Tasks for Political Theorists

*Thomas Schelling. 1978. *Micromotives & Macrobehavior*. W.W. Norton. (Chapters 1 & 3).

Jack Knight & James Johnson. 2007. "The Priority of Democracy: A Pragmatist Approach to

Political-Economic Institutions and the Burden of Justification," *American Political Science Review* 101:47-61.

*James Johnson. 2005. "What the Politics of Enfranchisement Can Tell Us About How Rational

Choice Theorists Study Institutions." In *Preferences & Situations*. Ed. Ira Katznelson & Barry Weingast. Russell Sage Foundation.

23 January ~ Central Texts I

^ Jean-Jacques Rousseau. 1762. *The Social Contract.*

* Condorcet 1785. "Essay on the Application of Mathematics to the Theory of Decision-Making"

* Immanuel Kant. 1784. "An Answer to the Question 'What is Enlightenment?'"

* James Madison. 1787. *Federalist #10 and #14.*

* Benjamin Constant. 1819. "The Liberty of the Ancients Compared to that of the Moderns."

^ Karl Marx. 1852. *The 18 Brumaire th of Louis Bonaparte*. International Publishers.

* Karl Marx. 1859. "Preface to the Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" (extract).

30 January ~ Central Texts II

^ John Stuart Mill. 1859. *On Liberty*.

^ John Stuart Mill. 1861. *On Representative Government*.

^ Friedrich Nietzsche. 1886. *Beyond Good & Evil*. Vintage.

* Charles Peirce. 1877. "The Fixation of Belief"

^ John Dewey. 1927. *The Public & Its Problems*. Swallow Press.

* John Dewey. 1939. "Creative Democracy: The Task Before Us."

6 February ~ Central Texts III

* Joseph Schumpeter. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy*. Harper. (Part IV)
*Isaiah Berlin. 1958. "Two Concepts of Liberty."
^ Kenneth Arrow. 1963. *Social Choice & Individual Values*. Yale University Press.
Hannah Arendt. 1963. "What is Authority?" and "What is Freedom?"
^ Michel Foucault. 1979. *Discipline & Punish*. Pantheon.

13 February ~ Institutions I: Markets
David Kreps. 1990. *A Course in Microeconomic Theory*. Princeton UP. (Chapters 1,6, and 8)
^ Charles Lindblom. *The Market System*. Yale University Press.
Amartya Sen. 1993. "Markets & Freedoms," *Oxford Economic Papers* 43: 519-41.
Debra Satz. 2007. "Liberalism, Economic Freedom & the Limits of Markets," *Social Philosophy*
& Policy 24:120-40.
* Debra Satz. 2004. "Noxious Markets." In *Globalization, Culture & the Limits of the Market*.
Ed. S. Cullenberg & P. Pattaniak. Oxford UP.
Debra Satz. 2003. "Child Labor: A Normative Perspective," *World Bank Economic Review*
17:297-309.
Debra Satz. 1992. "Markets in Women's Reproductive Labor," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*
21:107-31.
Debra Satz. 1995. "Markets in Women's Sexual Labor," *Ethics* 106:63-85.

20 February ~ Institutions II: Decentralized Institutional Mechanisms
Ronald Coase. 1988. *The Firm, The Market & the Law*. Chicago. (Chapters 5 & 6)
Joseph Farrell. 1987. "Information and the Coase Theorem," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 1:113-29.
Richard McKelvey and Talbot Page. 1999. "Taking the Coase Theorem Seriously," *Economics and Philosophy* 15:235-47.
Gary Miller and Thomas Hammond. 1994. "Why Politics is More Fundamental than Economics," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 6:5-26.
Jack Knight and James Johnson. 1999. "Inquiry Into Democracy," *American Journal of Political Science* 43:566-89.
Michael Taylor. 1987. *The Possibility of Cooperation*. Cambridge.
Randall Calvert. 1992. "Leadership and Its Basis in Problems of Social Coordination," *International Political Science Review* 13:7-24.

27 February ~ An Interlude on Power
* Pranab Bardhan. 2005. *Scarcity, Conflicts & Cooperation*. MIT Press. (Chapters 2,3,6).
^ Keith Dowding. *Power*. University of Minnesota Press.

Adam Przeworski and Michael Wallerstein. 1988. "The Structural Dependence of the State on

Capital," *American Political Science Review* 82:11-29.

Brian Barry, 2002. "Capitalists Rule OK? Some Puzzles about Power," *Politics, Philosophy &

Economics* 1:155-84.

Keith Dowding. 2003. "Resources, Power & Systematic Luck," *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 2:305-22.

Brian Barry. 2003. "Capitalists Rule, OK? A Commentary on Keith Dowding," *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 2:323-41.

* Phillip Pettit. 1997. *Republicanism*. Oxford UP. (Chapters 2,3).

5 March ~ Institutions III: Equilibrium Institutions & Their Genesis

Kenneth Shepsle. 1989. "Studying Institutions," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 1:131-47.

* Randall Calvert. 1995a. "The Rational Choice Theory of Social Institutions." In *Modern

Political Economy* ed. J. Banks and E. Hanushek. Cambridge UP.

* Randall Calvert. 1995b. "Rational Actors, Equilibrium and Social Institutions." In *Explaining

Social Institutions* ed. J. Knight and I. Sened. University of Michigan Press.

Russell Hardin. 1999. *Liberalism. Constitutionalism & Democracy*. Oxford UP. (Chapter 3).

Ordeshook, Peter. 1993. "Constitutional Stability," *Constitutional Political Economy* 3:137-175.

Douglas North. 1990. "A Transaction Cost Theory of Politics" *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 2:355-67

^ Jack Knight. 1992. *Institutions and Social Conflict*. Cambridge University Press.

* Jack Knight. 1995. "Models, Interpretations and Theories: Constructing Explanations of Institutional Emergence and Change." In *Explaining Social Institutions*. Ed. J. Knight and I. Sened. University of Michigan.

12 March ~ Spring Break

19 March ~ Modes of Justification

* Robert Goodin. 1991. "Utility and the Good." In *A Companion to Ethics*. Ed. P. Singer. Blackwell.

Jonathan Riley. 1990. "Utilitarian Ethics and Democratic Government," *Ethics* 100:335-48.

* Kim Lane Scheppele and Jeremy Waldron. 1991. "Contractarian Methods in Political and

Legal Evaluation," *Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities* 3:195-230.

* Carole Pateman. 1989. *The Disorder of Women*. Stanford [Ch. 4 - "Women & Consent," pp. 71-89].

* Brian Barry. 1989. *Democracy and Power*. Oxford. [Ch. 2: "Is Democracy Special?"]

* Thomas Christiano. 1996. *The Rule of the Many*. Westview. [Ch. 2: "Equality"]
* Jeremy Waldron. 1998. "Participation: The Right of Rights," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian
Society* 97:307-37.
Amartya Sen. 1999. "Democracy as a Universal Value," *Journal of Democracy* 10:3-17.
*Adam Przeworski. 1999. "A Minimalist Conception of Democracy." In *Democracy's Value* ed.
Ian Shapiro & Casiano Hacker-Cordon. Cambridge.
James Johnson. 2000. "Why Respect Culture?" *American Journal of Political Science*
44(3): 405-18.

19 March - 26 March: MID-TERM EXAM

26 March ~ Participation & Representation
*Hannah Pitkin. 1989. "Representation." *In Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*, ed. T.
Ball, *et. al.*. Cambridge.
David Plotke. 1997. "Democracy Is Representation," *Constellations* 4:19-34
Page 6 of 8
Bernard Manin. 1994. "The Metamorphoses of Representative Government," *Economy and
Society* 23:133-71.
* Lani Guinier. 1994. *The Tyranny of the Majority*. Free Press. [pp.71-118].
* Anne Phillips. 1995. *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford. [pp. 27-57,145-67].
Jane Mansbridge. 2003. "Rethinking Representation,"*American Political Science Review*
97:515-28.
* Jane Mansbridge. 1999. "On the Idea that Participation Makes Better Citizens." In *Citizen
Competence and Democratic Institutions* . Ed. S. Elkin & K. Soltan. Penn State Press.
Jon Elster. 1981. "States that are Essentially By-Products." *Social Science Information*
20:431-473.
David Miller & Joseph Chan. 1991. "Elster on Self-Realization in Politics,"
Ethics, 102: 96-102.
Russell Hardin. 2000. "Democratic Epistemology and Accountability," *Social Philosophy and
Policy* 17:110-26

2 April ~ Casting Votes & Counting Them
^ William Riker. 1982. *Liberalism Against Populism*. Waveland.
Nicholas Miller, *et. al.* 1989. "The Geometry of Majority Rule," *Journal of Theoretical Politics*
1:379-406.
Jonathan Levin & Barry Nalebuff, Barry. 1995. "An Introduction to Vote-counting Schemes,"
The Journal of Economic Perspectives. 9:3-26.

Geoffrey Brennan and Philip Pettit. 1990. "Unveiling the Vote," *British Journal of Political*
Science 20: 311-33.
* Partha Dasgupta and Eric Maskin. 1999. "Democracy and Other Goods." In *Democracy's*
Value ed. I. Shapiro & Casiano Hacker-Cordon. Cambridge.
Nicholas Miller. 1983. "Pluralism and Social Choice," *American Political Science Review*
77:734-47.
Richard Niemi. 1969. "Majority Decision-Making with Partial Unidimensionality," *American*
Political Science Review 63:488-97.

9 April ~ From Political Argument to Democratic Deliberation

Amartya Sen. 2003. "Democracy & Its Global Roots," *New Republic* (6 October) 28-35.
Joshua Cohen. 1989. "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy." In *The Good Polity*. Ed. A.
Hamlin and P. Pettit. Blackwell.
Bernard Manin. 1987. "On Legitimacy and Democratic Deliberation," *Political Theory*
15:338-68.
Joshua Cohen. 1986. "An Epistemic Conception fo Democracy," *Ethics* 97:26-38.
* James Johnson. 1998. "Arguing for Deliberation." In *Deliberative Democracy*. Ed. J. Elster.
Cambridge.
Jack Knight and James Johnson. 1994. "Aggregation and Deliberation," *Political Theory*
22:277-97.

John Dryzek & Christian List. 2003. "Social Choice Theory & Deliberative Democracy,"*British*
Journal of Political Science 33:1-28.
* Jack Knight and James Johnson. 1997. "What Sort of Equality Does Democratic Deliberation
Require?" In *Deliberative Democracy*. Ed. J. Bohman and W. Rehg. MIT Press.
Lynn Sanders. 1997. "Against Deliberation," *Political Theory* 25:347-76.
Chantal Mouffe. 1999. "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism," *Social Research*
66:745-58.
Gerry Mackie. 2006. "Does Democratic Deliberation Change Minds?" *Politics, Philosophy &*
Economics 10: 279 - 303.
Christian List, Robert Luskin, James Fishkin and Iain McLean. 2006. "Deliberation,
Single-Peakedness, and the Possibility of Meaningful Democracy: Evidence from
Deliberative Polls." (Unpublished Manuscript).
http://personal.lse.ac.uk/list/PDF-files/DeliberationPaper.pdf

16 April ~ A Theory of Democracy

Knight/Johnson Manuscript.

23 April ~ Authority, Competence & Expertise

^ William Keech. 1995. *Economic Politics*. Cambridge UP.

* Joseph Stiglitz. 1998. "Central Banking in a Democratic Society," *de Economist* 146:199-226.

* Steven Epstein. 2000. "Democracy, Expertise & AIDS Treatment Activism." In *Science, Technology and Democracy*. Ed. Daniel Kleinman. SUNY Press.

Mark Warren. 1996. "Deliberative Democracy and Authority," *American Political Science Review* 90:46-60.

Bernard Grofman and Scott Feld. 1988. "Rousseau's General Will: A Condorcetian Perspective,"*American Political Science Review* 82:567-76.

David Estlund, *et al.*, "Democratic Theory and the Public Interest: Condorcet and Rousseau Revisited," *American Political Science Review* 83:1317-40.

Goodin, Robert and Christian List. 2001. "Epistemic Democracy: Generalizing the Condorcet Jury Theorem," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 9:277-306.

Russell Hardin. 2002. "Street-Level Epistemology & Democratic Participation," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 10:212-29.

* Michael X Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale. [pp. 62-177].

* Marion Smiley. 1999. "Democratic Citizenship: A Question of Competence?" In *Citizen Competence and Democratic Institutions* . Ed. S. Elkin & K. Soltan. Penn State Press.

Matthew Festenstein, 2001. "Inquiry as Critique: on the Legacy of Deweyan Pragmatism for Political Theory," *Political Studies* 49:730-748.

Phillip Kitcher. 2006. "Public Knowledge & the Difficulties of Democracy," *Social Research* 73:1205-24.

Page 8 of 8

30 April ~ Pragmatist Experimentalism

^ Richard Posner. 2003. *Law, Pragmatism & Democracy*. Harvard UP.

Jack Knight & James Johnson. 1996. "Political Consequences of Pragmatism," *Political Theory* 24:68-96.

^Roberto Mangabeira Unger. 2007. *Free Trade Reimagined*. Princeton UP.

Dani Rodrik. 2007. *One Economics, Many Recipes*. Princeton University Press. Chapters 4-6.

SYLLABUS Q

Political Science 383/583: Culture and Politics   Spring Term 2001
Instructor: J. Johnson   312 Harkness   5-0622
jjsn@troi.cc.rochester.edu
Office Hours: Thursday 1:30-2:30 & By Appointment
This is a course in social and political theory. It starts from two premises. First, it presumes that culture and politics are related in complex, seemingly ubiquitous, but very poorly understood ways. Second, it presumes that the primary deficiencies in our understanding are in the first instance theoretical rather than empirical. The readings for the course reflect these premises and are intended to clarify the explanatory and normative issues at stake in how we understand the relations between culture and politics. However, given the lamentable state of out understanding of the relevant issues we will be directly engaged in the act of theorizing. By that I mean that we will not simply be concerned with what this or that author has to say, but with the more constructive task of elaborating a plausible theory to aid in exploring the explanatory and normative issues that arise at the intersection of culture and politics.

The course will be run as a seminar. That means that I expect students to read assigned materials in advance, to read the readings critically, to come to class prepared with questions, thoughts, objections, etcetera, and to be willing to voice those questions, thoughts, objections and so on in class discussions. Please note that there is a *lot* of reading and that that reading is both unfamiliar and sometimes quite difficult.

Your grade for the course will depend heavily on class participation. It also will depend on two written assignments. The first (due at the end of week 10) will address questions of explanation, the second (due May 10) will take up normative issues. These papers will be roughly ten typed pages. I will give more precise instructions as the deadlines draw near. The precise topics are negotiable - that means you will need to discuss them with me in advance! So start thinking.

Readings
Books, marked *, are on order at the UofR Bookstore. They also are available via Amazon - all
are in print and readily accessible.
Items marked # can be obtained on JSTOR via the UofR Library web page. Go to that page -
http://groucho.lib.rochester.edu/ - click "Electronic Journals," scroll down to "Major Collections," click JSTOR then follow the search directions. I will set up a process by which you can obtain and copy the remaining readings. Some will be available in the PSC department, some will be on reserve in the Library.

Week 1 - Introduction - The Current Impasse and a Road Map.
"Cultural Explanations" *The Economist* (9 November 1996) 23-26.

James Johnson, James. 1997. "Symbol *and* Strategy in Comparative Political Analysis," *APSA-CP: Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics* (Summer) 6-9.

Week 2 - Raising Issues
David Kertzer. 1988. *Ritual, Politics, and Power*. Yale

Week 3 - Classical Views
Karl Marx. "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy"
Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America* -- 1.II.9
Max Weber *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* -- Introduction, Chs. 2,4
Emil Durkheim *Selected Writings* pp. 219-250.

Week 4 - On the Wrong Track - Contemporary Approaches to "Political Culture"
Verba, Sidney. 1965. "Comparative Political Culture." In *Political Culture and Political Development*, Ed. L. Pye and S. Verba. Princeton University Press.
Almond, Gabriel. 1982. "The Intellectual History of the Civic Culture Concept." In *The Civic Culture Revisited*, Ed. G. Almond and S. Verba. Boston: Little Brown.
Ronald Inglehart. 1988. "The Renaissance of Political Culture," *American Political Science Review* 82:1203-1230.
Harry Eckstein. 1988. "A Culturalist Theory of Political Change," *American Political Science Review* 82:789-804.
Robert Putnam. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton. Chs. 2,4,-6
James Johnson. 1999. "Notes on 'Political Culture'"

Week 5-6 - Interpretation
* Clifford Geertz. 1972. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic
Charles Taylor. 1985. *Philosophy and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1.
Sherry Ortner. 1984. "Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:126-166.
Sherry Ortner. 1990. "Patterns of History" In *Culture Through Time* ed. E. Ohnuki-Tierney. Stanford University Press.
Steven Lukes. 1982. "Relativism in Its Place." In *Rationality and Relativism* ed. M. Hollis and S. Lukes. MIT Press.

Week 7 - Down to Cases? Or Theoretical Disagreements About Mechanisms?
The Symbolic Aftermath of Communism, East & West
* Katherine Verdery. 1999. *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies*. Columbia.
* David Kertzer. 1996. *Politics and Symbols*. Yale.

Week 8 - Interpretation and Rationality
Gananath Obeyesekere. 1992. *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook*. Princeton University Press. I, III-VI, Afterword

Marshall Sahlins. 1995. *How 'Natives' Think*. University of Chicago Press. 1-85,148-89,203-5
Clifford Geertz.. 1995. "Culture War," *New York Review of Books* (30 November) 4-6.
Steven Lukes. 2000. "Different Cultures, Different Rationalities?" *History of the Human Sciences* 13:3-18.
Clifford Geertz. 1983. *Local Knowledge*. Basic Books. Ch. 4

Week 9 - Strategic Interaction in a Culturally Austere World
Michael Taylor. 1987. *The Possibility of Cooperation*. Cambridge. Chs. 1-3
Thomas Schelling. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Harvard. Chs. 1-6.
Calvert, Randall. 1992. "Leadership and Its Basis in Problems of Social Coordination," *International Political Science Review* 13:7-24.
Amelie Rorty. 1983. "Imagination and Power," *Social Science Information* 22:801-16.

Week 10 - Strategy - Some Wrong Turns
Robert Nozick. 1993. *The Nature of Rationality*. Princeton University Press. pp. 3-64,133-39,172-74.
David Kreps. 1990. "Corporate Culture and Economic Theory. In *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy* ed. J. Alt and K. Shepsle. Cambridge University Press.
Avner Greif. 1994. "Cultural Beliefs and the Organization of Society." *Journal of Political Economy* 102:912-50.
Robert Bates, Rui de Figueiredo, and Barry Weingast. 1998. "The Politics of Interpretation" (corrected version) *Politics and Society* 26:603-42.

Week 11 -The Poverty of Primordialism
Clifford Geertz. 1993. "Ethnic Conflict" *Common Knowledge* 2:54-65
Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1,4,7.
Arjun Appadurai. 1996. *Modernity at Large*. University of Minnesota Press. Ch.7-9.
–4–
Robert Haydon. 1999. *Blueprints for a House Divided*. University of Michigan. Chs. 2-4
James Johnson. 1999. "Inventing Constitutional Traditions" (Ms.)

Week 12 - Communitarians & Liberals on The Value of Cultural Membership
Charles Taylor. 1994. "The Politics of Recognition" In *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition.* ed. A.Gutmann. Princeton University Press.
Charles Taylor. 1995. *Philosophical Arguments*. Harvard University Press. Ch. 7
Will Kymlicka. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford. Chs. 1-6.
Joseph Raz. 1994. *Ethics in the Public Domain*. Oxford Chs. 6,8.

Week 13 - Women
* Susan Okin. 1999. *Is Multiculturalism Bad For Women?* Princeton.
Yael Tamir. "Hands Off Clitoridectomy" *Boston Review* 21(3) (Summer 1996) at
http://bostonreview.mit.edu/BR21.3/Tamir.html
Comments by Nussbaum, George, Kamm, and Neuwirth and a Reply by Tamir. *Boston*

Review Volume 21 (5) (November 1996) at http://bostonreview.mit.edu/BR21.5/
Nancy Hirschmann. 1997. "Eastern Veiling, Western Freedom?" *Review of Politics* 59:461-88.

Week 14 - Skeptics
Chandran Kukathas. 1992. "Are There Any Cultural Rights?" *Political Theory* 20:105-39.
Jeremy Waldron. 1992. "Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative," *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 25:751-93.
Leslie Green. 1998. "Rights of Exit," *Legal Theory* 4:165-85.
Amartya Sen. 1997. "Human Rights and Asian Values" *The New Republic* (14 & 21 July) 33-40
Brian Barry. 1998. "The Limits of Cultural Politics," *Review of International Studies* 24:307-19.
James Johnson. 2000. "Why Respect Culture? *American Journal of Political Science* 44:405-18

PSCI 6630
Spring 2008   3412 Friedmann
Wed 6:30-9pm   Office Hours: Tue 2-3:30, Wed 5:15-6:15, Thurs
                                                                       11-12 & by appt
Friedman 3309   387-5698
                                                     jacinda.swanson@wmich.edu

Political Philosophy II

Overview and Objectives:

This course is intended to provide an intensive introduction to some of the key texts and themes in the *modern* period, roughly the 16th through the 19th century, of the approximately 2500-year history of Western political theory. (Western political theory first emerged as a field of inquiry in ancient Greece.) Even within the time period we are studying, we will not be able to discuss many important theorists and ideas. We will, though, cover some of the more important texts in the emergence and development of liberalism, social contract theory, republicanism, theories of representative government/democracy, Marxian theory, and critiques of humanism and metaphysics. Consequently, we will begin to get some sense of the wide range of ways in which politics and political phenomena have been theorized. Moreover, we will read some of the texts that have shaped how later political theorists, political scientists, philosophers, social theorists, and citizens today think about politics.

As we will see, even in the Western world, theorists have thought about politics and government in very different ways. Yet, there are numerous themes or topics that recur throughout the history of political thought, including the following: the characteristics of human nature; the relationship between the citizen and the state/government; the origin of government; the ends or purposes of government; freedom; rights; equality; legislation; justice; political obligation/duty; citizenship; the different types of political regimes/forms of government, including democracy; the powers and functions of government; revolution and rebellion; property and economics. Studying some of the history of political theory allows us to see how issues like freedom or the purpose of government can be thought about in different ways and what the strengths and limitations of each of these different ways are. It will also enable us to see how what is considered "political" is itself variable and disputed.

In this seminar, we will be taking the texts and their arguments seriously, paying close attention to how authors define concepts, the logic of their arguments, and the ethical, social, political, and economic consequences of their arguments. This will require close, detailed readings of the texts. In other words, this class seeks to further develop your skills in systematically *analyzing* political arguments and theories, rather than simply summarizing them, which will require a particular (analytical) approach to reading,

discussing, and writing. (Analyzing involves, for example, determining a writer's assumptions, how she/he defines key political concepts, the logical steps in her/his argument, how her/his different ideas fit together, etc.) We will also be attentive to the similarities and differences among the authors. The aim is not only to gain an in-depth understanding of the specific theorists we read, but also, more generally, to increase your ability to read and grasp the arguments of other political theorists as well as your ability to formulate appropriate and compelling theoretical frameworks for (empirically) studying various political phenomena, whether it's in the field of U.S. politics or comparative politics.

Required Texts:
Please purchase the specified edition of these books, so that everyone in class is using the same edition (and thus the same translation and pagination), which will facilitate seminar discussion. Please bring the relevant book to class since we will often read and analyze passages from the readings in class. The edition you use is also an issue with regard to your paper citations—you'll need to let me know if a paper you submit cites another edition.

- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, revised student edition, ed. by Richard Tuck, Cambridge University Press, 1996
- John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, ed. C. B. Macpherson, Hackett, 1980
- Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Basic Political Writings*, trans. Donald A. Cress, intro. Peter Gay, Hackett, 1987
- John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty and Other Essays*, ed. John Gray, Oxford, 1998
- Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd ed., ed. Robert C. Tucker, W. W. Norton, 1978
- Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, trans. & intro. Douglas Smith, Oxford, 1999

Additional REQUIRED readings: secondary sources available through WMU library's e-reserve system (http://www.wmich.edu/library/reserves/, under the listing for this class; these books are also on reserve at Waldo Library):

- Tracy B. Strong. 1994. "The General Will and the Scandal of Politics." *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The Politics of the Ordinary*, 67-103. Sage.
- Dennis F. Thompson. 1976. "The Theory of Government." *John Stuart Mill and Representative Government*, 91-135. Princeton.
- Richard D. Wolff and Stephen A. Resnick. 1987. excerpts. *Economics: Marxian Versus Neoclassical.* Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tracy B. Strong. 1975. "The Necessity and Possibility of Truth." *Friedrich Nietzsche and the Politics of Transfiguration*, 20-52. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Course Requirements:
Please notify me if you have a documented disability that requires accommodation.

A complete and updated copy of this syllabus can be found online, at the link for this class at http://homepages.wmich.edu/~jswanson. Assignments will be handed out and/or emailed to you (at your WMU email account). Feel free to contact me via email with questions about the readings, assignments, and so forth, although be aware that, in general, I will not be checking my email regularly in the evenings and on weekends.

Assignments:
- seminar participation, 7%
  Participation includes regular, active participation in weekly seminar discussion as well as writing 1 or 2 one-page (singe-spaced, 11 or 12 pt font) in-depth analyses of an important concept or argument from one of the week's assigned (primary source) readings. These analyses should NOT attempt to summarize an entire chapter or article. Each week one student will be assigned to provide such an analysis for the following week; that student should either bring enough copies of her/his analysis to distribute to the entire seminar OR email or bring me a copy of the analysis at least 15 minutes before class, which I will then photocopy.
- 3 short (6 page) papers, 20% each
  These papers will be on assigned topics and based on the assigned readings; they do not require outside research.
- take-home final exam (approx 12 pages), 33%
  It will be based on the assigned readings and does not require outside research.

Note: Because I am typically in my office only on Tues., Wed., and Thurs., you'll need to email your papers and final exam to me (unless you're turning them in early, when I am in my office). If you turn in a paper via email, do NOT assume I have received it just because your email apparently went through. Make sure you receive an email back from me confirming receipt.

You are responsible for making yourself aware of and understanding the policies and procedures in the Graduate Catalog that pertain to Academic Honesty. These policies include cheating, fabrication, falsification and forgery, multiple submission, plagiarism, complicity and computer misuse. The policies can be found at http://catalog.wmich.edu/index.php under Academic Policies, Student Rights and Responsibilities. If there is reason to believe you have been involved in academic dishonesty, you will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. You will be given the opportunity to review the charge(s). If you believe you are not responsible, you will have the opportunity for a hearing. You should consult with me if you are uncertain about an issue of academic honesty prior to the submission of an assignment or test. *A finding of responsibility for academic dishonesty on any assignment will result in failure of this course (see the Graduate Catalog).*

Course Outline:
Jan. 9   Introduction

Jan. 16   Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Hobbes' dedication & introduction, ch. 1-7, 10-17

Jan. 23   Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ch. 18-21, 24, 26, 28-31, "A Review and Conclusion"
            FIRST SHORT PAPER ASSIGNMENT HANDED OUT

Jan. 30   Locke, *Second Treatise*, preface, ch. I-VI

Feb. 6   Locke, *Second Treatise*, ch. VII-XV

Feb. 9   FIRST SHORT PAPER DUE BY 9AM

Feb. 13   Locke, *Second Treatise*, ch. XVI-XIX
            SECOND SHORT PAPER ASSIGNMENT HANDED OUT

Feb. 20   Rousseau, *On the Social Contract*, Book I-II

Feb. 27   Rousseau, *On the Social Contract*, Book III-IV
            Strong, "The General Will"
            THIRD SHORT PAPER ASSIGNMENT HANDED OUT

Mar. 1   SECOND SHORT PAPER DUE BY 9AM

Mar. 5   NO CLASS (spring break)

Mar. 12   Mill, *Considerations on Representative Government*, ch. I-III, V-VIII

Mar. 19   Mill, *Considerations on Representative Government*, X, XII
            Mill, *On Liberty*, ch. I (all), II (pp. 20-25, 37-42, 51-4, 59-61), III (pp. 62-5,
                71-82), IV (pp. 83-8)
            Thompson, "The Theory of Government"
            Mill question on TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAM HANDED OUT

Mar. 22   THIRD SHORT PAPER DUE BY 9AM

Mar. 26   Marx, Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*
            Marx, "On the Jewish Question"
            Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, "Estranged Labor"
                and "Private Property and Communism"
            Marx, first 2 paragraphs of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*
            Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*

Apr. 2   Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, ch. 1, 4, 6, 7, 26, 27, 31, 32; Vol. III excerpts (pp.
                294-361, 431-42)
            Resnick and Wolff, Introduction: E.2, E.3, E.5 (pp. 25-7, 30-5); Ch. 3: A-
                D.2 (pp. 125-157)
            Marx question on TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAM HANDED OUT

Apr. 9   Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, preface, First Essay, Second Essay

Apr. 16   Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, Third Essay
              Strong, "The Necessity and Possibility of Truth"
              Nietzsche question on TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAM HANDED OUT

Apr. 24   TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAM DUE BY 9AM

Annotated Bibliography

American Political Science Association. "State of the Discipline," Edited Volumes.

Almond, Gabriel A., Eric C. Bellquist, et al. "Political Science as a Discipline," *American Political Science Review* 56 (1962) 417-421. This article works to define political science as a discipline apart from other social science. In doing so, it offers an explanation of the basic subsets of the discipline such as theory. Political science is explored in connection with its historical roots with respect to the given country in which it is being studied.

Bloom, Allan. "The Closing of the American Mind," Simon and Schuster, 1987. This book is a cornerstone criticism of postmodern education and its failure in higher education. It speaks to the importance of the Socratic method.

Germino, Dante. "The Revival of Political Theory," *Journal of Politics*, 25 (1963) 437-460. This article stresses the importance of the theory portion of the political science discipline. It combats popular opinions of the time that thought theory was a dying vocation. Additionally, it emphasizes the need for a grounding in theory, the classics, in order to study political science in general.

Goren, Paul. "Political Expertise and Principled Political Thought," *Political Research Quarterly* 53 (2000) 117-136. This study sought to explore Americans' collective core values and beliefs and then explored how those core traits influenced their behavior, mostly through voting. This article is important to the subject at hand because it poses the question of whether or not core teachings have any impact on behavior in the first place.

Gunnell, John G. "American Political Science, Liberalism, and the Invention of Political

   Theory." *The American Political Science Review* 82 (1988) 71-87. This study

   takes a look at the role of political theory in an education in political science.

   Moreover, it speaks to the impact of political theory on the rest of the field. This

   article may help to explain the influence of political theory on students' political

   science education.

Ishiyama, John, Stephen Hartlaub. "Sequential or Flexible? The Impact of Differently

   Structured Political Science Majors on the Development of Student Reasoning,"

   Political Science and Politics 36 (2003) 83-86. Delving deeper into the subject of

   curriculum, this article compares programs of study in political science

   departments in order to ascertain the differences in students' development of

   reason and critical thinking skills. What organization's model works best to foster

   the development of critical thinking skills? This article presents different options

   for the creation of a political science major and then compares those systems.

Katznelson & Milner, editors *Political Science: State of the Discipline* (Norton, 2002)

Lawler, Peter A., "A Message to Political Educators," *Peabody Journal of Education* 59
   (1981) 43-45. This piece explores the issue of "self-evident truths" and the notion
   that the education of young people in America should contribute to a patriotic
   citizenry. It challenges the idea and suggests a level of ethnocentrism inherent in
   the American education system. Lichbach, *Is Rational Choice Theory All of
   Social Science?* (University of Michigan,

    2003)

McCormick, John P. **"**Political Science and Political Philosophy: Return to the Classics.

   No, Not Those!**"** *PS: Political Science and Politics 33 (2000) 194-197. This*

   article offers an insight into why exactly the classics have been essentially

abandoned in graduate political science education and what, in turn, should be done to remedy the problem. McCormick offers a realistic and unapologetic review of the current state of political science education that he sees as lacking a foundational underpinning.

Mickelson, John M., "What Does Research Say About the Effectiveness of the Core Curriculum?" *School Review* 65 (1957):144-160. This article discusses the general effectiveness of the core curriculum in education. Regardless of the subject matter, is a core curriculum helpful? Mickelson defines what exactly is meant by core and addresses what he saw in 1957 as a shift toward curriculum-based education.

Norton, *Theses on Politics, Culture, and Method* (Yale, 2004)

Ostrom, Elinor, "Converting Threats into Opportunities," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(1), (2006): 3-12. This article documents four possible threats to the discipline of political science as well as the broader umbrella of social sciences: "the excessive energy devoted to factional fights," "the counterproductive search for universal laws of human behavior," "The validity (or, for some, the morality) of using rational choice models of individual choice," and "*The tendency to focus on one level of government and to ignore other disciplines" (p. 3-4).*

Wahlke, John C., "The Political Science Course Syllabi Project: Selections from the Editors' Introductions to Five Introductory Course Collections," *Political Science and Politics* 25 (1992): 541-545. Wahlke's piece speaks to the impact of course syllabi on students' first impressions of classes. Further, the text selections and format of the class can in influence the students' overall impression of the discipline. This effect is specifically noted in relation to undergraduate introductions to political science.

Works Cited

American Political Science Association, Institutions that Grant Ph.D.s in Political Science: Ph.D. Granting Institutions in the Field of Political Science, http://www.apsanet.org/content_6947.cfm

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Catholic University of America, http://politics.cua.edu/courses/courses.cfm

Ceaser, James W. *Nature and History in American Political Development.* Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Dewey, John. *My Pedagogic Creed.* Chicago: A. Flanagan Company, 1910

Duke University http://fds.duke.edu/db/aas/PoliticalScience/gradcourses.html

Easton, David and J.G. Gunnell. *The Development of Political Science*, New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1990.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Atlantic, 1963.

Freire, Paolo. *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1990

Gramsci, Antonio. *The Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

Hayek, Friedrich A. von. *The Counter-Revolution of Science: Studies in the Abuse of Reason*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952.

Hegel, G.W.F. *Phenomenology of the Mind*, trans. J.B. Baillie, New York: Humanities Press, 1977.

Ira Shor, *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Ishiyama, John and Stephen Hartlaub. "Sequential or Flexible? The Impact of Differently Structured Political Science Majors on the Development of Student Reasoning," *Political Science and Politics* 36 (2003) 83-86.

Kant, Emmanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Norman Kemp Smith. New York: Modern library, 1958.

Kierkegaard, Søren. *Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Fragments*, edited and trans. Howard V. Hong. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Manitoba Department of Education*, WBC E-Learning Glossary*, (Manitoba, Canada), http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/dl/wbc/wbcgloss.html

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *Das Kapital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Washington, D.C: Regnery Publishing, 2000

Michigan State University, http://www.reg.msu.edu/Courses/Request.asp

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*, trans. Walter Kaufman. New York: Random House, 1967.

Northern Arizona University, http://www4.nau.edu/academiccatalog/2007/courses/P/PoliSciGradCourses.htm

Plato. *Meno*, trans. Benjamin Jowett, The Internet Classics Archive, Daniel C. Stevenson, http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/meno.html

—. *Theaetetus*, trans. Benjamin Jowett. BiblioBazaar, 2008 http://books.google.com/books?id=MJlHlKE21AsC&dq=Theaetetus&printsec=fr

ontcover&source=bn&hl=en&ei=r5HBSYnIDYqmsQPYlzkBg&sa=X&oi=book_
        result&resnum=4&ct=result#PPA2,M1

—. *The Dialogues of Plato: Euthyphro*, trans. Benjamin Jowett, New York: Prometheus
        Books, 1988.

—. *Republic*, trans. Benjamin Jowett. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 2005.

Rickly, Rebecca J. "Glossary for Feminist Research Methodologies," English
        Department, Texas Tech University,
        www.faculty.english.ttu.edu/rickly/5320/glossary.htm

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile,* trans. Allan Bloom. United States: Basic Books, 1979.

Sedowski, Leanne and Michael Brintnall. *Trends in the Political Science Profession:
        Political Science Job Listings in APSA's eJobs 1 Listing Service,* American
        Political Science Association.
        http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/EJobsWriteUp%2012%202006.pdf

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Will to Live*. New York: Continuum, 1967.

Soanes, Catherine and A. Stevenson. *Oxford English Dictionary.*
        http://www.askoxford.com/concise_oed/postmodernism?view=uk

Strauss, Leo. *On Tyranny,* New York: Free Press, 1991.

—. *The Crisis of Our Time*. Quoted in Howard Spaeth, ed., *The Predicament of Modern
        Politics*. Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1964.

—. *What Is Political Philosophy and Other Studies.* Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.

University of Maryland, http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/courses/gvpt.htm

University of Rochester
        http://www.rochester.edu/college/psc/courses/newdescriptions.php#PSC480Johns
        on

U.S. Census Bureau. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: Education,* 2003.
        Washington, DC GPO. http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/02statab/educ.pdf

Voegelin, Eric. *Order and History: The World of the Polis.* Columbia: University of
        Missouri Press, 2000.

Weimer, Maryellen. *Learner Centered Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.

Western Michigan University,

http://catalog.wmich.edu/content.php?catoid=10&navoid=246