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WHAT EXACTLY IS “RESEARCH TRANSPARENCY” AND HOW MUCH OF IT DO WE WANT?
What is Research Transparency?

Definition: A norm whereby empirical researchers publicize how and why they reach conclusions.

≠ BELIEF IN IDEAL “REPLICABILITY”
≠ BELIEF IN “POSITIVIST SOCAL SCIENCE”
≠ BELIEF IN UNIFORM RULES FOR ALL
“History has this in common with every other science: that the historian is not allowed to claim any single piece of knowledge, except where he can justify his claim by exhibiting...the grounds upon which it is based [and] what the evidence at his disposal proves.”

-- R. G. Collingwood

*What is History?*
Why do we care about transparency NOW?

- **All Academics:** A crisis of legitimacy.

- **Political Scientists:** New trends among scholars, funders, competitors.

- **Qualitative Researchers:** A once-in-a-generation opportunity.
  
a. **Richness:** Reverse the decline in opportunities to publish detailed, subtle and extensive narratives.

b. **Rigor:** Implement the “qualitative methods revolution” and refocus debate on questionable claims.

c. **Relevance:** Engage journalists, policy analysts, public officials, scholars in more policy-relevant disciplines, even cranky bloggers, who are all now digitally transparent.

d. **Respect:** Enhance the prestige of qualitative researchers, especially younger ones, who receive diminishing respect for their empirical research skills.
Transparency as a Methodologically Neutral Ideal

“The idea is to try to give all the information to help others to judge the value of your contribution; not just the information that leads to judgment in one particular direction or another.”

-- Richard P. Feynman
“I always believed that social science was a progressive profession because it was the powerful who had the most to hide about how the world actually worked and if you could show how the world actually worked it would always have a de-masking and a subversive effect on the powerful. I don’t think that’s quite true, but it seems to me it’s not bad as a point of departure anyway.”

-- James C. Scott, Prof of Anthropology and Political Science, Yale University
What is Research Transparency in Political Science?

“Research transparency” applies to evidence-based knowledge claims. It has 3 dimensions:

• **Data Transparency:** Access to evidence.

• **Analytic Transparency:** Explication of link from evidence to descriptive/causal/interpretive claims.

• **Procedural Transparency:** Revelation of processes used to collect, generate or choose evidence, theory, and method.
WHAT DOES TRANSPARENCY MEAN FOR QUALITATIVE/INTERPRETIVE RESEARCHERS?

Principle Number One of DA-RT is autonomy: every research community sets its own rules.
What does research transparency mean for qualitative/interpretive research?

Distinct research traditions/communities can and should define transparency differently, because they have distinctive:

1. Epistemological modes of explanation
   (Qual: Typically
    a. textual evidence
    b. about few cases
    c. arrayed as “causal process observations”)

2. Practical “real-world” constraints
   (Qual: Ethics, IP, logistics, first use, journal practice)
How is the epistemology of qualitative/interpretive research distinct?

• MOST qualitative political science is narrative:
  • Intensive analysis of few “case studies”
  • Textual evidence
  • Evidence/data as “causal process observations”
What distinct “real world” research concerns face qualitative researchers?

- Ethics (Confidentiality/Human Subject)
- Intellectual Property Rights
- Potential Logistical Burden
- Rights of “First Use”
- Journal Publishing Formats and Practices
WHAT SPECIFIC QT STANDARDS HAVE BEEN PROPOSED?

HOW WELL DOES EACH BALANCE THESE VALUES?
Formats and Modes of QT: What are the options?

- CONVENTIONAL CITATION
- HYPERLINKS TO ON-LINE SOURCES
- DATA ARCHIVING (AND SOFTWARE DATABASES)
- ACTIVE CITATION (AC)
Conventional Formats: Or, what’s wrong with Political Science Today?

- The richness, rigor, reputation, and relevance of qualitative research—and the ability of qualitative scholars to have conversations with themselves—is being degraded.

A. Ever-shorter word limits (14K → 10K – 6K?)

B. Uninformative citations
  - Many (~20%) vague, no (or too many) page numbers, item unavailable;
  - Many (~15%) invalid.
  - Too costly to access in practice.

C. No analytic transparency, especially “scientific citations”

→ THE RESULT:

- Relatively little scholarly conversation about or acknowledgement of qualitative empirics…no richness, rigor, reputation, relevance…

- Any enhancement must be digital.
Data Archiving (the “Quantitative” Model) is not a Viable Default QT Standard

QT DOES NOT mean archiving your documents...

- Archiving “all” the textual evidence is myth.
- Human subject protection, IP law.
- Archiving does not provide analytic transparency.

→ Archiving cannot and should not be a default transparency format.

(It should be a voluntary option in the residual cases with a manageable amount of non-confidential, non-copyrighted evidence.)
4 Potential Formats to Promote Qualitative Transparency: What’s left?

- CONVENTIONAL CITATION
- HYPERLINKS TO ON-LINE SOURCES
- QUALITATIVE DATA ARCHIVING AND DATA DATABASES
- ACTIVE CITATION (AC):
  “Digitally enabled citations” linked to annotated source excerpts in an appendix.
WHAT EXACTLY IS “ACTIVE” (DIGITALLY ENABLED) CITATION?

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY CAN TAKE US “BACK TO THE FUTURE” → TRADITIONAL FORMATS THAT ENCOURAGE RICH QUALITATIVE NARRATIVES
Koh then rearticulated many of the complementarity-related concerns he had expressed in New York less than three months earlier. He observed that domestic aggression prosecutions “would ask the domestic courts of one country to sit in judgment upon the state acts of other countries in a manner highly unlikely to promote peace and security.”74

74. Id. Many national courts apply the act of state doctrine precisely to prevent one nation’s courts from sitting in judgment on the public acts of another nation. The act of state doctrine extends back at least as far as 1674. Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino, 376 U.S. 398, 416 (1964) (citing Blad v. Bamfield (1674) 36 Eng. Rep. 992 (Ch)). The doctrine was given clear expression by the U.S. Supreme Court in Underhill v. Hernandez, in which Chief Justice Fuller wrote for a unanimous Court:

Every sovereign state is bound to respect the independence of every other sovereign State, and the courts of one country will not sit in judgment on the acts of the government of another, done within its own territory. Redress of grievances by reason of such acts must be obtained through the means open to be availed of by sovereign powers as between themselves.

168 U.S. 250, 252 (1897). In Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino, the U.S. Supreme Court reaffirmed and applied the act of state doctrine, even though Cuba had likely violated international law. The Court noted that while the doctrine is not constitutionally required, it is rooted in separation-of-powers concerns. 376 U.S. at 423.
WHAT IS AN ACTIVE CITATION (AC)?

BODY OF ARTICLE
(Remains Unchanged)

MAIN TEXT
Contestable
Knowledge-based
Claim

CITATION
Footnote, Endnote or In-Text
WHAT IS AN ACTIVE CITATION?

BODY OF ARTICLE (Remains Unchanged)

MAIN TEXT
Contestable
Knowledge-based Claim

CITATION
Footnote, Endnote or In-Text

TRANSPARENCY APPENDIX (New)
WHAT IS AN ACTIVE CITATION?

BODY OF ARTICLE (Remains Unchanged)

MAIN TEXT
Contestable Knowledge-based Claim

CITATION
Footnote, Endnote or In-Text

TRANSPARENCY APPENDIX (New)

TRANSPARENCY APPENDIX ENTRY
1. 50-100 Word Excerpt
2. Annotation
3. Full Citation
[ 4. Optional Scan or Link to Full Source]
How does AC address Procedural Transparency?

**Issues**: Choices and robustness with regard to data selection ("cherry picking"), theory choice and specification, analytical methods, weighing conflicting evidence, etc.

- No ideal or perfect process transparency, but...
- AC provides a special first "methodological" entry in the TRAX. Length is at the author’s discretion.
Tommy Lee Jones
Rep. Thaddeus Stevens on the Thirteenth Amendment

...according to Steven Spielberg, who got it from historian Fawn Brodie (1959), who got it from popular lecturer James Scovel (1898)...

“The greatest measure of the nineteenth century was passed by corruption, aided and abetted by the purest man in America.”
In Steven Spielberg’s recent film *Lincoln*, the abolitionist Rep. Thaddeus Stevens (played by Tommy Lee Jones) returns home after the House of Representatives passed the Thirteenth Amendment (banning slavery). He utters the a striking phrase to his mulatto common-law wife, Lydia Smith, referring to Lincoln’s role in the passage of the amendment: “The greatest measure of the nineteenth century [was] passed by corruption, aided and abetted by the purest man in America.” The accuracy of this quotation has been questioned. One account, written much later, suggests that Stevens said this. Yet, if he did, it seems highly unlikely that he did so at home to his companion.

To the writer of this sketch Mr. Stevens told the story of the legislation which gave to the black man his right to vote: … [548]

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

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

During the last thirty years of his life its unwritten romance was the unselfish and tender devotion with which Stevens was attended by Lydia Smith, a mulatto, who in her youth had great beauty of person. [550]
The first published reference to Steven’s “corruption” statement appeared in 1898. James M. Scovel, a retired New Jersey politician and lawyer, quotes Stevens verbatim and links the reference to “corruption” to Lincoln’s willingness to secure support for the Thirteenth Amendment by trading votes against a direct NY to Washington railway. Is Scovel reliable on this point? On the positive side, his account contains specific details, including a story Stevens allegedly told him about the passage of the Fifteenth Amendment and an anecdote about witnessing Stevens gamble. We know Scovel and Stevens were political allies, and Stevens encouraged Scovel to run for Congress. A modest correspondence has been preserved. On the negative side, Scovel was hardly in Washington during the Lincoln Administration, and only published his recollections 33 years later, when he was making a living as a lecturer. In any case, Scovel’s account does not imply any connection between the quotation and Lydia Smith, Stevens’ common-law wife, though she is mentioned. Nor is it clear how anyone except Smith herself, who left no memoirs, would know if Stevens had said it to her alone.
Influence from the White House secured votes against a favorite measure of Mr. Stevens for an air-line railway from Washington to New York, and, as the Rialto of Congress “hath its merchandise,” these same votes helped Mr. Lincoln’s great amendment for emancipation. Of this legislative bargain Stevens said, “The greatest measure of the nineteenth century was passed by corruption, aided and abetted by the purest man in America.”

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

Data Transparency $\rightarrow$ *The text*

Analytic Transparency $\rightarrow$ *Interpretation of the text in historical context*

Process Transparency $\rightarrow$ *Selection, reliability and robustness of the text and analytic methods*
An Example: Jack Snyder

https://qdr.syr.edu/discover/projectcontentsnyder
Practical Advantages of AC as a default

- Reduces the cost of accessing relevant evidence, analysis and process information to the “one click” minimum.

- Enhances not only data access but also analytic and procedural transparency.

- Respects the basic epistemology of qualitative research.

- 50-100 word excerpts minimize constraints of intellectual property law, human subject protection, logistics, and format.

- Subsumes most of the advantages of hyperlinking and archiving.

- Can be employed in almost any form of research: unpublished or working papers, manuscripts, online or hard-copy journal articles, policy reports, and (eventually) e-books.
WHAT’S IN IT FOR QUALITATIVE/INTERPRETIVE RESEARCHERS?

A ONCE-IN-A-GENERATION OPPORTUNITY!
1\textsuperscript{st} Benefit: Fulfills our Ethical Responsibility

As scholars we have a collegial and democratic responsibility not to hide behind authority and power, but to be as transparent as we can to each other and to the public.
**2nd Benefit: Encourages Richer Scholarship (contra Isaac)**

- **Enriches narrative.**
  - “One touch” access to evidence, interpretation and process information.
  - Abolishes word limits and restores discursive footnotes.

- **Deepens scholarly conversation.**
  - Evidence, interpretation and method become public goods: those who want to discuss, teach, critique, extend, reanalyze or analogize start with more material and need make only a marginal contribution.

- **Validates interpretive social science.**
  - Political actors speak directly to readers “in their own voices.”
  - Makes explicit that scholars interpret evidence.
  - Explicitly concedes that scholars encounter and choose evidence.
3rd Benefit: Encourages Greater Rigor

• Incentivizes focus on qualitative work.
  - The so-called “multi-method” thesis.

• Incentivizes innovation and investment in qualitative techniques.
  - Local knowledge, humanistic and hermeneutic skills (e.g. linguistic ability, area studies, functional knowledge, policy expertise, historical knowledge, interpretive subtlety) (Contra Isaac)
  - “Qualitative methods” (e.g. ethnography, process-tracing, interpretive analysis, content analysis, digital techniques, field research techniques).
4\textsuperscript{th} Benefit: Encourages Greater Public and Policy Relevance (Contra Isaac)

- Converges to standards in history, law, public policy and other more policy-relevant disciplines.
  - More transparent disciplines are more policy-relevant.

- Converges to standards in journalism, government, and public discourse.

- Answers legitimacy concerns voiced by the public, politicians and funders.
5th Benefit: Enhances Reputation and Rewards of Qualitative Research

- Incentivizes innovation and investment in humanistic skills and qualitative methods.

- Facilitates broader disciplinary acceptance of qualitative merit. (contra Isaac)
  - Makes the advantages of qualitative work more explicit: the necessary precondition for any discourse and recognition of quality.
  - Appeals to explicit meta-standards we all accept.

- Empowers gatekeepers (e.g. publishing, evaluation, prizes).
  - 80-95% of political scientists use qualitative analysis.
  - Think about a journal.
The benefits may be large, but what about the costs?
Not as large as most people imagine.

- Only “contestable empirical claims” are actively cited.

- A decentralized not centralized system: like footnotes, only form not content is mandatory. Authors decide what is contestable, empirical and needs to be cited. (Contra Isaac)

- Modern technology + advance planning lighten the load.

- AC is at once a “best practice” and a conservative “back to the future” proposal → We already know we can do it.
  - Commonplace in fields like law, history, anthropology and classics.
  - Commonplace in books.
  - Commonplace in political science until recently.
  - Still approximated in best books and qualitative journals (SAPD, IS, etc.).
  - Have you ever met a qualitative scholar who didn’t want MORE words?
ments reveals that the Soviets apparently believed that Zhou's complaint about Pyongyang's intentional exclusion of Beijing from the decision process was quite justified. In an initial draft of a September 20 telegram to China on the subject, Gromyko criticized as "entirely mistaken" the North Korean leadership's reluctance to "conscientiously inform the Chinese Comrades of the military situation and all the decisions the Korean commanders and political leadership made regarding issues arising in the course of military operations." In this initial draft Gromyko wrote that he believed that Kim Il-sung himself "must correct this point." Gromyko did not, however, transmit this draft to Beijing. The telegram that was actually sent was quite different and was almost certainly geared toward manipulation of the alliance to minimize China's anger at Pyongyang and to maximize the chance that Beijing would still come to its defense if and when needed. In the revised telegram the situation is described more neutrally as "not right" (or "abnormal") but then is quickly explained away by reference to the "weak links" that the central command in North Korea has with its front lines. Gromyko says this situation arose because of technical difficulties not because the "Korean Comrades are unwilling" to share information with the Chinese.  

---

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

- Funding from NSF, SSRC, APSA, IQMR ISPR,
- 5 years of articles/workshops/papers/journal special Issues on conceptual and practical issues
- Established a Qualitative Data Repository (QDR)
- Created NSF/QDR On-line Demonstration Portal: 20+ scholars retrofitting “classic” and forthcoming research
- Developed Training Materials and Sessions at summer institutes and universities
- Revised APSA and QDR Guidelines (Quant and Qual)
- Interdisciplinary cooperation (SSRC, BITSS, etc.)
- Designed New Software
ACE Word Add-in

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

Active Citation Editor

Annotation:

Source Summary:

Full Citation:

Add Source File Add Source URL
Qualitative Transparency: It is happening NOW!

- Sponsored Articles/Workshops/Special Issues on Conceptual and Practical Issues (Funding from IQMR, NSF, APSA, ISPR)
- Developed Active Citation (AC)
- Established a Qualitative Data Repository (QDR)
- Developed Training Materials and Sessions at summer institutes and universities
- Revised APSA Norms and Guidelines (Quant and Qual)
- Created NSF/QDR On-line Demonstration Portal: 20+ scholars retrofitting “classic” and forthcoming research to AC (e.g. Snyder, Saunders, Boix)
- Designed New Software
- **25 journals have signed on to a qual/quant transparency package that mentions AC, to be implemented in 2016.**
25 Journals have adopted (Oct 2014 – Feb 2016)

- American Political Science Review
- American Journal of Political Science
- Journal of Conflict Resolution
- Comparative Political Studies
- International Security
- Political Analysis
- Research and Politics
- State Politics and Policy Quarterly
- Political Science Research and Methods
- Journal of Theoretical Politics
- Quarterly Journal of Political Science
- Political Behavior
- The Political Methodologist
- Italian Political Science Review / Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica
- Journal of Peace Research
- European Union Politics
- International Interactions
- British Journal of Political Science
- Security Studies
- The Journal of Politics
- European Political Science
- Party Politics
- Cooperation and Conflict
- Conflict Management and Peace Science
- European Journal of Political Research
- Journal of European Public Policy
Best Practices: Natural Science

Example: When did Polar Bears Evolve?

Article

Supplementary Materials
Best Practices: Policy Analysis

UN Secret Detention Report (Part One): The CIA’s “High-Value Detainee” Program and Secret Prisons

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

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

Given the length of this section of the report (pp. 43-59), I’m publishing it in three parts. The first, published below, provides an introduction, and deals with “The ‘high-value detainee’ programme and CIA secret detention facilities,” the second looks at “CIA detention facilities or facilities operated jointly with United States military in battlefield zones,” and the third looks at “Proxy detention sites,” “Complicity in the practice of secret detention” and “Secret detention and the Obama administration.”

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

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

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

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

98. In spite of the prominent role played by the United States of America in the development of international human rights and humanitarian law, and its position as a global leader in the protection of human rights at home and abroad following the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. on 11 September 2001, the United States embarked on a process of reducing and removing various human rights and other protection mechanisms through various laws and administrative acts, including the Authorization for Use of Military Force, the USA Patriot Act of 2001, the Detainees Treatment Act of 2005, the Military Commissions Act of 2006 (which sought to remove habeas corpus rights), as well as various executive orders and memoranda issued by the Office of Legal Counsel that interpreted the position of the United States on a number of issues, including torture. It also sanctioned the establishment of various classified programmes much more narrowly than before [A/HRC/6/1/Add.3, para. 3].

99. The Government of the United States declared a global “war on terror,” in which individuals captured around the world were to be held not merely as criminal suspects, put forward for federal court trials in the United States, nor treated as prisoners of war protected by the Geneva Conventions, irrespective of whether they had been captured on the battlefield during what could be qualified as an armed conflict in terms of international humanitarian law. Rather, they were to be treated indiscriminately as “unlawful enemy combatants” who could be held indefinitely without charge or trial or the possibility to challenge the legality of their detention before a court or other judicial authority.

100. On 7 February 2002, the President of the United States issued a memorandum [PDF] declaring that “common article 3 of Geneva does not apply to either Al-Qaida or Taliban detainees”, that “Taliban detainees are unlawful combatants and, therefore, do not qualify as prisoners of war under article 4 of Geneva”, and that “because Geneva does not apply to our conflict with Al-Qaida, Al-Qaida detainees also do not qualify as prisoners of war.” This unprecedented departure from the Geneva Conventions was to be offset by a promise that “as a matter of policy, the United States Armed Forces shall continue to treat detainees humanely and, to the extent appropriate and consistent with military necessity, in a manner consistent with the principles of Geneva.” This detention policy was defended by the Government in various submissions to the United Nations [See for example CCPR/C/USA/CO/3/Rev.1/Add.1, p. 2; A/HRC/4/41, paras. 453 - 455, and A/HRC/4/40, para. 12], including on 10 October 2007, when the Government stated that the law of war, and not the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, was the applicable legal framework governing the detentions of “enemy combatants” [CCPR/C/USA/CO/3/Rev.1/Add.1, p. 3], and
“I think the web's norms of linking to sources are becoming the world's norms. And the more transparent we are, the more trustworthy we will be.”

-- Brian Seltzer, CNN Reliable Sources
JUNE 5, 2014

G.M. Inquiry Cites Years of Neglect Over Fatal Defect

By BILL VLASIC

General Motors Chief Executive Officer Mary T. Barra with Executive Vice President Mark Reuss, right, and President Dan Ammann during a news conference on Thursday in Warren, Mich. CreditFabrizio Costantini for The New York Times

WARREN, Mich. — A sweeping internal investigation of General Motors released on Thursday condemned the company for its decade-long failure to fix a deadly safety defect, one that led to “devastating consequences,” including at least 13 deaths.

The report, written by the former United States attorney Anton R. Valukas, set off the dismissal of 15 G.M. employees, including a vice president for regulatory affairs and a senior lawyer responsible for product liability cases, and forced broad changes in how the company handles vehicle safety.

...
The results of an investigation overseen by Anton R. Valukas, a former United States attorney, into the company’s handling of a defective ignition switch. 

JUNE 5, 2014

RELATED ARTICLE

REPORT TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GENERAL MOTORS COMPANY REGARDING IGNITION SWITCH RECALLS

May 29, 2014

Anton R. Valukas
JENNER & BLOCK

Priveleged and Confidential
Protected by Attorney-Client Privilege and as Attorney-Work Product

By Dan Hopkins  June 16, 2013

Poli-Sci Perspective is a weekly Wonkblog feature in which Georgetown University’s Dan Hopkins and George Washington University’s Danny Hayes and John Sides offer an empirical perspective on the issues dominating Washington. In this edition, Hopkins looks at the relationship between Republican opposition to immigration and the party’s troubles with Latino voters. For past posts in the series, head here.

Pundits left and right have embraced the notion that the Republican Party has a strong political interest in
Government Reports

(even Classified Intelligence Estimates and Briefings)
Materials available at the QDR: https://qdr.syr.edu/

and the APSA DA-RT: http://www.dartstatement.org/

Materials from this lecture available at:
www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs
under “DATA AND METHODS”
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