

**Norwegian Graduate School in History
Course in Theory and Methods 2019**

	Monday 4th March 2019	Tuesday 5th March 2019	Wednesday 6th March 2019	Thursday 7th March 2019
9:15-10	Welcome, presentations and information	3. «Writing Methodology» by Gram-Skjoldager	Essay seminar 6a: Sandmo 6b: Skålevåg	Essay seminar 9a: Brautaset 9b:
10:15-11	1. «How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love Theory» by Toufoul Abou-Hodeib , UiO.	Essay seminar 3a: Gram-Skjoldager 3b: Teige	6. “Making space: maps as a source in historical research” by Erling Sandmo of the Norwegian National Library and UiO	8. «Numbers in history. History in Numbers» by Camilla Brautaset , UiB.
11:15-12		Essay seminar 4a: Toufoul 4b: Teige		
12:00-13:15	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
13:15-14	Essay seminar 1a: Toufoul 1b: Gram-Skjoldager	4. « The study of informal relations and networks, and how this may help in integrating micro- and macro-level approaches” by Ola Teige , Volda University College	Essay seminar 7a: Sandmo 7b: Skålevåg	Essay seminar 10a: Brautaset 10b:
14:15-15	Essay seminar 2a: Toufoul 2b: Gram-Skjoldager		Essay seminar 8a: Sandmo 8b: Brautaset	9. «A human right to history? Multi-perspectivity/multivoice in historical research, teaching and memorialization processes»: by Hanne Hagtvedt Vik , UiO
15:15-16	2. “New Approaches and Methods in International History: Examples from Ongoing Research on International Bureaucracy” by Karen Gram-Skjoldager , University of Aarhus.	Essay seminar 5a: Teige 5b: Skålevåg	7. «Right to privacy and protection of personal information in historical research» Introduction by Svein Atle Skålevåg , UiB, and Vidar Enebakk , NESH, followed by roundtable discussion with Sunniva Engh and Hanne Hagtvedt Vik (Chair)	
16:15-17		5. «The Epistemology of History» by Svein Atle Skålevåg , University of Bergen	Concluding session	
	Dinner at restaurant 18:00		Tapas at UiO 17:00	

In order of appearance:

« **How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love Theory** » by [Toufoul Abou-Hodeib](#), UiO
What is historical theory? How is it different from a theory or philosophy of history? And who needs theory when the facts can speak for themselves? Focusing specifically on social theory, this lecture looks at what role theory plays in history writing and research. Looking beyond what is regarded in the discipline as the empiricism/theory dichotomy, the lecture re-familiarizes the idea of theory by looking at some of the theories and concepts commonly taken for granted by historians. It further looks at how such assumptions influence both the selection and interpretation of facts. On the other side of this issue, several questions then arise: how does one link facts to theory without subordinating the former to the latter? What constitutes the starting point for thinking theoretically about one's own work? And what relationship do sources, concepts, and theories have to each other? The lecture addresses these questions by looking at a text that crosses the disciplinary boundaries of history and the social sciences (Mitchell). The lecture concludes by looking at some of the methodological implications historical theory has for understanding the formation of an archive and for archival research.

Required reading:

- Sewell Jr., William H. "Theory, History, and Social Science." In *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*, 1-21. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005.
- Mitchell, Timothy. "Can the Mosquito Speak?" In *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*, 19-53. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2002.
- Bailkin, Jordanna. "Where Did the Empire Go? Archives and Decolonization in Britain." *The American Historical Review* 120 (2015): 884-899.
<https://academic.oup.com/ahr/article/120/3/884/19860>

Suggested readings:

- Burke, Peter. *History and Social Theory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Postcolonial Studies and the Challenge of Climate Change." *New Literary History* 43 (2012): 1-18.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Fulbrook, Mary. *Historical Theory*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Gunn, Simon. *History and Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Jordanova, Ludmilla. "What's In a Name? Historians and Theory." Review article in *English Historical Review* 126 (2011): 1456-1477.
- Klein, Kerwin Lee. *From History to Theory*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2011.
- Mahmood, Saba. "Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some Reflection on the Egyptian Islamic Revival." *Cultural Anthropology* 16 (2001): 202-236.
- Mitchell, Timothy. "Carbon Democracy." *Economy and Society* 38 (2009): 399-432.
- Partner, Nancy and Sarah Foot, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Historical Theory*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2013.
- Petersen, Richard A. "Why 1955? Explaining the Advent of Rock Music." *Popular Music* 9 (1990): 97-116.
- Sewell Jr., William H. *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

“New Approaches and Methods in International History: Examples from Ongoing Research on International Bureaucracy” by [Karen Gram-Skjoldager](#), University of Aarhus. PhD students are not the only ones struggling with how to select, read and work new theoretical and historiographical approaches into their research. Using my current research project ‘The Invention of International Bureaucracy. The League of Nations and the Creation of International Public Administration, 1920-c.1960’ as a starting point, I will try to show you how we can engage with new historiographical and theoretical trends to strengthen and develop our research. Particular focus will be placed on how we convert general historiographical and theoretical arguments and concepts into concrete historical analysis. This is a dynamic – and sometimes messy – process in which we continuously have to revisit and adjust our research questions, analytical concepts and source materials in order to create a coherent and convincing piece of research. We will talk about how we can embrace this untidy process without losing our sense of direction.

Mandatory reading:

Patrick Finney: “Introduction: What is International History?”, in: Patrick Finney (ed.): *Palgrave Advances in International History*, 2005, pp.1-35

Karen Gram-Skjoldager and Haakon Ikononou: *The League of Nations – Perspectives from the Present*, Aarhus University Press 2019 (forthcoming, draft), excerpt

Recommended reading:

Jérémie Cornut, “The Practice Turn in International Relations Theory”, *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*, 2015

(<http://internationalstudies.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-113>) DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.113

John Lewis Gaddis: “History, Theory and Common Ground”, *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 1, Summer 1997, pp.75-85.

C.A. Bayly, Sven Beckert, Matthew Connelly, Isabel Hofmeyr, Wendy Kozol, and Patricia Seed: “AHR Conversation: On Transnational History”, *American Historical Review*, vol. 111, 2006, pp. 1440-64

Pierre-Yves Saunier: ‘Transnational’, entry in: Pierre-Yves Saunier and Akira Iriye (eds.): *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History. From the mid-19th Century to the Present Day*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, pp. 1047-1055.

Joe Maiolo, “Systems and Bondaries in International History” *International History Review* Vol 40, Issue 3 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2016.1217554>

David Reynolds, “International History, the Cultural Turn and the Diplomatic Twitch” *Cultural and Social History* Vol 3 Issue 1 2006, pp. 75-91.

<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478003806cs053xx>

«Writing Methodology» by Gram-Skjoldager

A good dissertations includes a strong methods section that transforms the theoretical and historiographical assumptions and insights on which your thinking and writing is based into a concrete research design that also includes reflections on how the materials for your analysis have been selected and approached. In this seminar, we will discuss how you can build that bridge from theory to get-your-hands-dirty historical analysis. Based on a lecture that offers some (hopefully) useful tips and tricks for writing methodology, we will examine three examples of dissertation methods sections and use them as a starting point for discussing your research methods and how you present them in writing. *In the reading response for this seminar, I would like you to pick the dissertation excerpt that is closest to your dissertation (either in terms of topic or approach), read it, and reflect on three useful take-aways from this for your own methods chapter.*

Mandatory reading:

<https://patthomson.net/2013/01/10/a-little-worry-about-methods-assignments/>

<https://patthomson.net/2013/01/24/the-methods-chapter-as-a-party/>

<https://patthomson.net/2013/02/18/methodology-isnt-methods-or-what-goes-in-a-methods-chapter/>

<https://patthomson.net/2014/08/14/the-audit-trail-a-too-common-omission-in-methods-chapters/>

Dissertation excerpts:

Byron Rom-Jensen: *The Scandinavian Legacy. Nordic Policies as Images and Models in the United States*. PhD Dissertation, Aarhus University

Helle Strandgaard Jensen: *Defining the (In)appropriate. Scandinavian debates about the role of media in children's lives, 1950-1985*, PhD Dissertation, European University Institute 2013

Hanne Østhus: *Contested authority. Master and servant in Copenhagen and Christiania, 1750-1850*, PhD Dissertation, European University Institute 2013

Recommended reading:

Howard S. Becker: *Tricks of the Trade. How to Think about Your Research While You're Doing It*, University of Chicago Press 1998

Wayne C. Booth et al.: *The Craft of Research*, 4th edition, 2016

«The study of informal relations and networks, and how this may help in integrating micro- and macro-level approaches» by [Ola Teige](#), Volda University College

Historical network analysis – the study of informal social relations - is an approach that exists somewhere in the intersection of social history, political history and cultural history, and is originally inspired by sociology. All historians that look at societies and communities and how historical actors interact, as well as themes as politics, elites, local, national or international organizations etc., will at one point, implicitly or explicitly, have to perform some sort of network analysis or at least try to understand how informal social relations between their actors helped shape their object of study. It is rarely enough to understand their hierarchical and formal relations. In many cases informal relations as friendship, patron-client ties and the like, is key to understand a phenomenon, in other they form good supplement to information found in official sources. Explicit network analysis can thereby shed light on traits of past societies that often have been under-communicated in older historiography.

Historians use network analysis to collect data for comparisons, as well as highlight informal relations, and thereby give a clearer and fuller picture of the social life and power dynamics of organizations and actors. The approach may enable us to integrate micro- and macro-level studies as the social ties and individual interaction on the micro level can reveal how larger social structures were created, reproduced, changed, and how they played out in the relationships over time. The most important questions that we will discuss are: How can historians study informal relations? Do we use a quantitative approach as found in the sociological studies that inspired the use of the method also in history? Is there also room for more qualitative oriented approaches? What types of informal relations can we say exists, and which aspects can we ascribe them?

Mandatory reading:

Ganovetter, Mark S., [“The Strength of Weak Ties”](#) *The American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 78, No. 6. (May, 1973), pp. 1360-1380.

Wetherell, Charles, “Historical Social Network Analysis”, *International Review of Social History* 43 (1998), 125-144.

Fuchs, Eckhardt, [“Networks and the History of Education”](#), *Pedagogica Historica*, 43:2 (2007), 185-197.

Recommended reading:

Teige, Ola, "Friends, Brokers, and the King: A Norwegian Merchant's Informal Political Network in Copenhagen in the Early Eighteenth Century" in *Friendship and Social Networks in Scandinavia, c. 1000-1800* by Jón Vidar Sigurdsson and Thomas Småberg (eds).

«**The Epistemology of History**» by [Svein Atle Skålevåg, of the University of Bergen](#)

What kind of knowledge does history provide? Does it provide knowledge of a specific object, i.e. History? Or does it rather provide knowledge distinguished by being acquired in a specific manner, or following a specific methodology? Or does it study objects in a certain perspective (i.e. how object are situated in a specific time)? The historicist answer to these questions was that history was the scientific study of History, and that it was characterised by a certain method, source criticism. This constituted the epistemology of history in the late 19th and early 20th century. The assumption that there is such thing as History was challenged openly in the second half of the 20th century. Though it lingers on as a regulatory idea, few will today defend the idea of history as an epistemic object. But it remains debatable what kind of discipline history is after historicism. In this seminar we will study one seminal thinker in the assault on historicism, Michel Foucault, whose introductory pages to *Archaeology of knowledge* addresses the state of history. This will be contrasted to one major Scandinavian representative of historicism, Kristian Erslev. We will discuss these to texts, and the discussion will be supported by one of the more original interpreters of Foucault as a historian, French historian Paul Veyne.

Required reading:

Michel Foucault "The archaeology of knowledge", *Introduction* (pp3 – 17) 1969/1972.
[Kristian Erslev "Historieskrivning. Grundlinier til nogle kapitler af historiens teori» Kjøbenhavn 1911.](#)

Additional reading:

Paul Veyne: "Foucault revolutionizes history." In Arnold Davidson et al *Foucault and his interlocutors* (1997)

«**Making space: maps as a source in historical research**» by Erling Sandmo of the Norwegian National Library and UiO

Maps are immediately recognized as representations of the real, but they are also obviously contested sites, where world views, imperial gazes and assemblages of local knowledges are merged and hidden. The study of maps may therefore open interesting perspectives on histories of power, knowledge, and science. They may also serve as intakes to a discussion of historical ontology: mapping has always been about the representation of the real – but reality is historical, and the ontology of space is closely intertwined with the ontology of time, our domain as historians. Using examples from the history of cartography, this seminar will zoom in on specific maps and their possible interpretations and importance as intakes to basic categories of knowledge. It will also bring up a series of recent historiographical "turns": material, visual and spatial.

Mandatory reading:

J.B. Harley, Maps, Knowledge, and Power, in Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography* (Baltimore, 2001), pp. 51-81
Michel Foucault, *Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias* (1967/1984)
<http://web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1.pdf>

Recommended reading:

David Turnbull, Cartography and Science in Early Modern Europe: Mapping the Construction of Knowledge Spaces, *Imago Mundi* 48 (1996), pp. 5-24
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1151257.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Ab52d789b5318b7ba28f991e58158778a>

Seminar «Right to privacy and protection of personal information in historical research – law, ethics and history»

When can – and should – we identify individuals with their real names? And what can – and should – we reveal about them? This seminar will discuss the legal, ethical and practical sides to issue of the right to privacy and protection of personal information in historical research. This includes contemporary as well as earlier periods, which poses similar but also very different problems for the historian (and his/her institutions). The seminar will open with an ethical dilemma associated with the place of the patient in the history of medicine. The dilemma is not exclusive to, but maybe most acute when it comes to the history of psychiatry: Should the patient be named, and therefore acknowledged as an agent in this history, or should she be protected from unwanted attention by a veil of anonymity. Then we will move to the 2018 introduction of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the EU/EEA which brought changes on how personal data may be processed and stored. How do these and various implementation mechanisms in Norway changes affect us as historians? The seminar will have two group sessions: one on general professional ethical concerns; the second on how recent legal changes affect the projects each of you work on.

Introduction by [Svein Atle Skålevåg](#) and [Vidar Enebakk](#), NESH, followed by groups discussions and then roundtable discussion with [Sunniva Engh](#), and Hanne Hagtvedt Vik (Chair)

Mandatory reading:

Birkeland, Annette og Vidar Enebakk, «[Personvern og akademisk yringsfrihet: Om unntaket for akademiske ytringer i EUs personvernforordning](#)», *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 01/2018 (vol 35), 44-58.

<https://www.etikkom.no/FBIB/Temaer/Personvern-og-ansvar-for-den-enkelte/Personvern/>
<https://www.etikkom.no/forskningsetiske-retningslinjer/Samfunnsvitenskap-jus-og-humaniora/>

Recommended:

<http://blog.fullfabric.com/the-impact-of-the-gdpr-in-academic-research-a-talk-by-dr.-david-erdos>

Seminar: «Numbers in history. History in Numbers» by [Camilla Brautaset](#), UiB.

When, where and why did quantification and statistical thinking become a widespread practice? How has quantitative sources, theories and methodologies influenced history as a discipline in general, and economic history in particular? In this seminar we will discuss numbers and history. We will discuss quantification as a practice and the rise of statistical thinking in the 19th century, but emphasis will be placed on the deployment of statistical sources and approaches in history writing in general and in economic history in particular in the 1960s and 1970s. What has happened to quantitative history writing since? Underpinning this discussion is the larger question if and if so, how, sources and methodology define disciplines?

Mandatory reading:

François Furet, Quantitative History, Daedalus, Vol. 100, No. 1, Historical Studies Today (Winter, 1971), pp. 151-167.

Robert Whaples, A Quantitative History of the Journal of Economic History and the Cliometric Revolution, The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Jun., 1991), pp. 289-301.

Anders Nikolai Kiær, Om menneskets økonomiske værd, Statsøkonomisk tidsskrift, 1892 (6): 19–42.

Recommended reading:

Donald N. McCloskey, The Achievements of the Cliometric School, The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 38, No. 1, The Tasks of Economic History (Mar., 1978), pp. 13-28

Andrew Ruttan, But It Will Never Be Science, Either, The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 40, No. 1, The Tasks of Economic History (Mar., 1980), pp. 137-142

Theodore Porter: Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life (1995).

Stanley N. Katz, Do Disciplines Matter? History and the Social Sciences, Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 76, No. 4 (December 1995), pp. 863-877.

Claudia Goldin, The Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Spring, 1995), pp. 191-208.

K. T. Rammohan , Economic History as Human Science, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 40, No. 26 (Jun. 25 - Jul. 1, 2005), pp. 2859- 2863.

David B. Ryden, Perhaps We Can Talk: Discussant Comments for "Taking Stock and Moving Ahead: The Past, Present, and Future of Economics for History", Social Science History, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Summer 2011), pp. 209-212

«A human right to history? Multiperspectivity/multivoice in historical research, teaching and memorialization processes» by [Hanne Hagtvedt Vik](#), UiO

Travelling the world in her capacity as United Nations Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed frequently witnessed intense disagreement over events in the past. Although history is one of the few mandatory curriculum subjects in education systems the world over, Shaheed's work nevertheless convinced her that, in most societies, people cannot access historical narratives and cultural heritage in a way that fosters critical thinking and the understanding of alternative realities and perspectives. Shaheed's principal objective in the field of historical research, teaching and memorialization processes was the advancement of 'multi-voiced narratives' of the past. This seminar discuss the two reports she produced in 2013 and 2014 to assess the significance of these international-level activities for the work of historians in Norway and beyond.

Mandatory reading:

UNGA A/HRC/68/296 9 August 2013 Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed, on the writing and teaching of history.

UNGA A/HRC/25/49 23 January 2014 Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed, "Memorialization processes"