

Foundation Scholarship Examinations 2023-24

**Examination Papers set by Trinity College Dublin's Political
Science Department**

Guidance for Students

Introduction

The Foundation Scholarship examinations provided by the Political Science department have changed in 2020-21 due to the curriculum changes resulting from the Trinity Education Project (TEP). These changes resulted in political science offering **five** examinations, in place of the two examinations that were offered in 2016-17 through 2019-20. These differences have been retained this year.

The number and combination of papers that you should take depends on your programme plus the pathway that you are taking. There are mandatory papers for different programmes and pathways plus optional choices. The details can be found in the following table.

Paper description							
Paper 1: Political Science General Paper 1							
Paper 2: Political Science General Paper 2							
Paper 3: Political Science History of Political Thought Paper							
Paper 4: Political Science Comparative Politics Paper							
Paper 5: Political Science International Relations Paper							
Credit Profile in Political Science in Senior Fresh	No. of SF credits taken in Political Science by end of Semester 1	Number of papers taken in Political Science	Papers to be taken (M= mandatory, O= optional)				
			Paper 1	Paper 2	Paper 3	Paper 4	Paper 5
40 SF credits (20 by end Sem 1)	20	3	M		O	O	O
JF credits only	n/a	1		M			
40 SF credits (20 by end Sem 1)	20	2	M		O	O	O
20 SF credits (10 by end Sem 1)	10	2	M		O	O	O
20 SF credits (10 by end Sem 1)	10	1	M				

Please note that the Political Science Department **cannot** provide you with any guidance on what examinations you should take beyond the information provided in this table.

Each examination is timed at two hours fifteen minutes. Please note that no special tutorials will be provided by academic staff relating to any of these examinations. Sample questions for each examination can be found below.

Some “Frequently Asked Questions” are also answered on the Academic Registry’s website here: <https://www.tcd.ie/academicregistry/exams/scholarship/>.

We wish all students good luck with the Foundation Scholarship examinations.

POLITICAL SCIENCE 1

The examination “**Political Science 1**” requires students to write an essay on a topic related to one of the broad areas of political science covered in Senior Fresh (SF) modules—international relations, comparative politics, or history of political thought—but addressing materials that are outside the Michaelmas Term SF module syllabi. The topics can be found below, along with an additional reading list covering each topic. Students will therefore focus on one of these topics in advance and write one essay on that topic in a two-and-a-quarter-hour examination. The exam will contain only one essay question for each of the three topics for which reading lists have been provided. Students may, at their discretion, prepare more than one topic in advance, but they will answer only one essay question in the examination. To repeat: students must answer one question for this examination—the international relations question, the comparative politics question, or the history of political thought question—and not more than one.

When writing essays for “Political Science 1”, students are expected to know relevant materials and concepts from the related SF modules, but they must demonstrate engagement with, and mastery of, the materials contained on these additional reading lists. Similarly, students may choose to do additional reading, beyond the materials contained in the provided reading lists, on these political science topics, but, again, students are expected primarily and above all to demonstrate engagement with and mastery of the materials contained on these reading lists. There is no requirement to do any additional outside readings and indeed these reading lists are already extensive and demanding. Indeed, given that these reading lists are extensive, students may wish to select and prioritize their readings from among the readings set out. If a student wishes to refer to additional readings outside these reading lists (or materials contained on module syllabuses), the student is recommended to provide a reference, indicating author, title, and year of publication if possible.

Reading lists for these topics this year are contained in this document, as well as sample questions. Students, however, are advised to prepare broadly for a variety of possible questions addressing this material.

Readings for these topics will be made available online—through the library, through the Blackboard pages of the relevant modules, or through other means.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Dr Nikita Khokhlov

Topic: **War in the twenty-first century**

In 2022, war has again become a major topic of news and discussion among academics and politicians around the world. Despite globalization and increased connectivity between countries, the 21st century does not look any more peaceful than previous eras. Collective security is under threat, in particular from authoritarian countries that are increasingly resorting to military force to expand their spheres of influence. International Relations literature engages in the analysis of modern war, applying the 'grand IR theories, developed in the context of the World War I, World War II and the Cold War, as well as proposing the new explanations. The question will deal with the development of the IR theories regarding the causes and nature of wars in the 21st century with a particular focus on the readings below.

Readings:

Braumoeller, Bear F. 2008. "Systemic Politics and the Origins of Great Power Conflict." *The American Political Science Review* 102(1): 77–93.

Brooks, Stephen G. *Producing security: Multinational corporations, globalization, and the changing calculus of conflict*. Princeton University Press, 2005.

Chadefaux, T. (2011). Bargaining over power: when do shifts in power lead to war?. *International Theory*, 3(2), 228-253.

Copeland, Dale C. *The Origins of Major War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000)

Doyle, Michael W. "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80, no. 4 (December 1986): 1151–69.

Fazal, Tanisha M. "Dead wrong?: Battle deaths, military medicine, and exaggerated reports of war's demise." *International Security* 39, no. 1 (2014): 95-125.

Fearon, James D. "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization* 49 (Summer 1995): 379–414.

Goertz, Gary, Paul Francis Diehl, and Alexandru Balas. *The puzzle of peace: The evolution of peace in the international system*. Oxford University Press, 2016.

Gomza, Ivan. 2022. "The War in Ukraine: Putin's Inevitable Invasion." *Journal of Democracy* 33(3): 23–30.

Hegre, Håvard, John R. Oneal, and Bruce Russett. "Trade does promote peace: New simultaneous estimates of the reciprocal effects of trade and conflict." *Journal of Peace Research* 47, no. 6 (2010): 763-774.

Hom, Andrew R, and Luke Campbell. 2022. "Wartime in the 21st Century." *International Relations* 36(4): 525–46.

Ivan, A. T. (2001). *How the weak win wars: A theory of asymmetric conflict*. *International Security*, 26(1), 93-128.

Leeds, Brett Ashley, and Burcu Savun. "Terminating Alliances: Why Do States Abrogate Agreements?" *Journal of Politics* 69 (2007): 1118–32.

Levy, Jack S. 1998. "The causes of war and the conditions of peace". *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 139- 165.

Lieber, Keir A. "Grasping the technological peace: The offense-defense balance and international security." *International Security* 25, no. 1 (2000): 71-104.

Lopez, Anthony C. and Johnson, Dominic D.P. 2020. "The determinants of war in international relations". *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 178: 983-997.

Lyall, Jason. 2020. *Divided Armies: Inequality and Battlefield Performance in Modern War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

McDonald, Patrick J. 2015. "Great Powers, Hierarchy, and Endogenous Regimes: Rethinking the Domestic Causes of Peace." *International Organization* 69(3): 557–88.

Powell, R. (2006). War as a commitment problem. *International organization*, 60(1), 169-203.

Reiter, D. (2003). Exploring the bargaining model of war. *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(1), 27-43.

Snyder, Jack, and Erica D. Borghard. "The cost of empty threats: A penny, not a pound." *American Political Science Review* 105, no. 3 (2011): 437-456.

Van Evera, Stephen. "The cult of the offensive and the origins of the First World War." *International security* (1984): 58-107.

Van Evera, Stephen. *Causes of War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Voeten, Erik. "The Political Origins of the UN Security Council's Ability to Legitimize the Use of Force." *International Organization* 59 (Summer 2005): 527–57.

Weeks, Jessica L. P. *Dictators at War and Peace*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014.

Sample Question:

Are the wars of the 21st century different from the wars of the past? Why/why not? In your answer, rely on the international relations theories and at least one empirical example of the 21st century war and one example of the war of the past.

HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Prof Peter Stone

Topic: **Authoritarian Deliberation**

As the experience of the Athenian democracy demonstrates, there is a close relationship between deliberation and democracy. Deliberation, however, need not be democratic. In the modern world, there is an increasing number of deliberative experiments being run in authoritarian regimes, most notably China. This practice has been labelled *authoritarian deliberation* and suggest that deliberative authoritarian regimes may play an increased role in the 21st-century. But how ought one to think of these practices? Is authoritarian deliberation a contradiction in terms? Can the deliberation involved be genuine? How democratic can such deliberation be? And does the use of such deliberation stabilize or destabilize authoritarian regimes? This question will deal with authoritarian deliberation and its relationship to democratic theory.

Readings:

Bitton, Mathis. 2022. "Mini-Publics and Political Meritocracy: Towards a New China Model." *Chinese Political Science Review*. Online first, September 7.

Fishkin, James S.; He, Baogang; Luskin, Robert C.; and Siu, Alice. 2010. "Deliberative Democracy in an Unlikely Place: Deliberative Polling in China." *British Journal of Political Science*. 40 (2): 435-448.

Fishkin, James S.; He, Baogang; Siu, Alice. 2006. "Public Consultation through Deliberation in China: The First Chinese Deliberative Poll." In *Governance Reform under Real-World Conditions: Citizens, Stakeholders, and Voice*, eds. Sina Odugbemi and Thomas Jacobson. Washington: The World Bank. <https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/sites/ppp.worldbank.org/files/2022-05/GovernanceReformsWB.pdf>.

He, Baogang. 2014. "Deliberative Culture and Politics: The Persistence of Authoritarian Deliberation in China." *Political Theory* 42 (1): 58–81.

He, Baogang. 2018. "Deliberative Citizenship and Deliberative Governance: A Case Study of One Deliberative Experimental in China." *Citizenship Studies* 22 (3): 294-311.

He, Baogang; Breen, Michael; and Fishkin, James, eds. 2022. *Deliberative Democracy in Asia*. London: Routledge.

He, Baogang and Thøgersen, Stig. 2010. "Giving the People a Voice? Experiments with Consultative Authoritarian Institutions in China." *Journal of Contemporary China* 19 (66): 675–692.

He, Baogang and Warren, Mark E. 2011. "Authoritarian Deliberation: The Deliberative Turn in Chinese Political Development." *Perspectives on Politics* 9 (2): 269–289.

He, Baogang and Warren, Mark E. 2017. "Authoritarian Deliberation in China." *Daedalus* 146 (3): 155-166.

Leib, Ethan J. and He, Baogang, eds. 2010. *The Search for Deliberative Democracy in China*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tang, Beibei; Tamura, Tetsuki; and He, Baogang. 2018. "Deliberative Democracy in East Asia: Japan and China." In *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*, eds. Andre Bächtiger, John S. Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark Warren. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sample Question: Does China's model of deliberative authoritarianism constitute a new model of democracy?

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Dr Lisa Keenan

Topic: **Judicial politics**

This question will deal with the role of judges in a democracy. The judiciary constitutes one of the three branches of government. A key principle of democracy is that judges will be independent of government and free from political influence. Such independence has the potential to create conflict between the judiciary against the other branches of government. Some critics argue that judges are important political actors who act as policymakers rather than simply making impartial judgements that rely on existing case law.

Readings:

Bulmer, E. (2017). Judicial Tenure, Removal, Immunity and Accountability. *International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance*. Available online at: <https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/judicial-tenure-removal-immunity-and-accountability-primer.pdf>

Burgers, L. (2020). Should judges make climate change law? *Transnational Environmental Law*, 9(1), 55-75.

Dahl, R. A. (1957). Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy-Maker. *Journal of Public Law*. 6, 279-295.

Della Porta, D. (2001). A judges' revolution? Political corruption and the judiciary in Italy. *European Journal of Political Research*, 39(1), 1-21.

Donegan, M. (2023, July 11). The US supreme court has hijacked American democracy. *The Guardian*. Available online at: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jul/11/supreme-court-republican-justices-shame-power-thomas-alito-roberts>

Easterbrook, F. H. (2002). Do liberals and conservatives differ in judicial activism. *U. Colo. L. Rev.*, 73, 1401.

Elliott, R. D. (2004). Judicial activism and the threat to democracy. *UNBLJ*, 53, 199.

Fiss, O. M. (1993). The limits of judicial independence. *U. Miami Inter-Am. L. Rev.*, 25, 57.

Gallagher, M., Laver, M. & Mair, P. (2011). *Representative Government in Modern Europe*. (Chapter 4).

Gardbaum, S. (2014). Are strong constitutional courts always a good thing for new democracies. *Colum. J. Transnat'l L.*, 53, 285.

Gibler, D. M., & Randazzo, K. A. (2011). Testing the effects of independent judiciaries on the likelihood of democratic backsliding. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3), 696-709.

Landau, D., & Dixon, R. (2019). Abusive judicial review: courts against democracy. *UC Davis L. Rev.*, 53, 1313.

Lever, A. (2009). Democracy and judicial review: are they really incompatible?. *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(4), 805-822.

Millhiser, I. (2023, October 3). The Supreme Court's uncharacteristic moment of sanity. *Vox*. Available online at: <https://www.vox.com/scotus/2023/10/3/23901502/supreme-court-cfpb-appropriations-clause-community-financial-kavanaugh-barrett>

O'Brien, P. (2017). "Enemies of the People": Judges, the media, and the mythic Lord Chancellor. *Government and Opposition*, 8, 11.

Petrov, J. (2020). The COVID-19 emergency in the age of executive aggrandizement: what role for legislative and judicial checks?. *The Theory and Practice of Legislation*, 8(1-2), 71-92.

Politics Weekly America podcast episode (from *The Guardian*). Holy Smoke podcast episode (from *The Spectator*). *Is the US supreme court bad for democracy?* (30 June 2023). Available online at: <https://open.spotify.com/episode/5xJG6tLVuhi8qgtCgV1tyz?si=0dbbdf41ee9241de&nd=1>

Prendergast, D. (2019). The judicial role in protecting democracy from populism. *German Law Journal*, 20(2), 245-262.

Segal, J. A., Epstein, L., Cameron, C. M., & Spaeth, H. J. (1995). Ideological values and the votes of US Supreme Court justices revisited. *The Journal of Politics*, 57(3), 812-823.

Stone Sweet, Alec. (2020). 'Constitutions, rights and Judicial Power' in Caramani, D. (Ed.), *Comparative Politics (5th edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sumption, J. (2020). Brexit and the British constitution: reflections on the last three years and the next fifty. *The Political Quarterly*, 91(1), 107-115.

Vanberg, G. (2015). Constitutional courts in comparative perspective: a theoretical assessment. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18, 167-185.

Sample Question:

To what extent is it fair to say that political considerations explain judges' decision-making?

POLITICAL SCIENCE 2

The examination “**Political Science 2**” can only be taken by students not enrolled in any SF political science module. It requires students to answer two general questions about the nature of politics. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. None of the questions will require knowledge of any SF political science module.

A reading list for this examination, as well as sample questions, can be found below. Students, however, are advised to prepare broadly for a variety of possible questions addressing this material.

Students must answer two questions out of the five offered. All questions deal with the general nature of politics, with a particular focus on the question of how best to approach the study of politics.

Readings:

The following readings make good introductions to the topic:

Almond, G.A. (1988). “Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 21 (4): 828–42.

Keohane, R.O. (2009). “Political Science as a Vocation.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 359-63.

Mansbridge, J. (2014). “What Is Political Science for?” *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (1): 8-17.

Putnam, R.D. (2003). “The Public Role of Political Science.” *Perspectives on Politics* 1 (2): 249-55.

Smith, R.M. (2002). “Putting the Substance Back in Political Science.” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 48:30 (April 5): B10-B11.

After reading the introductory readings, students should proceed to the following:

Symposium. (2000). “The Public Value of Political Science Research.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33 (1).

Symposium. (2002). “Shaking Things Up? Thoughts about the Future of Political Science.” *P.S.: Political Science and Politics* 35 (2).

Almond, G. (1966). “Political Theory and Political Science.” *American Political Science Review* 60 (4): 869-79.

Bond, J.R. (2007). “The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science.” *Journal of Politics* 69 (4): 897-907.

Grant, R.W. (2002). "Political Theory, Political Science, and Politics." *Political Theory* 30 (4): 577–95.

Hanley, R.P. (2004). "Political Science and Political Understanding: Isaiah Berlin on the Nature of Political Inquiry." *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 327-39.

Laitin, D.D. (2002). "Comparative Politics: The State of the Subdiscipline." in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, eds. Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner (New York: Norton). https://web.stanford.edu/group/laitin_research/cgi-bin/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Cpapsa.pdf.

Shapiro, I. (2002). "Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, Or What's Wrong with Political Science and What to Do About It." *Political Theory* 30 (4): 596–619.

Truman, D.B. (1965). "Disillusion and Regeneration: The Quest for a Discipline." *American Political Science Review* 59 (4): 865–73.

Sample questions:

1. Harold Lasswell defined politics as "Who gets what, when, and how." Is this an adequate definition of politics?
2. Is political science really a science?

POLITICAL SCIENCE 3

The examination “**Political Science 3**” can only be taken by students enrolled in POU22011 (History of Political Thought A). It requires students to answer two questions relating to this module. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. There are no additional readings associated with this examination. A mastery of the materials taught in those lectures and contained on those syllabi (including of course any optional or additional reading suggestions) up to the end of the Michaelmas Term is sufficient preparation.

Students must answer two questions out of the **five** offered. All questions deal with material covered in POU22011 (History of Political Thought A).

Sample questions:

1. Why did Aristotle believe that some people were “slaves by nature?”
2. Examine the relationship between the Plato’s metaphysical theory of forms and his political elitism.

POLITICAL SCIENCE 4

The examination “**Political Science 4**” can only be taken by students enrolled in POU22031 (Comparative Politics A). It requires students to answer two questions relating to this module. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. There are no additional readings associated with this examination. A mastery of the materials taught in those lectures and contained on those syllabi (including of course any optional or additional reading suggestions) up to the end of the Michaelmas Term is sufficient preparation.

Students must answer two questions out of the **five** offered. All questions deal with material covered in POU22031 (Comparative Politics A).

Sample questions:

1. “Presidential systems represent a threat to democracy.” Evaluate this statement.
2. Discuss the thesis that social class is no longer the dominant cleavage in European politics.

POLITICAL SCIENCE 5

The examination “**Political Science 5**” can only be taken by students enrolled in POU22021 (International Relations A). It requires students to answer two questions relating to this module. There will be a total of five questions on the exam. There are no additional readings associated with this examination. A mastery of the materials taught in those lectures and contained on those syllabi (including of course any optional or additional reading suggestions) up to the end of the Michaelmas Term is sufficient preparation.

Students must answer two questions out of the **five** offered. All questions deal with material covered in POU22021 (International Relations A).

Sample questions:

1. Is Keohane’s explanation of international cooperation the same as Axelrod’s explanation of cooperation between egoists? Answer drawing on readings and IR theory.
2. Under what circumstances do domestic lobby groups matter in international politics? Answer drawing on readings and IR theory.