

# **Foundation Scholarship Examinations 2020-21**

**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 for 2020-21 due to the curriculum changes resulting from the Trinity Education Project (TEP). This is reflected in the fact that political science will offer five examinations this year, in place of the two examinations offered in 2016-17 through 2019-20.

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 Political Science Department’s website.

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

**William Phelan**

### **Topic: The Politics of International Human Rights Agreements**

The question will deal with various contributions to political science explanations of the development and effectiveness of international human rights agreements, with a particular focus on the readings below. It will not deal with strictly legal-doctrinal analysis of international human rights law of the sort sometimes produced by professional lawyers.

#### **Readings:**

Duranti, M. (2013). "Holocaust Memory and the Silences of the Human Rights Revolution." In Aleida Assmann and Jan Assmann, eds., *Schweigen: Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation XI (Silence: Archeology of literary communication, vol. 11)*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Duranti, M. (2017). *The Conservative Human Rights Revolution: European Identity, Transnational Politics, and the Origins of the European Convention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hafner-Burton, E. and Tsutsui, K. (2007). "Justice Lost! The Failure of International Human Rights Law to Matter Where Needed Most." *Journal of Peace Research* 44 (4): 407-425.

Hafner-Burton, E. (2012). "International Regimes for Human Rights." *Annual Review of Political Science* 15: 265-286.

Hafner-Burton, E. (2005). "Trading Human Rights: How Preferential Trade Agreements Influence Government Repression." *International Organization* 59 (3): 593-629.

Kinzelbach, K. (2014). *The EU's Human Rights Dialogue with China: Quiet Diplomacy and Its Limits*. London: Routledge.

Kinzelbach, K. (2012). "Will China's Rise Lead to a New Normative Order? An Analysis of China's Statements on Human Rights at the United Nations 2000-2010" *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* 30 (3): 299-332.

Moravcsik, A. (2001). "Why Is U.S. Human Rights Policy So Unilateralist?" In Shepard Forman and Patrick Stewart, eds., *The Cost of Acting Alone: Multilateralism and US Foreign Policy*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Moravcsik, A. (2000). "The Origins of Human Rights Regimes: Democratic Delegation in Postwar Europe." *International Organization* 54 (2): 217-252.

Phelan, W. (2016). "Diagonal Enforcement in International Trade Politics." EUI Working Paper SPS 2016/1. Fiesole: EUI.

[http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/38445/EUI\\_SPS\\_2016\\_01.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/38445/EUI_SPS_2016_01.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

Simmons, B. (2009). *Mobilizing for Human Rights*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP.

Spilker, G. and Böhmelt, T. (2013). "The Impact of Preferential Trade Agreements on Governmental Repression Revisited." *Review of International Organizations* 8 (3): 343-361.

Von Stein, J. (2015). "Making Promises, Keeping Promises: Democracy, Ratification and Compliance in International Human Rights Law." *British Journal of Political Science* 46 (3): 655-679.

Vreeland, J. R. (2008). "Political Institutions and Human Rights: Why Dictatorships Enter into the United Nations Convention Against Torture." *International Organization* 62 (1): 65-101.

**Sample questions:**

1. Why do states enter into demanding international human rights agreements?
2. What if anything is distinctive about international human rights politics compared to other issue-areas in international relations?

## HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

**Peter Stone**

### **Topic: The Wisdom of the Multitude**

In Book 3 of the *Politics*, Aristotle suggests that a multitude may, by acting together, demonstrate greater collective wisdom than even a very wise person can demonstrate individually. This has led political theorists to the idea of *epistemic democracy*, which stresses that democracy may serve an important *epistemic* function, in generating sound decisions. The question will deal with the strengths and weaknesses of the case for thinking of democracy in epistemic terms.

### **Readings:**

Special Issue. (2008). "Epistemic Approaches to Democracy." *Episteme* 5 (1).

Special Issue (2017). "Epistemic Democracy, Deliberative Quality and Expertise." *Social Epistemology* 31 (3).

Anderson, E. (2006). "The Epistemology of Democracy." *Episteme* 3 (1-2): 8-22.

Bagg, S. (2018). "The Power of the Multitude: Answering Epistemic Challenges to Democracy." *American Political Science Review* 112 (4): 891-904.

Berger, W.J. and Sales, A. 2019. "Testing Epistemic Democracy's Claims for Majority Rule." *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 19 (1): 22-35.

Bookman, J.T. (1992). "The Wisdom of the Many: An Analysis of the Arguments of Books III and IV of Aristotle's *Politics*." *History of Political Thought* 13 (1): 1-12.

Cammack, D. (2013). "Aristotle on the Virtue of the Multitude." *Political Theory* 41 (2): 175-202.

Cohen, J. (1986). "An Epistemic Conception of Democracy." *Ethics* 97 (1): 26-38.

Fuerstein, M. (2008). "Epistemic Democracy and the Social Character of Knowledge." *Episteme* 5 (1): 74-93.

Gerlsbeck, F. 2018. "What Is Democratic Reliability? Epistemic Theories of Democracy and the Problem of Reasonable Disagreement." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 21 (2): 218-241.

Invernizzi-Accetti, C. (2017). "Does Democratic Theory Need Epistemic Standards?" *Democratic Theory* 4 (2): 3-26.

Knight, J.; Landemore, H.; Urbinati, N.; and Viehoff, D. (2016). "Roundtable on Epistemic Democracy and Its Critics." *Critical Review* 28 (2): 137-170.

Landemore, H.E. (2012) "Why the Many Are Smarter than the Few and Why It Matters." *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8 (1).

MacGilvray, E. (2014). "Democratic Doubts: Pragmatism and the Epistemic Defense of Democracy." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 22 (1): 105-123.

Ober, J. 2013. "Democracy's Wisdom: An Aristotelian Middle Way for Collective Judgment." *American Political Science Review* 107 (1): 104-122.

Risse, M. (2001). "The Virtuous Group: Foundations for the Argument from the Wisdom of the Multitude." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 31 (1): 53-84.

Schwartzberg, M. (2015). "Epistemic Democracy and Its Challenges." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 187-203.

Schwartzberg, M. (2016). "Aristotle and the Judgment of the Many: Equality, Not Collective Quality." *Journal of Politics* 78 (3): 733-745.

Vermeule, A. "Many-Minds Arguments in Legal Theory." *Journal of Legal Analysis* 1 (1): 1-45.

Waldron, J. (1995). "The Wisdom of the Multitude: Some Reflections on Book 3, Chapter 11 of Aristotle's *Politics*." *Political Theory* 23 (4): 563-584.

**Sample Question:** Can universal suffrage be justified in modern democracies in epistemic terms?

## COMPARATIVE POLITICS

**Lisa Keenan**

### **Topic: Political representation**

This year's comparative politics question for the Political Science 1 paper will focus on the topic of political representation.

Issues to consider include the following:

- How do we define representation?
- What does it mean to be represented?
- When should the views of individuals be represented?
- Are there political institutions that foster greater representation?
- How can direct democracy complement representative democracy?

### **Readings:**

Art, D. (2007). "Reacting to the radical right: Lessons from Germany and Austria." *Party Politics* 13 (3): 331-349.

Blais, A., and M.A. Bodet (2006). "Does Proportional Representation Foster Closer Congruence between Citizens and Policy Makers?" *Comparative Political Studies* 39 (10): 1243-1262.

Bollinger, L. C. (1990). "'The Tolerant Society:' A Response to Critics." *Columbia Law Review* 90 (4): 979-1003.

Bowler, S.; Donovan, T.; and Karp, J. A. (2007). "Enraged or Engaged? Preferences for Direct Citizen Participation in Affluent Democracies." *Political Research Quarterly* 60 (3): 351-362.

Carter, E. L. (2002). "Proportional Representation and the Fortunes of Right-Wing Extremist Parties." *West European Politics* 25 (3): 125-146.

Childs, S., and Krook, M. L. (2006). "Should Feminists Give up on Critical Mass? A Contingent Yes." *Politics & Gender* 2 (4): 522-530.

Farrell, D. M.; O'Malley, E.; and Suiter, J. (2013). "Deliberative Democracy in Action Irish-Style: The 2011 *We the Citizens* Pilot Citizens' Assembly." *Irish Political Studies* 28 (1): 99-113.

Huber, J. D., and Powell, G. B. (1994). "Congruence between Citizens and Policymakers in Two Visions of Liberal Democracy." *World Politics* 46 (3): 291-326.

Lardeyret, G. (1991). "The Problem with PR." *Journal of Democracy* 2 (3): 30-35.

Lupia, A. and Matsusaka, J. G. (2004). "Direct Democracy: New Approaches to Old Questions." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 463-482.



Mansbridge, J. (1999). "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes.'" *Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 628-657.

Page, B. I. (1994). "Democratic Responsiveness? Untangling the Links between Public Opinion and Policy." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 27 (1): 25-29.

Phillips, A. (1995). *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, chapter 1.

Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, chapter 1.

Pitkin, H. F. (2004). "Representation and Democracy: Uneasy Alliance." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 27 (3): 335-342.

Popper, K. (1962). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Volume 1. New York: Routledge. Introduction.

Powell, G. B. (2004). "Political Representation in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 273-296.

Stein, J. (2010). "Bring on the Elites! Why I Want Experts Sitting on the Supreme Court. And Remodeling My Kitchen." *Time Magazine*. Available online at: <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2010191,00.html>

Van der Brug, W. and Van Spanje, J. (2009). "Immigration, Europe and the 'New' Cultural Dimension." *European Journal of Political Research* 48 (3): 309-334.

Wlezien, C. and Soroka, S. N. (2012). "Political Institutions and the Opinion-Policy Link." *West European Politics* 35 (6): 1407-1432.

### **Sample Question:**

"Congruence between voters and policy makers is greater under proportional representation." Discuss.

# 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:

Edwards, M. (2003). “Political Science and Political Practice: The Pursuit of Grounded Inquiry.” *Perspectives on Politics* 1 (2): 349-354.

Keohane, R.O. (2009). “Political Science as a Vocation.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 359-363.

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): 249-255.

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): 869-879.

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.

Calvert, R.L. (1993). “Lowi’s Critique of Political Science: A Response.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 26 (2): 196-198.

Hanley, R.P. (2004). "Political Science and Political Understanding: Isaiah Berlin on the Nature of Political Inquiry." *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 327-339.

Laitin, D.D. (2003). "The Perestroika Challenge to Social Science." *Politics & Society* 31 (1): 163-184.

Lowi, T.J. (1992). "The State in Political Science: How We Become What We Study." *American Political Science Review* 86 (1): 1-7.

Lowi, T.J. (1993). "A Review of Herbert Simon's Review of My View of the Discipline." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 26 (1): 51-52.

Meckstroth, C. (2012). "Socratic Method and Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 106 (3): 644-660.

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.

Simon, H.A. 1993. "The State of American Political Science: Professor Lowi's View of Our Discipline." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 26 (1): 49-51.

**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. “Unelected judges have no right to overrule democratically elected politicians”. Discuss with reference to at least two countries.
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.