

Foundation Scholarship Examinations 2021-22

**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 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 Law – War and War Crimes etc

The question will deal with the development and effectiveness of international law relating to war and war crimes/crimes against humanity (etc) with a particular focus on the readings below. It will not deal with strictly legal-doctrinal analysis of international law on war and war crimes etc of the sort sometimes produced by professional lawyers.

Readings:

Please note that where a book is recommended, an extract will be placed on Blackboard for convenience, but students preparing for the Foundation Scholarship examination are invited to read the books as a whole.

John Q Barrett [The Nuremberg Trials : A Summary Introduction](#) [on Blackboard]

Gary Bass - “Stay the Hand of Vengeance: The Politics of War Crimes Tribunals” Chapter on [Nuremberg Trials](#) on Blackboard.

D Bosco, *Rough Justice: The International Criminal Court in a World of Power Politics* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2014) . Extract on Blackboard.

John Dower, [Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II](#), (Norton, 2000) extract on Blackboard.

Norbert Frei [Adenauer's Germany and the Nazi Past: The Politics of Amnesty and Integration](#) (Columbia, 2002), extract on Blackboard.

F. Hirsch “Soviet Judgment at Nuremberg: A New History of the International Military Tribunal After World War II” (Oxford 2020) [extract](#) on Blackboard.

IV Hull, *A Scrap of Paper: Breaking and Making International Law during the Great War* (Cornell, Ithaca, NY 2014) [chapter on violation of Belgian neutrality](#) on Blackboard.

Jo, Hyeran and Beth Simmons (2016). 'Can the International Criminal Court Deter Atrocity?' *International Organization* 70: 443-475.

Mark Lewis “[The Birth of the New Justice: The Internationalization of Crime and Punishment 1919-1950](#)” pp. 14-26 on Blackboard.

Samuel Moyn [Humane : How the United States Abandoned Peace and Reinvented War](#) (Verso, 2021), extract on Blackboard

Judith Shklar Legalism (Harvard University Press, 1964), extract on Blackboard

René Staedtler, 2020 *THE PRICE OF RECONCILIATION: WEST GERMANY, FRANCE AND THE ARC OF POSTWAR JUSTICE FOR THE CRIMES OF NAZI GERMANY, 1944-1963* (2020 PhD Dissertation) Extract on Blackboard (nb full dissertation will not be made available).

Sandra Wilson Why were there no war crimes trials for the Korean War? *Journal of Global History* (2021), 16: 2, 185–206

Sample Question :

1. Why do states pursue the punishment of acts of aggressive war, war crimes and crimes against humanity in international politics?

HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Topic: The Theory of Sortition

Aristotle famously claimed that aristocracies fill their political offices via election, whereas democracies fill their offices via *sortition*—selection by lottery. Over the past two hundred years, however, election has come to be associated with democracy, while sortition has fallen out of use. Sortition has, however, enjoyed a comeback within democratic theory in recent decades, with many political theorists viewing it as key to the revival of democracy around the world. But just what is the case for sortition? What are its advantages and disadvantages? And just what could a revival of this practice contribute to democracy today? The question will deal with contemporary political theory debates regarding sortition.

Readings:

Gastil, J. and Wright, E.O., eds. (2019). *Legislature by Lot: Transformative Designs for Deliberative Governance*. London: Verso.

Lopez-Rabnatel, L. and Sintomer, Y., eds. (2002). *Sortition and Democracy: History, Tools, Theories*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Mansbridge, J. and Fishkin, J.S., eds. (2017). “The Prospects and Limits of Deliberative Democracy.” *Daedalus* 146 (3). Symposium.

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

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Lisa Keenan

Topic: Gender and political representation

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

Issues to consider include the following:

- What are the causes of women's underrepresentation?
- How can we model these causes?
- Does women's underrepresentation represent a challenge for democracy?
- Once elected, will women represent women?
- Are quotas a successful means of tackling women's underrepresentation?
- Do political parties prevent women from being selected/elected?

Readings:

Black, J. H., & Erickson, L. (2003). Women candidates and voter bias: do women politicians need to be better? *Electoral Studies*, 22(1): 81-100.

Buckley, F. (2013). Women and politics in Ireland: the road to sex quotas. *Irish Political Studies*, 28(3), 341-359.

Caul, M. (1999). Women's representation in parliament: The role of political parties. *Party Politics*, 5(1), 79-98.

Celis, K. (2007). Substantive representation of women: the representation of women's interests and the impact of descriptive representation in the Belgian parliament (1900–1979). *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 28(2), 85-114.

Childs, S., & Krook, M. L. (2006). Should feminists give up on critical mass? A contingent yes. *Politics & Gender*, 2(4), 522-530.

Claveria, S. (2014). Still a 'Male business'? Explaining women's presence in executive office. *West European Politics*, 37(5), 1156-1176.

Davis, R. H. (1997). *Women and Power in Parliamentary Democracies: cabinet appointments in Western Europe, 1968-1992*. London: University of Nebraska Press. [Ch2]

Dolan, K., & Lynch, T. (2014). It takes a survey: Understanding gender stereotypes, abstract attitudes, and voting for women candidates. *American Politics Research*, 42(4), 656-676.

Engstrom, R. L. (1987). District magnitudes and the election of women to the Irish Dáil Electoral Studies, 6(2), 123-132.

Fox, R. L., & Lawless, J. L. (2010). If only they'd ask: Gender, recruitment, and political ambition. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(2), 310-326.

- Fox, R. L., & Lawless, J. L. (2014). Uncovering the origins of the gender gap in political ambition. *American Political Science Review*, 108(3), 499-519.
- Kam, C., Bianco, W. T., Sened, I., & Smyth, R. (2010). Ministerial selection and intraparty organization in the contemporary British parliament. *American Political Science Review*, 104(2), 289-306.
- Krook, M. L., & O'Brien, D. Z. (2012). All the president's men? The appointment of female cabinet ministers worldwide. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(3), 840-855.
- Lawless, J. L., & Pearson, K. (2008). The primary reason for women's underrepresentation? Reevaluating the conventional wisdom. *The Journal of Politics*, 70(1), 67-82.
- Mansbridge, J. (2005). Quota problems: Combating the dangers of essentialism. *Politics & Gender*, 1(4), 622-638.
- Matland, R. E., & Studlar, D. T. (1996). The contagion of women candidates in single-member district and proportional representation electoral systems: Canada and Norway. *The Journal of Politics*, 58(3), 707-733.
- McElroy, G., & Marsh, M. (2011). Electing women to the Dáil: gender cues and the Irish voter. *Irish Political Studies*, 26(4): 521-534.
- Norris, P. (Ed.). (1997). *Passages to power: Legislative recruitment in advanced democracies*. Cambridge University Press. [Ch1: 'Introduction: theories of recruitment']
- Norris, P., & Lovenduski, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Gender and party politics*. Sage Publications. [Ch1&Ch13]
- Phillips, A. (1995). *The politics of presence*. Clarendon Press. – Chapter 1
- Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: The University of California Press. Chapter 1.
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (2002). Gender stereotypes and vote choice. *American Journal of political Science*, 20-34.
- Sapiro, V. (1981). If US Senator Baker were a woman: An experimental study of candidate images. *Political Psychology*, 3(1/2), 61-83.
- Tremblay, M., & Pelletier, R. (2000). More feminists or more women? Descriptive and substantive representations of women in the 1997 Canadian federal elections. *International Political Science Review*, 21(4), 381-405.

Sample Question:

What explains women's underrepresentation in cabinets around the world?

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. “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.