

IR (Huntington):

1. Tell me what you like to discuss with me today.
2. Is nation state losing autonomy in the era of globalization?
3. What is the impact of market integration on exchange policy?
4. Classify international institutions.
5. Is regionalism compatible with globalization? Is formal or informal regional institution better for globalization?
6. Discuss collective security by comparing the concert of Europe with League of Nations.
7. What international system is the most stable, unipolar, bipolar, and multipolar? And why? What about the post-Cold war period? After I said it's the unipolar, he asked me to compare the current international system to that of Europe in the 19th century especially focusing on the role of Bismarck's Germany.
8. How would you explain the emergence of ethnic conflicts in the post-world war era?
9. Why did Soviet Union break up peacefully while the former Yugoslavia experienced violent civil war?

Theory(Krause)

1. Can we use utilitarianism as a methodology of social science as well as a moral guideline to design social institutions?
2. Why is utilitarianism so successful in political theory? What is attractive about it?
3. Explain the debate between communitarianism and liberalism and tell me the advantages and disadvantages of the two.
4. What is Plato's justice? Compare it with Machiavelli's virtue.
5. Does necessity play any role in Plato's justice?
6. How does noble lie fit in Plato's argument about justice?
7. What is the state of nature in Hobbes and Locke? Did state of nature ever exist? What role does this concept play in modern philosophy? Is it useful when thinking about current society?

The examiner of my focus field, political methodology, was Gary. Let me know if anyone is interested in what his questions were.

I started with theory which may be a bad idea (it was for me) Krause said she planned to do 15 minutes on Concepts and 15 minutes on 1060/1061 - which I was not prepared for. She asked me about:

1. utilitarianism: its strengths and weaknesses as a moral and descriptive theory.
2. rights theories and how they relate to utilitarianism.
3. is utilitarianism egalitarian or realistic?
4. What's the liberal/communitarian debate Answer: "I dont know - I never learned about this..."
5. What is the Republic about?
6. conceptions of justice in the Republic, and what do the non-Socratic conceptions have in common?
7. is there freedom in the Republic (I said not really)

8. Locke on freedom - how is he the classic liberal?
 9. Is Rousseau a liberal or a democrat?
 10. Which of the currents in concepts is most like Rousseau - I said something about utilitarianism...
 11. Rawls - what do I find interesting about him? I talked about how maybe we are back to Plato again...
- Well that was painful and I went on to Latin America - if you are interested in what I was asked here please email me - it was pretty straightforward except Steve wanted me to compare across cases today and tell him what explained variation.

So on to Comparative. Let me preface this by saying that Hoffmann asked me to give him a list of questions - I gave him 20 broad questions and we talked about almost none of them... The only thing I said I did not want to talk about was participation, but we ended up there for a while...

Hoffmann asked me:

1. can we compare transitions in LA and Eastern Europe?
 2. what s the role of international actors in transitions?
 3. Is there a link between economic development and democracy?
 4. how would I define democracy?
 5. Is a civic culture necessary for democracy?
 6. can we have democracy in multiethnic states?
 7. Is there a kind of nationalism that is good or bad for democracy (in terms of Weimar Germany)?
 8. Is territorial representation still representative, and what alternatives are there if it is not? I responded with something about globalization and then he suggested functional representative bodies which I had never heard of. I said so, and he said they never worked because parties were too jealous. I seized on this comment about the role of parties and talked about Huntington's comments on this...
 9. Is Huntington right about participation vs. institutionalization? I said no.
 10. What do you want to talk about for the last 2 minutes? I said the international context and its effect on domestic politics. He said "is this anything new" and I said no.
 11. Why did we need to bring the state back in? Was it thrown out anywhere outside the US? Levitsky jumped in to ask if it had been thrown out in LA - I said mostly, he asked about dependency theory. I realized I had missed the fact that the statist literature was also a response to Marxism, and made some lame remark about discussion of the military as smuggling the state in even in O'Donnell's structuralist account...
- And the 90 minutes of torture were over...

I had Colton for Comparative Politics, Pharr for my focus field of Japan, Braumoeller for International Relations, and Muirhead for Theory.

I gave Colton several topics that I wanted to speak about, and he stuck closely to them (as did Muirhead and Braumoeller, actually). He began, as is his wont, with several general questions: CP has its methodology in its title. Or does it? Then, he asked about: Why are the theories in CP more unfocused and complex than those in IR? After some

stumbling, we moved into interests and representation. Does Olson's argument re: coordination and collective action make sense? Can you see where it wouldn't? Is corporatism a category that only fits certain countries? He asked a question to which I had no answer: discuss 'Thatcherism' in terms of the theories of CP. Then, we moved onto ethnicity and nationalism. Again, he asked broad questions: what's new in these fields? Among this plurality of approaches, are some more appropriate than others? What about in the field of ethnic conflict? We ended on questions concerning state capacity (is it a good idea, what does it describe) and the international context.

Pharr asked me questions that non-Japan specialists won't be interested in. E.g. since the 1994 electoral regime shift, we haven't seen a proportional change in political parties or in behavior. Are those theories wrong? I said no, look to American SMD and the personalistic vote as opposed to the Westminsterian system for guidance. We then moved into why the 'bums in the LDP haven't been thrown out' despite the 10 years of recession, and why the opposition parties have been so weak. Then, onto the question of a unique model of Japanese capitalism, and the role of a civic legacy in economic development. She also asked, do ideas matter here? After that, we moved into the structure of contentious politics in Japan (is it different than in Western countries, if so, why) and the characteristics of the association landscape in Japan.

Next was IR. He began with a broad question: why has so much ink been spilled in IR on the topic of realism if war is so rare? What value does it provide? Then, on to questions about Japan-US treaties in light of the various IR paradigms: does the treaty meet or exceed realist expectations? He asked about the applicability of the unitary rational actor model to states (when is it appropriate, I brought up that Achen piece) and then he asked about the relationship between polarity and stability in the int'l system. He moved on to Carol Cohn and other 'ideas matter' literature, and then asked what I thought to be the weakest reading on the list. I responded the stuff on the 'security community' of Europe which seemed based on an $N = 1$. We ended with questions about the commitment problem in international relations and the use of game theory there.

Muirhead began by asking: is it always rational to seek power? I said no, look to writings of Augustine and others for piety, Aristotle and Plato for virtue, etc. He said fine: but what about the purpose of politics in those Christian writings? We moved from there into theories of elite rule, the need for a noble lie / founding myth in Plato and others, and he asked: contrast Plato's education for leaders with the educations emphasized by modern, liberal regimes. We bounced around on the ancients vs. moderns track for a while with general questions and then he asked: can modern liberal regimes cultivate nationalism? I said probably not, given transparency, secularism, individuality, etc. We ended with a discussion of communitarianism on the spectrum between a single absolute good and a multiplicity of goods.

my exam is quite smooth. professors tend to ask unexpected questions or question u 'unintentionally' mentioned. so be prepared. but generally they stick to the 'setup', if there is one.

i was majoring in IR, focusing on formal theory, and minor in theory.

my ir examiner is Huntington, he ask questions almost outside ir seminar. he is interested in particular questions such as globalization, regional econ cooperation, how many polars are there in today's world.

my formal theory examiner is shepsle. u can obtain the info by emailing me.

my theory examiner is Krause, she mainly stick to the setup but she will ask one or two unexpected questions. also she emphasizes the continuity of discourse. she devote half time to concept half to philosophers, all what i mentioned.

American For Majors (w/ Prof. Bybee)

1. Thinking about the federalist papers, what are the best and worst things/institutions they came up with?
2. a conversation about partisan identity (e.g. change over time, what it is, etc...)
3. a conversation about interest group politics, then a question of whether or not the president acts like an interest group (e.g. particularized interests, etc...)
4. a conversation comparing Cox & McCubbins and Krehbiel
5. a conversation about the normative implicaitons of the interest group system

Theory (w/ Professor Sandel)

note: overall, this was a conversation about civic engagement/participation

1. a discussion of Rawls, and a comparison of Rawls to the utilitarian theorists; this also led to a discussion of whether or not Rawls is a communitarian or not
2. a discussion of civic participation/engagement in the work of Rousseau
3. some discussion of Plato and Aristotle, in a very general/vague manner

Generals questions:

Skach "West European Politics"

What are the positive and normative arguments about constitutional courts?

With reference to F or G Courts, what are the arguments that they are damaging or strengthening democracy? [This and the following question is relevant to Skach's APSA paper 2000]

Considering post-authoritarian situations: consider the quote "the country with the worst democratic record in the inter-war period had the most robust democratic record in the postwar period". [This is connected to Skach's work on divided minority govts/ Weimar]

Consider the above question with respect ot Lijphart Patterns of democracy measures of democratic output? [This is the textbook for a class I Tfed for]

Can we predict with any certainty what kinds of coalition government will form?

Why do minority governments form? What are the implications for Eastern Europe?

International Relations/ Rosen

Are CP and IR blurring?

How does the character of domestic institutions affect international relations?

I talked about Martin's Democratic Commitments.

What are the effects of international institutions?

What is distinctive of the pattern of international politics in Europe versus outside?

Are states rational actors? Is this a productive approach?

Comparative/ Herrera

What are the theoretical frameworks explaining modernization?

What is the general relationship economic reform and democratization?

Tell me about lipset/ Przeworski and Limongi/ Huntington/ etc

What areas do democracies post-transition need to focus on in order to remain democracies?

Nationalism: What are the different theories to explain the emergence of nationalist movements?

Talk about Anderson/Bates/Deutsch/Laitin/ Gellner

Do you expect nationalist movements to arrive in Europe in the coming decades?

Theory/ Muirhead:

Define liberalism.

Make sense of Rousseau's forcing people to be free. What problem is he trying to solve?

What do Hobbes or L have to say about rule of the majority? Are they relevant to today's non-majoritarian institutions?

What do any of the authors have to tell us about the nature of founding a city/ state? (I had expressed an interest in this).

What is the difference between nationalism and patriotism? What do theorists have to say about these?

What is the difference between the ancients and the moderns?

What I was asked about in generals:

Major field (IR, Rosen): He began by asking me to focus on states as the principal actors in the international system, and on the various determinants of state interests. We talked about the various factors, including my focus on the deep normative structure of international society as partially determinative of state interests and behavior. He then asked me a series of questions about the assumption of rationality, and we discussed the extent to which state behavior represents aggregated societal interests, rational or boundedly rational decision-making, or reflects psychological factors. Next, Rosen turned to the question of non-state actors, asking in particular about the role of institutions in IR. We eventually returned to the subject of state sovereignty and the extent to which deep normative ideas in the international system are grounded in material or ideational factors, and how they evolve over time.

Theory (Sandel): Sandel began by asking to discuss my interests, picking up on my interest in sovereignty and an earlier reference to Grotius. We discussed sovereignty at length, discussing its historical basis and evolution, and allowing me to cover the transition from feudal to early modern Europe, the original purposes of sovereignty (making reference to Mill, Walzer and Bryan Hehir) and to changed domestic and international conditions which lead to a renewed emphasis on the permissibility of intervention in the affairs of other states. He asked a series of questions about the connections between international and domestic notions of sovereignty, which lead us to discuss the different conceptions of sovereignty in Hobbes and Rousseau. Eventually Sandel asked what else about political theory was relevant to my work in IR, and we discussed the democratic peace and Kant. Finally, he asked me to say something about Plato or Aristotle, which lead us into a brief discussion about elites and representative government.

Focus field (IO, Moravcsik): As is always the case, this portion of the exam was quite specific to me. Moravcsik began by asking me to outline what I saw as the major issues of interest in institutionalism, with an emphasis on legalization, and to provide some definitions. We then discussed Keohane's *After Hegemony* in excruciating detail, followed by a more general discussion of the limitations of his approach to international institutions and methods of empirical testing. Moravcsik noted that I'd taken Iain Johnston's class on critical IR theory, and asked about international norms and the potential contributions of constructivist and critical theory to the study of international regimes. We proceeded to a discussion of international legal institutions, particularly the ECJ and NAFTA's dispute panels, and to questions of their origins, powers and persistence. In the last two minutes, he raised the one issue I'd specifically requested to discuss, the area of international human rights regimes.

Theory: Professor Mansfield

What is Plato's Republic about? (Ans: particular conception of justice, which led to) Are there any problems with that? Can you separate the just man and the just society? Compare this conception of justice with what Machiavelli or Hobbes has to say. (I picked Hobbes) For Hobbes, is there nothing on which all men agree? How should one think about patriotism? Isn't it unjust to favor one's own? (brief discussion of Rousseau, Alasdair MacIntyre)

What would Machiavelli have to say? (which led to a discussion of differing interpretations of Machiavelli, which led to . . .) Which interpretation of Machiavelli's views on morality do you find more persuasive? Do you see more similarities, or more differences, between *The Prince* and *The Discourses*? After this, there were a series of exchanges on the requirements for moral virtue in political leaders. We especially focused on lying. Giving the identity crisis I may have had discussing my present commander-in-chief, I discussed FDR and LBJ.

Comparative: Professor Bates

How should we think about the effects of the international context on national political systems? Can you tell a pure second image (vs. combination second-image/second-image

reversed) story? What are some of the different explanations for what societal cleavages will be politically relevant? Is the military just another interest group in society? How should we understand its interests? (Discussion of Terry Moe applied to civil-military relations) What literature that you have read in comparative helps you to understand the current political turbulence in Colombia? What literature would help you understand American interests there, and the likelihood that the U.S. would intervene? - (interjected during another section of my exam): What comparative politics literature gives you leverage in understanding Kosovo? Is there a gap that needs to be filled? - (interjected during another section of my exam): Would you say it is true that the U.S. is no longer likely to intervene militarily based on purely economic interests?

IR: Professor Busch (these are probably out of order)

In your paper, you wrote that Clausewitz was essentially a realist. So what are some differences between his views and those of Professors Keohane and Martin? What literature focuses on the roles of norms and values in the international system? E.H. Carr focused on peaceful change. What are some items in the literature you have read which give you further leverage into prospects for peaceful change in the international system? So, do you think that the "Deleware effect" is inevitable? What do you think that the banana wars and hormone-beef dispute have to tell us? So, do you think that this is very damaging to the neoliberal institutionalists' arguments? What do you think about unipolarity? How would you differentiate between balance of threat and balance of power? How should we think about interests regarding trade policy? What is the role of institutions in explaining trade policy? Are they a strong competing explanation?

Focus Field: Professor Rosen

[I'm sure that these questions were highly specific to me, and probably not helpful to others, but here are a few of them anyway. I also don't remember wording, below is merely gist.] Discussion of relationship between ethics and strategy. Are political science methods easily portable to the study of war? What are some other approaches (i.e. Schelling, which was then critiqued; and quantitative methods, which were then critiqued. This was not a long discourse on my part, but came out in a series of questions and answers). So, since you suggest that strategy is so hard, does that mean we should give up? - [Several back-and-forth exchanges about the proper relationship between political and military leaders in the making of strategy.] Is "war is a continuation of politics by other means" a statement of fact, or normative? Critique an application of principal-agent analysis to military innovation. Apply what you've studied (esp. ref. strategic bombing) to Kosovo. Who is right?

I. Prof. Colton: Comparative politics (Minor)

Colton had asked me which topics I felt most comfortable with when we met beforehand- he did stick to the topics I mentioned. He did not push me much on authors I brought up. He started the exam with a couple of questions about the field in general: something like:

1. Comparative politics is the only field within political science that has the method in the title. Why?
2. What is the comparative method? (and an evaluative question I don't quite remember)
3. Have we made any progress in the field?
4. Topic: The state and new institutionalism: What is the state? Have we gained anything by bringing it back in? Who left it out? How so? Based on my answers the discussion shifted to new institutionalism. I don't remember all of the exact questions, but he did want to know how the new institutionalism differed from the old institutionalism.
5. Topic: ethnicity: What is it (i.e.: different definitions – primordial vs. constructed)? Various follow-up questions
6. Topic: regimes:

II. Prof. Seyla Benhabib: Political Theory (Minor)

1. Benhabib started by asking me about my paper, which was an attempt to link Hannah Arendt's distinction between power and violence to IR. She basically asked me to summarize the main arguments and to defend them against some possible criticisms..
2. Next, she linked Arendt to Aristotle by asking in which way Arendt was Aristotelian. The rest of the Aristotle discussion was not quite as I had expected it to be. What I remember is that it included a discussion of the types of activities. She also asked me how I would defend A's notion that politics is a necessary ingredient for the good life - or explain it if I did not feel like defending it - to undergrads.
3. I believe she proceeded by asking me whether Kant would agree. She asked me to define Kant's notion of liberalism (in which way he was a liberal), discuss his approach to IR, why and how the state, what autonomy meant for him, his notion of perpetual peace. Her next link started by saying that some people critique Kant for being ahistoric. Do you know who made this criticism and do you agree?
4. This, of course, led to Hegel (which I dreaded!) - she would normally ask people whether they feel comfortable discussing Hegel, but I had taken 1065 (Hegel to Habermas) with her and so she thought it was a legitimate topic for discussion. I don't remember all of it, but it began with a discussion of his conception of history, we then went into civil society (there was something about whether the arguments I had made also had a structural basis and about the structures of civil society).
5. Finally she wanted to ask me about Concepts - she had prepared a question on patriotism or the rights of different cultural groups, but since I had not taken Concepts with Sandel, but with Tuck, she dropped that and asked me instead what concepts we had talked about in Tuck's class. Answer: utilitarianism and rights theories. This led to a short definition of both approaches, a critique of their respective weaknesses, foundations for rights theories and finally to short discussion of Rawls.

III. Prof. Lawrence Broz: International Relations (Major)

1. He picked up Colton's question: Has there been any progress in the field? I had mentioned that I perceived a spiral movement in CP, so he asked me whether I would say the same about IR.
 2. I mentioned: focus on domestic origin of preferences (example DP), constructivists as well look at where preferences come from, how do things matter as opposed to why do they matter
-

- 1) Stanley Hoffmann (IR)
- 2) Paul Pierson (Comparative)
- 3) Dennis Thompson (Modern Political Theory)
- 4) Jill Frank (Ancient Political Theory)

Stanley Hoffmann:

- 1) Lets talk about your paper (which was about secession). Questions:
 - difficulties with my paper
 - application to Bosnia case
 - implications for intervention
- 2) Is there anything you would like to talk about? (I said Thucydides)
 - Why?
 - What does he say about intervention?(I talked about intervention, imperialism, human nature, why Thucydides was not a realist, what Thucydides was)
 - Is it true that realists don't care about domestic politics?

Paul Pierson:

- 1) International context:
 - How does IR affect economic policy? Or does it?
 - Does the importance of IPE make domestic policy irrelevant?
- 2) Corporatism and consociationalism (Sorry, I don't remember the questions, but I remember that I ended up talking about these topics)
- 3) Democratization:
 - Is democratization structural or voluntaristic?
 - What are the important issues that affect the success of democratization?
 - What's the impact of simultaneous economic liberalization on democratization?
- 4) Wrap-up question (somewhat related to my paper):
 - Does the comparative politics literature have anything to say about constitutionalism and institutional design?
 - (Stanley Hoffmann jumps in): If you were to give advice about constitutional design to Albania, what would you say?
 - (Dennis Thompson jumps in): Is one electoral system better than another on moral grounds? (PR versus majority rule)

Dennis Thompson:

1) Kant:

- Does contemporary theory have anything to gain from Kants political theory as opposed to his ethics?

- Is Kant democratic at all?

(This was followed by a long discussion of Kant. I dont remember the specific questions.)

2) Hobbes says that anyone who can be unjust and get away with it in civil society is a fool. Isnt this inconsistent with his account of human nature?

3) Talk about Locke, Rousseau, Marx, and anyone else you want with respect to methodology:

- Should we read all their works? Why not read only their later works?

- Should we look for continuities in their works?

Jill Frank:

1) You mentioned Thucydides, Kant, Hobbes on human nature. How do they relate to the ancients account of human nature?

2) Aristotle: Discuss the following:

- Relationship between public and private

- Relationship between nature and convention

- Discuss the above with examples of slavery, property, family.

- (Based on my discussion) Is there any private left in Aristotle?

3) Same themes for Plato.

4) Same themes in Augustine. In addition, based on my discussion: - Does Augustine try to make Christianity compatible with citizenship or the other way around?

5) Impact of Plato in Aquinas? (Based on my discussion of Augustine)

6) What makes a people? What makes for the unity of the body politic? What do the ancients have to contribute to this question? (Based on my paper)

Tuck (Ancient) -- he started off with the quintessential Tuck question, "why does the Republic start with the city of pigs?" We moved on to discuss the elements of Aristotle's critique of Plato, and wound up talking about the best citizen vs. the best man, and also about the reluctant ruler in Plato. We didn't get to anything other than Plato and Aristotle.

Sandel (Modern) -- we began with a discussion of whether Machiavelli was a modern, and what the distinction was between modern and ancient thought. We also talked a lot about the importance of unity, both for Plato and for

Hobbes, Rousseau, and Marx, and the negative effects of partial associations. He then asked me why, if modern thought is characterized by a concern with unity, that we normally think of it as pluralistic. That led to a discussion of Mill, Hegel, and a little bit of Locke.

Broz (IR) -- we talked about the impact of globalization on domestic politics (Rogowski), and then about the democratic peace.

Ertman (Comparative) -- following up on Broz, he asked how one might explain civil war within democratic countries. This led to a long discussion of ethnic conflict. We finished with a discussion of democratization, and in particular the effect of economic growth on democratization.

Paul Pierson:

- 1) What have we learned about the process of democratization over the past 25 years? After I finished trashing structural explanations and emphasizing voluntaristic explanations, he asked me: So you're saying background and institutions don't matter at all? Then we started talking about presidentialism/parliamentarism + electoral systems.
- 2) What is the difference similarity between the "bringing the state back in" movement and the new institutionalism? (Needless to say that question nearly killed me, so I don't quite remember what I mumbled...)
- 3) How would you answer criticisms of macrohistorical studies (e.g studies of revolution) that they have too few data points?

Ted Brader:

- 1) What can the Eastern Europeans learn from US institutional structure? The discussion was about American exceptionalism and the courts, but it was quite painful to draw comparisons.
- 2) I thought I was done with the forced comparison and could finally talk about the US for a change, and he slapped with "What can the US learn from Eastern Europe?", so I gave him some bullshit about the role of the media and parties, hoping he'd latch on to one of those, and he did, so
- 3) Is it good or bad that the media has started providing the info to the voters instead of the parties?
- 4) What does Aldrich say about parties?

I guess you don't need to know what Seyla asked me, since I think no one else would ask about Hegel. We talked about Hegel and Marx for 15 min, and just when I hoped we could start talking about someone else, she let me say just a couple of sentences about Machiavelli and then started asking me some terrifying questions about Alasdair MacIntyre and whether comparing countries is possible at all. However, when she realized she's not gonna get anything coherent from me on that topic, she closed with utilitarianism/rights theories.

Tuck -- ancient political theory

This exam is supposed to be about ancient and medieval political philosophy? Have you studied any of the medievals?

It is said that Augustine may have been defending ancient philosophy against Christianity as much as defending Christianity against ancient philosophy. What do you think? Is this true?

Is Augustine more of an Aristotelian or a Platonist? Why?

Augustine seems to have been something of a republican, but he lived at the time of the Roman Empire. What form do you think he would have preferred for the *civitas terrena*?

Is Aquinas an aristotelian?

Why would Aquinas have preferred Aristotle to Plato? Doesn't Plato seem like the more typical choice for the Christian philosopher?

Mansfield -- Modern political theory

What is the difference between the ancients and the moderns?

Is Machiavelli a modern? Is his secularism modern?

Is Locke a modern?

Some questions about Locke and property and Locke as a natural law theorist.

Some questions about the submitted paper.

Schwartz -- American Politics

Was there any causal story in the field seminar reading that you thought was true, or useful for your further work?

Some questions about Polsby and the institutionalization of Congress followed, given my answer.

Is the American people (electorate) stupid?

Follow-up questions about the American Voter and John Zaller's stuff, after I mentioned them.

So you have mentioned survey results and individual-level findings, but is the public as a whole stupid?

After some talk about formal theory results (i.e. Condorcet cycles), I was asked:

Is there anything else about the public voting that seems irrational? (Or something like this.)

Follow-up questions about divided government, whether it is intentional or simply some effect of formal structure or demographics or whatever.

Mayhew is one of the oldest books on the list. What was his analysis of the motivations of Congressmen, and what sort of behaviors did he say that they took to achieve their goals? And why is the United States Congress seem to be designed to meet these goals? Could there be any other (legislative) institutions that do a better job at this sort of thing?

As a political theorist, do you think that Mayhew's assessment of representatives is desirable? Is this what we want our representatives to be like?

What is the realignment literature about? Who is interested in maintaining the old cleavages and who in emphasizing the new cleavages? What did Burnham and Sundquist have to say about this?

Ertman -- Comparative Politics

You spoke in your American part of the exam about voting according to party ID, what other models of voting are there?

Do you find the rational choice models convincing?

What advice might you give to a democratizing regime about how to uphold stability? What does comparative politics and political theory have to say about this?

Follow-up questions:

Does modernization/economic development contribute to the stability of a country?

How would you identify the interests in a certain country?

What is the difference between Frieden and Rogowski's analysis?

If you think that neo-corporatism and bargaining leads to stability, how can you explain the stability of the United States and Britain?

MAJOR, Comparative (Levitsky):

What kinds of theories have been proposed to explain the factors that interact/cause democratization?

How do you think culture can be used in the study of comparative politics?

What kinds of solutions have been offered for dealing with ethnic conflict?

What's the new institutionalism?

What is path dependency?

Are political parties in decline? What theories might explain why this is the case?

Considering the Americanization of comparative politics, do you still think there's still room for area studies specialists?

MINOR, American (Campbell):

Does the media have an impact on voters?

What might explain why the two American parties are so ideologically similar?

What kinds of questions in American politics might rational choice theory help us tackle?

MINOR, Theory (Sandel):

My theory experience was very, very weird, and probably not applicable to anyone else. Sandel started out by asking me about what I studied and then we spent about 15 minutes talking about that, and the sorts of institutional structures (like pr) that influenced some cross-national differences. Then he asked me for my views on different ideas of representation and asked me to justify representative government. I very briefly mentioned at various points in our conversation Plato, Rousseau, and John Stuart Mill.

I had Muirhead for ancients, Mansfield for the moderns, Andrea Campbell for American and Yoshkio Herrera for Comparative.

I had met with Muirhead for about an hour the previous week and he asked me what I wanted to focus on--I said the quest for the best regime in Aristotle, Plato, and Cicero and how Augustine agreed and disagreed with that intellectual project. He threw out off the top of his head at the meeting in rapid succession about 25 specific questions about the Republic and the Politics and the ancients in general he might ask, some of which directly impacted the rest of my studying--i.e. "why do the philosophers rule?" He also strongly encouraged me to develop my own take on the history of political thought and to be able to give a well-developed answer to the "what's the difference between the ancients and moderns" question.

Based on that I focused most heavily on prepping Aristotle's Politics. But most of the exam was on the Republic--we just kept going and going with it.. Here is what he asked so far as I can remember:

Why does Socrates speak? What's special about speech? After some stumbling I asked if he meant speech as an act or dialogue as a form. He said the latter and I made the point about dialogue allowing different temperaments etc to be represented. From there he asked

Who is Thrasymachus and what point of view does he represent?

Is Thrasymachus vindicated (either in the Republic or in the history of political thought)?

Why does Socrates think that talking about justice in the city and justice in the individual are linked or should be talked about at the same time?

What are the different cities Socrates talks about? (He wanted me to list--pigs, ideal city, timocratic, etc.)

Tell me about the city of pigs. (I did and said the move from the city of pigs to a city with luxury represented Socrates' concession that most people are not philosophers.)

What makes the city of pigs just? I said everyone was doing what they were fit to do and he asked "What's just about THAT?" I came up with an answer on that, and the next question was

Is it natural to live in the city of pigs or is there something unnatural about it?

He then asked, who represents glory in the ideal city?

Which led into a question about the education of the military guardians: did I think that their education was indoctrination? I said that perhaps all education is indoctrination in some sense but that certainly from a liberal point of view it was indoctrination b/c it couldn't tolerate ideas dangerous to regime stability.

He then asked about the education of the philosophers.

He asked, why should they rule, and what do they get out of ruling?

I referenced Cicero in that answer and he asked me to compare Cicero and Aristotle with Plato on what rulers get out of ruling if anything.

At some point he asked me to compare the conception of justice as the right ordering of the soul with Rawls's Theory of Justice and ask if I thought Rawls could make use of that idea. I thought for a while and said no, they were incommensurable b/c Rawls focus on justice as relations b/w persons but I suspect he was fishing for a deeper answer.

He then asked me to discuss either Plato, Aristotle, or Augustine on religion and citizenship. I talked about Augustine, that he saw being Christian as commensurate with citizenship, etc. Muirhead asked whether belief in heaven makes one a good or bad citizen, pro and con.

Then he went back to Aristotle and asked, well if civic and political life is so important for him, how come he doesn't talk about it in the Ethics--or does he? That had me stumped although in retrospect obviously numerous things could have been cited. But he gave me the answer he was looking for I think, which was "courage" as a virtue, and asked what was good about courage for Aristotle and what courage conferred on the courageous person that was good.

He then asked whether Augustine could go along with that notion of courage. I talked then about just war theory and how Augustine's view makes it inevitable that Christians will develop patriotic feelings that will compromise their commitment to the city of God.

He then asked about whether Hobbes would think Aristotle's conception of courage was stupid. With the necessary qualifications I said yes, and then his last question was, did I think "noble" action was justified or was Hobbes right. I said I agreed with Aristotle and put becoming the best sort of person as a higher good than self-preservation, and that led straight into the moderns.

The first question Mansfield asked was the "ancients and the moderns question." I laid out my answer worked out well in advance which focused on starting with premise that

politics is about living well and developing the best sort of person v. politics is about establishing security and a rational system of self-preservation given base human passions, and then how some of the later Moderns tried to put virtue back in different ways.

M first asked, well, what else makes the moderns and ancients different? Equality, social contract v. natural state, etc. M volunteered secularism also and I agreed with that.

Predictably, he then asked, well, how does Machiavelli fit into this? >From there--why does Mach think security is the real political problem? >From there I said love of glory. We went on that for a little while.

He then gave me a choice b/w Hobbes and Locke and I took Locke. He asked, does LOCKE think people naturally strive for glory? How does liberty and equality connect with security problem for Locke? What difference does it make what your view of the state of nature is? What are the main features of Locke's state?

Then to Rousseau: Somehow we got to R's view of man in the state of nature. M asked me to compare Rousseau and Locke's account of property and which I thought was correct.

By now there were about 5 minutes left. He gave me a choice of Germans and I foolishly picked Marx even though I hadn't reviewed him very much and had no idea what Mansfield's take on him is. (I should have picked Kant!!!!)

He asked "What does Marx mean by species-being?" It took me a while to come up with something for that, but it wasn't bad. The next questions were "What does he want to accomplish with that idea and why". When I stuttered on the "why" question he said "how" and then we were off talking about internationalism and allegiance to class, etc. He asked what generated class consciousness in Marx and I was fine on that. He then asked what I thought was relevant about Marx for today and I mentioned that he had a vision that was at times uplifting for the spirit to read and that some of his specific critiques of say the role of money under capitalism was great literature; and that yes you could still use him to analyze global capitalism. I then volunteered the one thing I had wanted to say about Marx which was that Rousseau had foreseen where Marx's concept of the move to a stateless society went wrong in talking about the Legislator and the difficulty of people as they are shaped by capitalism being wise enough and just enough to establish a just state and not want to rule over it themselves. But all in all not a fun 5 minutes although I think it's pretty funny in a way.

With American, I'll just list the questions and not give a play by play, although I think for theory majors it's important to have a sense that what you say will directly affect their next questions, etc and that it's very dialogical.

American:

What problems were the Founding Fathers worried about and how did they try to solve them? (Not on syllabus! So read the Fed Papers to cover this base!)

Talk about American Exceptionalism. Is it still true today.

What's good and bad about federalism.

Compare Madison and Mancur Olson on interest groups.

Interest groups today (Walker, etc.)

How are interest groups and parties different, how are they alike.

Why no 3rd party in the US (she's looking for Downs in this.)

Neustadt and others on the Presidency. How does Clinton prove or disprove them.

What is social capital. Is it the dependent or the independent variable, and if the latter, what does it explain.

There were some follow-ups in there but that was it basically.

Comparative: This was my most disjointed exam, mainly I think b/c Herrera and I had only briefly exchanged emails since she was in Hawaii for 10 days. I had said I was most interested in globalization and had submitted my seminar paper on globalization and regional policy in Europe. She had written back saying just be prepared to talk about the basic stuff in comparative politics and we didn't have a follow up conversation, which might have helped b/c the bulk of the exam was a battery of questions about globalization:

Globalization and the concept of the state--

Globalization and state autonomy with ref to Skocpol or some other state-centered theorist

Globalization and economic policy.

Globalization and modernization/social mobilization (Deutsch, etc.). Did I think globalization was an extension of modernization.

Globalization and intergovernmental relations (she was fishing for Keohane and Nye.)

Did I think their picture was accurate (I have no idea but I came up with an answer and why it is probably wrong.)

At some point as I said there were probably still some policies that are purely domestic and she said "name one!" and I couldn't, so be careful on that kind of thing. The better answer would have been yes on lots of things there may be a theoretical link b/w a domestic action and int'l consequences but that it is not a strong one and certainly not causal, or something like that.

Then, some questions on regionalism (obviously not a major focus of the syllabus). When does it make sense to have a big state and when to break it up into subunits (I answered pretty weakly with ref to ethnic politics lit.) Name someone who talks about advantages of centralization v. decentralization (I cited Dahl.)

Next, definitions of democracy. Name several in the literature. Is it useful to have this different gradation of democracy.

What is pluralism.

Economic growth and democracy. Different takes in the lit on that. I mentioned Huntington v. Jeffrey Sachs and she asked me to compare how they would have approached the post-Soviet Russia question differently.

Then, what Huntington would say about Gorbachev.

Then, why study elites? Does study of elites tell us more in nondemocratic countries than democratic countries. (I wasn't quick-witted enough to shift the discussion here from the Putnam book questions about elite to the Bachrach/Baratz sorts of questions about elites.)

At some point she asked whether the trade bill with China would support democracy there. I answered with ref to Dahl saying yes if it built up a bourgeoisie there and no if it reinforced the existing power structure by helping state-dominated firms. There were some followups on that and perhaps she was fishing for either a story about economic growth and democracy or a story about sectoral cleavages (land/labor ratios etc) and trade.

Last question: what will the major topics in comparative politics be in the future and what topics will be obsolete.

Anyway, the comparative was strangely the most difficult one but I think if there had been more communication before hand it would have gone smoother.

I also would suggest in theory to talk about the people freshest in your brain (Kant, not Marx!) I actually benefitted a lot from looking at the Republic in the last 24 hrs before pretty closely and for the ancients if you want you can get a lot of mileage out of knowing that book well.