General Instructions and Advice:

Students must answer three (3) of the following questions. Choose questions that enable you to demonstrate a broad knowledge of international relations. Examination answers should demonstrate knowledge of the history and development of the field. Relevant real world examples should be integrated into the answer and important recently published literature should be cited. It is to your advantage to avoid excessive overlap across your answers.

A good exam is characterized by coherent and forceful arguments based on existing work and evidence in the field. A weak exam is one in which the argument is made in isolation from the literature and/or in which no argument is made. Almost all the questions are designed to allow you to take a position on an issue. Do so, and do not simply produce an annotated bibliography. In other words, use the questions to show that you both know the material and can present an argument as a scholar.

The examiners anticipate that each question can be answered in approximately 3000 words. Please double-space your answers, provide reasonable margins, and number the pages.

1. Recent years have seen the advent of a number of post-modernist studies in International Relations. What is post-modernism? How is it different from or similar to both modernism and post-structuralism? What, if anything, does it have to contribute to the study of International Relations?

2. Discuss the evolution of international organization (IO) theories. What have been its major issues and turning points? What are the underlying forces or dynamics that explain this evolution? Have we seen progress?

3. What did John Ruggie mean when he recently argued that what matters most for understanding the post-WWII global order is not the existence of American hegemony, but rather the existence of American hegemony?

4. Power and the pursuit of power are essential to how we understand and explain international relations. Yet power is a contested concept. How is it defined across the existing array of IR theories? Specifically, how are materialist versus normative or ideational versions of power defined and given significance within contemporary IR theory?

5. Arthur Stein (2008) argues that “neoliberal institutionalism” is an unfortunate moniker for an IR perspective emphasizing institutions in international politics. Do you agree? What is “neo-”, “liberal”, and “institutionalist” about neo-liberal institutionalism?
6. What are the most significant developments in the theoretical interpretations of foreign policy since the 1954 publication of the Richard C. Snyder, et al. decision-making approach? Has there been any substantial accumulation in the theoretical understanding of foreign policy in the past 40 years?

7. Discuss the background to and development of the ‘human security paradigm’. What do its proponents note and what do its critics point out? How can it be distinguished within a broader field of international security studies? Finally, where do you stand on the benefits or limitations of the human security paradigm as a way of understanding international relations?

8. Pick two of the following three processes or topics widely researched in the field of international ethics: humanitarian intervention, torture, and reconciliation. How would the perspectives of realism, the English School, and those working within the Kantian tradition approach these two topics? In your answer, make sure to provide a background to each of these three perspectives, how they might overlap in particular analytical or normative ways, and briefly assess to what extent *intra*-perspective disagreement exists within each.

9. Many international agreements enjoy high rates of compliance. What explains the willingness of states to comply with international agreements? What inhibits the effectiveness of international law as constructed in such agreements?