Instructions: Students must answer three (3) of the following questions.

Advice to the student: 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.

A good exam is characterized by coherent and forceful arguments based on existing work and evidence in the field. A weak exam is one where the argument is made in isolation from the literature and/or where 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.

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

1. Power, anarchy and sovereignty are central concepts in International Relations. Yet they are all contested concepts as well. Pick one of these concepts, and then write an answer which considers the following questions: How can we define and operationalize this concept as a central one in the study of international relations? How is it defined and studied across the existing array of IR perspectives? What role does it play in organizing these perspectives’ views of IR?

2. What role have the epistemological and methodological debates played in the study of international relations? Answer this question generally and with specific references to particular theoretical perspectives. Answer this question generally and with specific references to particular theoretical perspectives.

3. Discuss the difference between rational, constructivist and psychological approaches to international relations. Are these approaches competitive or complementary?

4. Evaluate Geoffrey Blainey's "Manchester thesis." Why did it prove to be so incorrect at the time? Might it be correct now, in the 21st century, even though it wasn’t at the beginning of the 20th? How does the Manchester thesis compare with contemporary liberal peace theories, notably that proffered by Thomas Friedman (among others)? Does the theoretical and empirical record of the Manchester thesis tell us anything about
the possible future of the democratic peace thesis?

5. Scholars, policy-makers and journalists alike often describe the United Nations as a well intentioned institution that exhibits widespread dysfunction, persistently fails to live up to its ideals, and remains impervious to repeated attempts at reform. What explains the deviant, hypocritical and pathological behavior of the United Nations? What would both rationalist and sociological constructivist theories hypothesize regarding these aspects of IO behavior? First answer this question from a theoretical stance, and then further explain by using a specific empirical example of UN activity.

6. What are the trends in current and future research in foreign policy analysis? Evaluate the sources and prospects of these trends.

7. John Ruggie (1982) once described the post-WWII international economic order as based upon the idea of "embedded liberalism." What did he mean by this? How did the institutions constructed to govern the world economy after WWII embody this concept? Sixty years later, would you still describe the international economic order as an "embedded liberal" system?

8. To what extent has the conventional wisdom in development theory and practice moved beyond the Washington Consensus? What specific theories, agenda, or practices in international development today can you point to in order to either support or disprove claims of a "post-Washington consensus"?

9. Assess the state of international law in the contemporary world. Drawing from IR and law, which theoretical perspectives in these two fields are most effective in explaining the extent to which a state, some states, or all states participate in developing, accepting, and obeying international law?