

**International Relations
Preliminary Examination
Fall 2005**

RULES AND DIRECTIONS: You will have eight hours in which to answer the required questions. **The exam must be handed in no later than 4 p.m.** Be sure to save some of your time for putting the answers into an organized, typed or legibly written version in good English. Also be sure that you answer all the parts of each question, that your answers draw upon and specifically refer to relevant literature, and that your answers address the questions and are not repetitive. This is a “closed book” exam. Students may not use notes or books, nor may they discuss the examination with anyone while taking it.

Answer one question from part A and two questions from part B. Please read the instructions for part B carefully.

Part A: Thematic Questions

Answer one (1) of the following questions:

1. How have various strands of political realism shaped international relations theory? What are the principal strengths and weaknesses of these strands for explaining and/or understanding world politics?
2. Are rationalism and constructivism incommensurable or compatible approaches?
3. Is the traditional narrative of the history of international relations as a discipline accurate or helpful? What are the implications for the study and practice of international relations?

Part B: Seminar Questions

Answer two (2) of the following questions:

Most of the questions in this section raise issues that cut across courses that you have taken. Thus, they are intended to bridge different literatures. In writing a 'bridging' essay, be sure to draw explicitly on both literatures. Answer two of the following questions. Minimize duplication across your essays.

1. How, in light of developments in critical social theory and critical IPE, is sovereignty to be conceptualized and theorized in contemporary IR theory?
2. Does attention to production make political economy more central to IR? How does it affect the conventional separation between IPE and international security as distinct fields of inquiry?
3. How might a focus on international hierarchy inform the study of the relationship between war and state formation?
4. Some perceive the roots of international order in the global political economy, while others believe them to lie in the consequences of major wars. Critically review these perspectives with regard to the origins and persistence of international order. Make sure to address to what extent these approaches are competing and to what extent they are complementary.
5. Might "bellicist" accounts of state formation and political development be improved by critical Marxist approaches? And might critical Marxist treatments of the capitalist state be improved by "bellicist" perspectives?
6. What light does the concept and narrative of empire shed on the emergence and development of the modern nation-state?