

**International Relations
Preliminary Examination
Spring 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 do various theoretical perspectives on international relations differ in their conceptualizations of “culture” and “identity”? How do these approaches differ in their views of the causal and the constitutive importance of culture and identity? What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of these perspectives?
2. Are rationalism and constructivism incommensurable or compatible approaches?
3. The international system is often described by IR theorists as “anarchic”? How accurate or useful is this description? What are the implications for IR theory and practice?

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. What do the concepts of biopolitics and biopower bring to the discipline of IR?
2. Who/what are the subjects of IR, and how do feminist theories and/or critical theories of international political economy affect the discipline's understanding of and thinking about those subjects?
3. What does feminist theory bring to IR's theorization of international law? What does the study of international law bring to feminist theory?
4. Can the study of international law be brought into productive conversation with critical theorization of the global political economy? How so, or why not?
5. Discuss the similarities and differences between constructivist theorizing in international relations and new currents of theorizing in international legal scholarship interested in ideology, social construction, and social movements, including the work of scholars such as Balakrishnan Rajagopal and Harold Koh. What are the possible benefits from interdisciplinary collaboration between constructivists and international legal scholars?
6. According to critical theorists, how do conceptions of sovereignty shape the boundaries of political community? What else besides sovereignty must be considered to understand the boundaries of community?

1. Can "top-down" theories of civil and ethnic violence help us understand the causes of human rights abuses by states? Can theories of human rights abuses inform our understanding of the causes of civil and ethnic violence?
2. Social psychological and constructivist theories of nationalism and ethnic conflict emphasize the role that myth-symbol complexes (or "symbolic politics") play in inspiring intergroup tensions and violence. Describe and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this perspective. Does this approach give us any insights into the causes of human rights abuses, such as ethnic cleansing and genocide, targeted at particular societal groups?

3. The International Criminal Court (ICC) is designed, in part, to deter, prevent, and punish human rights abuses that occur in the context of internal wars. Will the ICC be effective in achieving these goals? And what effect, if any, might the ICC have on the onset, duration, and/or resolution of internal wars in the first place?
4. The literature on explanations for human rights violations shares some common concerns with contemporary theories on the causes of civil and ethnic wars, although scholars on these two topics rarely enter into dialogue with one another. What are most important theoretical arguments in each literature, and what are some of the common issues that appear in both literatures?
5. Compliance with international norms and rules is a question of central interest to legal scholars and IR scholars. Summarize what the different IR and International Law authors mean by compliance, and highlight the arguments different authors make about the conditions under which states will comply with global norms and institutions.
6. Over the last several years international security scholars have become more interested in how international actors might help provide for successful peace implementation, that is, put an end to civil wars. How have scholars applied the insights of the international institutions literature to the study of civil war termination? In your judgment, what are the limitations of such an application?

1. Concerns about the causes of war can be traced back to Thucydides. What do you consider to be the key insights of the causes of war literature in the past 20 years? Has the recent, rationalist-oriented theoretical emphasis in the field shed new insight into the causes of war?
2. According to critical theorists, how do conceptions of sovereignty shape the boundaries of political community? What else besides sovereignty must be considered to understand the boundaries of community?
3. Major wars have historically served as formative moments in the formation of international order. Why? What explains the nature of the current order? Refer to a variety of theoretical perspectives in answering these questions.
4. Discuss the similarities and differences between constructivist theorizing in international relations and new currents of theorizing in international legal scholarship interested in ideology, social construction, and social movements, including the work of scholars such as Balakrishnan Rajagopal and Harold Koh.

What are the possible benefits from interdisciplinary collaboration between constructivists and international legal scholars?

5. Compliance with international norms and rules is a question of central interest to legal scholars and IR scholars. Summarize what the different IR and International Law authors mean by compliance, and highlight the arguments different authors make about the conditions under which states will comply with global norms and institutions.
6. Compare the contributions and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of power-based, interest-based, and knowledge based perspectives on international regimes for explaining the emergence of cooperation in the international system. Discuss the contribution each of these perspectives has made more specifically to the emergence of international cooperation in the area of human rights.

1. In critical analyses of the global political economy, how is the state conceptualized and theorized? What is at stake in the conceptualization and theorization of the state in such analyses?
2. How are we best to understand sovereignty and law in neo-liberal governance?
3. How can feminist perspectives on power, resistance, and agency inform analysis of political change in the global political economy?
4. How would a feminist ethics assess the role of international institutions in global governance?
5. How can we best assess the claim that international institutions are elements of international structures of domination?
6. According to critical theorists, how do conceptions of sovereignty shape the boundaries of political community? What else besides sovereignty must be considered to understand the boundaries of community?