

Instructions: This is an open book exam for which you have eight hours. Answer one question from the theory section and answer one question from each of two other sections; you are answering three questions in all. Be sure your answers refer specifically to relevant literatures. Be sure also that your answers do not use the same basic literature for more than one question.

Theory

1. Proponents of the rationality assumption argue that it allows incremental theory-building in IR and thus constitutes a progressive research program. To what degree is this assertion true? To what degree do other non-rationalist approaches permit theory-building?
2. One way to carve up the discipline is between those who contend, on the one hand, that the international system lacks the capacity to overcome its supposedly endless capacity for bloodshed, violence, and war, and those, on the other hand, who detect signs of reason, learning, emancipation, and peaceful change. In short, some international relations theories can be characterized as theories of pessimism, and some international relations offer theories of progress.

In an essay that reflects on this statement, consider how the major theories come down on this debate, paying particular attention to the sources of progress and/or the sources of ominous inertia as seen by various theories.

World Orders

1. How are the structuring processes of enduring inequality in the production and reproduction of world orders most appropriately or adequately theorized?
2. Under what conditions and how are race, class, and/or gender important for the analysis of world order?

Political Economy

1. How does theorization of the production and circulation of value affect the development of the field of international political economy?
2. Discuss the assertion that “Growing international trade and international finance actually enhance state sovereignty.”

Norms and Institutions

1. Non-state actors, including international organizations and non-governmental organizations play an increasingly important role in the process of global governance, and yet IR theory has not traditionally treated either as an important international actor. Discuss how recent approaches to the study of international organizations and non-governmental organizations provide a different understanding of these actors from traditions of IR theory that ignore them, and what theoretical tools these recent approaches provide for understanding changes in global governance.
2. Over the last several years (neo)realists and (neo)liberals have come to draw from each other's works and criticisms in order to develop a more insightful and sophisticated understanding of how international institutions are created and sustained. Briefly consider each approach's "original" positions regarding whether institutions "matter," and then trace how each approach has learned from the critiques and drawn from the other's insights. Has this exchange and synthesis has been fruitful and led to a better understanding of how international institutions "matter"? To what extent has this mutual exchange led them to highlight some issues and ignore others?

Foreign Policy

1. Incorporating domestic politics and political institutions into IR theory has become commonplace in the field. Does incorporating variables from the second image help our understanding of many empirical phenomena? Specifically, how does this move help to explain important variation in the foreign policies of states? In your answer, be sure to:
 - a) discuss why the move toward second image theorizing
 - b) consider what second image theorizing you believe is best able to integrate systemic and domestic levels
 - c) provide examples from two cases of state foreign policy; in doing so, be explicit about how second image variables address critical issues left unexplained by systemic theorizing.
2. What has schema theory contributed to the study of foreign policy, and how has subsequent political psychological research attempted go beyond schema theory in ways that might further the understanding of foreign policy?

Security

1. How have scholars and policymakers conceived of “security”? How have those understandings shifted over time? Finally, how do you think security might be most usefully conceptualized?
2. Some hail globalization as ushering in an era of relative interstate and intrastate peace. Others see globalization as a destabilizing force, exacerbating existing tensions and creating new ones. Still others see globalization as much ado about nothing. What effects do you expect the processes associated with globalization to have on international and national peace and security? Make reference to relevant empirical evidence in answering this question.