

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
November 15, 2010**

**MAJOR FIELD EXAMINATION**

You are required to answer a total of **three questions** in this examination. You must answer **one question from the IR theory section and one question from each of your two pre-designated subfield sections**. You have **five hours** in which to write your answers. Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. In recent years, normative international relations (IR) theory has gained prominence in international relations scholarship. What do you see as the major contributions of this body of work? What are its shortcomings? Cite and discuss the work of at least three authors of your choice.
2. Wendt has written that "Most IR scholarship, mainstream and critical alike, seems to presuppose" the assumptions of scientific realism; namely that the state and state system are real structures whose nature can be approximated through science, which assumes the world exists independently of human beings. For Wendt, this "means that most IR scholars are at least tacit [scientific] realists." Do you agree? Why or why not? Cite relevant authors/works in making your argument.
3. Is there validity to the argument of a "democratic peace"? Can the "democratic peace" be explained by any factors or factors other than democracy? Cite relevant authors/works and examples.
4. If and when Tuvalu disappears beneath the waves due to sea-level rise, will it cease to be a nation-state? Would it continue to be a nation-state if it purchased territory from another? How is consideration of this apparently inevitable outcome and of the suggested possible outcome, respectively, informed by theories of the state and sovereignty, and of international relations more generally? Cite relevant authors/works in your answer.

... over to page 2

## SECURITY

1. If you were a member of the leadership of China, concerned about ensuring China's future as great power in coming decades, would you advocate a significant expansion of China's military power project capacity, or would you advocate alternative strategies? Explain your response with reference to key arguments in the international security literature. Cite relevant authors/works. (Note, this question does not call for specific knowledge of China's military capacities.)
2. As the study of civil war has developed, scholars have suggested that the 'greed vs grievance' binary is overly simplistic. Yet, at the same time, much current research stresses the centrality of profit- and rent-seeking on the part of non-state armed groups. Is there more to the outbreak and course of civil war than the search for profit? If so, identify what some other factors might be, and explain why they may or may not have effects independent of profit-seeking. Cite relevant authors and examples.
3. Scholars of international security are regarded as having failed to predict the ending of the Cold War. Are we better equipped in conceptual and theoretical terms to explain the occurrence and impacts of power transitions occurring among the major powers during the last decade and into the near future? Compare and contrast several lines of argument, citing relevant works/authors, in your answer.
4. In 1968 Hedley Bull noted in a review of strategic studies that, "Attention has shifted away from war as an instrument of actual policy toward the threat of war" and the threat of the use of force. Deterrence has become the central concept of international security. Discuss the validity of this statement for the contemporary international security order. Cite relevant authors/works and examples.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

1. Walzer warns that a multinational setting does not prevent states from pursuing their particular national interests. Nevertheless, intergovernmental organizations (IOs) are often regarded as having special legitimacy, particularly in deciding on justified uses of military force. What are the arguments for this special legitimacy? How valid do you think that they are? Refer to relevant works and examples.
2. Keohane has noted that cooperation is not necessarily a universal good: states may cooperate to exclude or to harm others. Accordingly, some IOs have been accused of doing more harm than good in the international community. How would one assess such claims, and what standards should one hold contemporary IOs to? Discuss with reference to at least two IOs.
3. To what extent, if any, does the fact that the IOs only admit sovereign states as full members limit their relevance to contemporary international politics? Discuss with reference to relevant authors/works and specific examples.

... over to page 3

International Organization ... continued

4. "If the trend of the last two decades continues, regional organizations will assume the major responsibilities for peace operations in conflict situations. Accordingly, the role and relevance of the United Nations, especially the Security Council, will decline." Do you agree with this statement? If so, discuss its consequences. If not, why not? Cite relevant authors/works and examples.

**INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY**

1. What are the implications of the legalization of international dispute resolution procedures, in either international trade or foreign investment, for the distribution of power between developed and developing countries? Cite relevant authors/works and provide examples.
2. One of the key features of the international economy in the last thirty-five years has been increasing financial liberalization. With reference to relevant authors/works, present an explanation for why countries have liberalized their financial regulations. Based on this argument, what would cause a reversal in financial liberalization?
3. Keohane, supported by Benjamin Cohen, has recently argued that much is missing in contemporary academic work on international political economy (IPE), in particular "the synthetic interpretation of change. More attention needs to be paid to major transformations that are going on in the world political economy." Is this a fair critique in your view? That is, to what extent does current scholarship of IPE account for the noted "ongoing transformations"? Cite relevant author/works and examples.
4. Is the Mundell-Fleming constraint a useful theoretical construct for explaining countries' choices of monetary regime? If yes, why? If not, why not? Discuss with reference to at least two countries choices of monetary regimes during and after the Bretton Woods period.

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
November 15, 2010**

**MINOR FIELD EXAMINATION**

You must answer a total of **three questions** in this examination. **One question must be selected from the IR theory section, one question from your pre-designated subfield section, and a third from either of these two sections.** You have **four hours** in which to write your answers. Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. In recent years, normative international relations (IR) theory has gained prominence in international relations scholarship. What do you see as the major contributions of this body of work? What are its shortcomings? Cite and discuss the work of at least three authors of your choice.
2. Wendt has written that "Most IR scholarship, mainstream and critical alike, seems to presuppose" the assumptions of scientific realism; namely that the state and state system are real structures whose nature can be approximated through science, which assumes the world exists independently of human beings. For Wendt, this "means that most IR scholars are at least tacit [scientific] realists." Do you agree? Why or why not? Cite relevant authors/works in making your argument.
3. Is there validity to the argument of a "democratic peace"? Can the "democratic peace" be explained by any factors or factors other than democracy? Cite relevant authors/works and examples.
4. If and when Tuvalu disappears beneath the waves due to sea-level rise, will it cease to be a nation-state? Would it continue to be a nation-state if it purchased territory from another? How is consideration of this apparently inevitable outcome and of the suggested possible outcome, respectively, informed by theories of the state and sovereignty, and of international relations more generally? Cite relevant authors/works in your answer.

... over to page 2

## SECURITY

1. If you were a member of the leadership of China, concerned about ensuring China's future as great power in coming decades, would you advocate a significant expansion of China's military power project capacity, or would you advocate alternative strategies? Explain your response with reference to key arguments in the international security literature. Cite relevant authors/works. (Note, this question does not call for specific knowledge of China's military capacities.)
2. As the study of civil war has developed, scholars have suggested that the 'greed vs grievance' binary is overly simplistic. Yet, at the same time, much current research stresses the centrality of profit- and rent-seeking on the part of non-state armed groups. Is there more to the outbreak and course of civil war than the search for profit? If so, identify what some other factors might be, and explain why they may or may not have effects independent of profit-seeking. Cite relevant authors and examples.
3. Scholars of international security are regarded as having failed to predict the ending of the Cold War. Are we better equipped in conceptual and theoretical terms to explain the occurrence and impacts of power transitions occurring among the major powers during the last decade and into the near future? Compare and contrast several lines of argument, citing relevant works/authors, in your answer.
4. In 1968 Hedley Bull noted in a review of strategic studies that, "Attention has shifted away from war as an instrument of actual policy toward the threat of war" and the threat of the use of force. Deterrence has become the central concept of international security. Discuss the validity of this statement for the contemporary international security order. Cite relevant authors/works and examples.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

1. Walzer warns that a multinational setting does not prevent states from pursuing their particular national interests. Nevertheless, intergovernmental organizations (IOs) are often regarded as having special legitimacy, particularly in deciding on justified uses of military force. What are the arguments for this special legitimacy? How valid do you think that they are? Refer to relevant works and examples.
2. Keohane has noted that cooperation is not necessarily a universal good: states may cooperate to exclude or to harm others. Accordingly, some IOs have been accused of doing more harm than good in the international community. How would one assess such claims, and what standards should one hold contemporary IOs to? Discuss with reference to at least two IOs.
3. To what extent, if any, does the fact that the IOs only admit sovereign states as full members limit their relevance to contemporary international politics? Discuss with reference to relevant authors/works and specific examples.

... over to page 3

International Organization ... continued

4. "If the trend of the last two decades continues, regional organizations will assume the major responsibilities for peace operations in conflict situations. Accordingly, the role and relevance of the United Nations, especially the Security Council, will decline." Do you agree with this statement? If so, discuss its consequences. If not, why not? Cite relevant authors/works and examples.

**INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY**

1. What are the implications of the legalization of international dispute resolution procedures, in either international trade or foreign investment, for the distribution of power between developed and developing countries? Cite relevant authors/works and provide examples.
2. One of the key features of the international economy in the last thirty-five years has been increasing financial liberalization. With reference to relevant authors/works, present an explanation for why countries have liberalized their financial regulations. Based on this argument, what would cause a reversal in financial liberalization?
3. Keohane, supported by Benjamin Cohen, has recently argued that much is missing in contemporary academic work on international political economy (IPE), in particular "the synthetic interpretation of change. More attention needs to be paid to major transformations that are going on in the world political economy." Is this a fair critique in your view? That is, to what extent does current scholarship of IPE account for the noted "ongoing transformations"? Cite relevant author/works and examples.
4. Is the Mundell-Fleming constraint a useful theoretical construct for explaining countries' choices of monetary regime? If yes, why? If not, why not? Discuss with reference to at least two countries choices of monetary regimes during and after the Bretton Woods period.

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
MARCH 22, 2010**

**MINOR FIELD EXAMINATION**

You must answer a total of **three questions** in this examination. **One question must be selected from the IR theory section, and one question from another section**, while your third answer may come from either of those two sections. You will have **four hours** in which to write your answers.

Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. Alexander Wendt and James Fearon have argued that depicting the central theoretical debate in the field of IR as between constructivism and rationalism is remarkable since neither is a theory of IR per se. Discuss.
2. All theories of international relations highlight some aspects and dynamics of international politics and neglect others. In what sense, if any, can we then speak of one theory being more correct than others? Discuss with specific reference to the relevant theoretical literatures.
3. Robert Kagan has argued that: "The fact that United States military power has solved the European problem, especially the 'German problem,' allows Europeans today to believe that American military power, and the 'strategic culture' that has created and sustained it, are outmoded and dangerous... . It is the United States that has had the difficult task of navigating between these two worlds, trying to abide by, defend, and further the laws of advanced civilized society while simultaneously employing military force against those who refuse to abide by those rules."  
Do you agree with Kagan's account of key features of the contemporary global order? Discuss with reference to relevant IR theoretical literatures.
4. A number of scholars have argued that any explanation in international relations involves engaging in normative theorizing. Do you agree? What are the implications of your answer for how we ought to study international relations?

... over to page 2

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

1. How significant are intergovernmental organizations such as the UN, NATO, ASEAN, and the World Bank in contemporary international politics? Discuss with specific reference to the role(s) played by two major contemporary intergovernmental organisations.
2. Complaints about the ineffectiveness and or inefficiencies of contemporary intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) are almost invariably coupled with calls for institutional reform. To what extent can the core challenges IGOs face actually be addressed by institutional engineering? Your answer should clearly identify at least three core challenges contemporary IGOs face and discuss their amenability to institutional solutions. You may refer to several different IGOs or focus on a single one.
3. According to Kratochwil and Ruggie (1986), the study of international organization began with a focus on intergovernmental organizations but turned increasingly towards the study of regimes in the 1970s. What (if anything) was gained by this shift of focus? What (if anything) was lost? Where should contemporary scholars of international organization focus their attention? Illustrate your argument with specific empirical examples.
4. Inis Claude writes, "The framers of the Charter assigned to regional organizations a primary role in the solution of local problems while retaining in principle that the Security Council should have overarching responsibility and unrestricted competence to intervene in any case at any time." To what extent has this vision been realized in the last two decades: a) with regard to the Security Council? And b) with regard to two regions (Asia, Africa, Europe, the Americas)?

## INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

1. "The stubborn amorality of international security studies seems to clash with the rising tide of ideational considerations in contemporary international relations thinking." The author of this quotation implies that ideational considerations have not impacted upon the theoretical considerations in international security studies. Discuss, noting the manner in which ideational factors have (or have not) been integrated into security studies and the difference that this has made.
2. Increasingly, one finds the distinction made between "traditional" and "non-traditional" security and security threats. Is this a meaningful distinction? In what ways does drawing this distinction help or hinder our study and understanding of contemporary security issues? Cite relevant literature and examples.
3. Do the terms "weak state," "failed state," and "strong state," create meaningful distinctions when it comes to understanding the causes, conduct, and resolution of contemporary conflict/war? Cite relevant examples.



... over to page 3

4. It is generally accepted that the end of the Cold War transformed the international security environment, bringing with it the need to reformulate "traditional" understandings of key theories and concepts. Discuss if, why, and how *one* of the following: (a) the role of nuclear weapons, *or* (b) the role of alliances, *or* (c) the role of deterrence, has (or has not) been reformulated to be relevant to understanding contemporary security issues.

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
OCTOBER 1, 2010**

**MINOR FIELD EXAMINATION**

You must answer a total of **three questions** in this examination. **One question must be selected from the IR theory section, one question from your pre-designated subfield section, and a third from either of these two sections.** You have **four hours** in which to write your answers. Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. Stephen Walt has argued that the three principal criteria for evaluating social science theories are a) logical consistency and precision, b) originality, and c) empirical validity. Accepting these for the moment, how do the principal theories of international relations meet these criteria? Are there other criteria that you regard as equally or more important?
2. A central premise of structural realism is that a sole superpower cannot be allowed to become hegemonic without a balancing coalition forming. However, in the two decades since the demise of the Soviet Union, we see little evidence of other major powers aligning against the United States. Does this indicate an historical shift, and/or the inadequacy of structural realism as a theory?
3. "Sovereignty is a bundle of rights." Discuss with attention to how you see theory and practice concerning sovereignty as having evolved since the end of World War II.
4. Does ethics have a legitimate place in scholarly work in International Relations? If not, why not? If so, what is that place and why? Cite specific examples in making your case.

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION**

1. "The number of international organizations has increased at a fantastic rate ... what was an impressive development in 1929 has become an avalanche from 1946 onwards." What factors do various theories of international organization suggest as explanations for this rapid expansion of formal intergovernmental organizations since the end of WWII? Is one explanation more convincing than the others? Discuss with reference to three theories purporting to explain the creation of intergovernmental organizations.

... over to page 2

2. "Legitimacy is a crucial element in the effectiveness, and indeed durability, of a multilateral organization." Define the concept of legitimacy in the context of international organizations. Assess the extent to which it predicts to a) the effectiveness, and b) the durability of an international organization. Illustrate your answer with regard to at least two intergovernmental organizations.
3. Climate change represents a collective action problem of unprecedented scale and complexity. Without presupposing detailed knowledge of the issues, how do you explain the failure of the international community to reach meaningful agreements regarding control of climate change causing emissions? Cite relevant arguments from the literature concerning international cooperation and international organization.
4. Many authors have noted the increased multiplicity of actors in contemporary international relations. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), transnational advocacy networks, epistemic communities, and multinational firms have all been noted to engage in international interactions, though not necessarily through the traditional channels of inter-state diplomacy. How has this trend affected the relevance of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs)? Discuss with reference to at least two contemporary IGOs.

## INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

1. Twenty years ago, in a special issue of the journal *Millennium*, Susan Strange called on the field of IR "to put the study of international business at the centre, together with states, instead of at the periphery." Has this occurred? If yes, why and in what ways? If not, why not?
2. What is the role of ideas in the study of international political economy? Critically assess the treatment of ideas in IPE in two substantive issue areas, citing relevant works and authors.
3. Is the WTO "good" for developing countries? In answering, present and justify what you mean by "good". Cite relevant works/authors associated with the arguments you present.
4. Scholars have debated the role of a hegemonic actor in the international financial system. Does the United States play this role in the current international system? What do scholars of international relations suggest regarding the United States' future role in the system?

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
OCTOBER 1, 2010**

**MINOR FIELD EXAMINATION**

You must answer a total of **three questions** in this examination. **One question must be selected from the IR theory section, one question from your pre-designated subfield section, and a third from either of these two sections.** You have **four hours** in which to write your answers. Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. Stephen Walt has argued that the three principal criteria for evaluating social science theories are a) logical consistency and precision, b) originality, and c) empirical validity. Accepting these for the moment, how do the principal theories of international relations meet these criteria? Are there other criteria that you regard as equally or more important?
2. A central premise of structural realism is that a sole superpower cannot be allowed to become hegemonic without a balancing coalition forming. However, in the two decades since the demise of the Soviet Union, we see little evidence of other major powers aligning against the United States. Does this indicate an historical shift, and/or the inadequacy of structural realism as a theory?
3. "Sovereignty is a bundle of rights." Discuss with attention to how you see theory and practice concerning sovereignty as having evolved since the end of World War II.
4. Does ethics have a legitimate place in scholarly work in International Relations? If not, why not? If so, what is that place and why? Cite specific examples in making your case.

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION**

1. "The number of international organizations has increased at a fantastic rate ... what was an impressive development in 1929 has become an avalanche from 1946 onwards." What factors do various theories of international organization suggest as explanations for this rapid expansion of formal intergovernmental organizations since the end of WWII? Is one explanation more convincing than the others? Discuss with reference to three theories purporting to explain the creation of intergovernmental organizations.

... over to page 2

2. "Legitimacy is a crucial element in the effectiveness, and indeed durability, of a multilateral organization." Define the concept of legitimacy in the context of international organizations. Assess the extent to which it predicts to a) the effectiveness, and b) the durability of an international organization. Illustrate your answer with regard to at least two intergovernmental organizations.
3. Climate change represents a collective action problem of unprecedented scale and complexity. Without presupposing detailed knowledge of the issues, how do you explain the failure of the international community to reach meaningful agreements regarding control of climate change causing emissions? Cite relevant arguments from the literature concerning international cooperation and international organization.
4. Many authors have noted the increased multiplicity of actors in contemporary international relations. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), transnational advocacy networks, epistemic communities, and multinational firms have all been noted to engage in international interactions, though not necessarily through the traditional channels of inter-state diplomacy. How has this trend affected the relevance of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs)? Discuss with reference to at least two contemporary IGOs.

## **INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY**

1. Twenty years ago, in a special issue of the journal *Millennium*, Susan Strange called on the field of IR "to put the study of international business at the centre, together with states, instead of at the periphery." Has this occurred? If yes, why and in what ways? If not, why not?
2. What is the role of ideas in the study of international political economy? Critically assess the treatment of ideas in IPE in two substantive issue areas, citing relevant works and authors.
3. Is the WTO "good" for developing countries? In answering, present and justify what you mean by "good". Cite relevant works/authors associated with the arguments you present.
4. Scholars have debated the role of a hegemonic actor in the international financial system. Does the United States play this role in the current international system? What do scholars of international relations suggest regarding the United States' future role in the system?

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
NOVEMBER 12, 2008**

You must answer a total of three questions in this examination. Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

**MAJORS:** One question must be selected from the IR theory section, and one question each must be selected from two of the other sections. You will have five hours in which to write your answers.

**MINORS:** One question must be selected from the IR theory section, and one question from another section, while your third answer may come from either of those two sections.

Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. In 1946, George Orwell wrote: "The defenders of every kind of regime claim that it is a democracy, and fear that they might have to stop using the word if it were tied down to any one meaning." What are the consequences of the difficulty in defining democracy for the study of international relations?
2. Realism continues to be the dominant theoretical paradigm in international relations—this despite the substantial criticisms directed against it from within, e.g., against its neo-realist variant, and from without, i.e., from alternative theoretical perspectives. What explains realism's continued theoretical status and longevity? Cite relevant authors in developing your argument.
3. The current international financial crisis has affected globalized economies all over the world, yet has hit the United States most severely in many ways (at least thus far). Which theoretical paradigm in international relations best explains/interprets the likely international political implications of the crisis? Cite relevant authors from various theoretical approaches in explaining your answer.
4. Is it possible for scholars who do not neatly fit within a single theoretical paradigm to become major figures in the study of international relations? Do those who strictly follow a single coherent theory inevitably become more prominent scholars in the field? More importantly, perhaps, what are the benefits and weaknesses the field experiences in orienting itself around battling grand theoretical paradigms?

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION/ GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

1. Why do states join intergovernmental organizations (IGOs)? Does the answer differ between different types of states or between different types of IGOs? If so, what distinctions are relevant? Illustrate your answer with specific empirical examples.
2. The study of international organizations arguably began as the study of formal intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) but then broadened to include an increasing focus on international regimes. How do IGOs and regimes relate to each other? Discuss with specific reference to at least one IGO and at least one regime.
3. Are intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) today being rendered irrelevant by the emergence of nonstate actors shaping or even spoiling global governance? If so, when did this begin and why? Does this vary by IGO or issue area? Do trends in IGOs' effectiveness in global governance support any of the major theories in international relations? Refer to at least three specific IGOs in arguing your point of view.
4. Over approximately the last decade, we seem to be witnessing a growing number of efforts by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), sometimes in collaboration with friendly states, to create international treaties or other global governance frameworks outside the auspices of IGOs such as the United Nations where treaty negotiation traditionally has occurred. Is this in fact the case? Why do NGOs pursue such a strategy? Is it likely to be more successful (both in concluding agreements and achieving compliance by states and nonstate parties) in some cases more than others, and if so, why? Illustrate your answer with specific empirical examples.

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
MARCH 20, 2008**

You must answer a total of three questions in this examination. Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

**MAJORS:** One question must be selected from the IR theory section, and one question each must be selected from two of the other sections. You will have five hours in which to write your answers.

**MINORS:** One question must be selected from the IR theory section, and one question from another section, while your third answer may come from either of those two sections.

Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. In a special issue of the journal *International Organization* from ten years ago, the framing article argued that the debate between rationalism and constructivism constituted the core theoretical controversy in the field. Does this remain a fair statement of the field of international relations over the last decade? What have been the chief contributions of this debate, and what of major value is slighted in characterizing the field in this way?
2. Theory seems to be highly valued in the academic discipline of international relations. What is theory, and do we have theories in international relations? How does one justify the pursuit of international relations theory as a vocation?
3. To what extent, if any, can today's states be considered to form an international community – or international communities? Be sure to consider how a variety of theoretical schools would answer this question in the process of defending your argument.
4. Does the “balance of power” retain its theoretical relevance in explaining the behaviour of states in today's international system? Cite authors and examples where relevant.



## **INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

1. China is reportedly embarking upon a major increase in its military budget. Is it a wise investment for China to attempt to challenge or even rival the reigning dominant military power (the United States), perhaps including developing a more global force projection capability well beyond its current regional capabilities? Why or why not?
2. Reports produced for the Pentagon and European Union have identified climate change as a major potential source of national and international insecurity. How is this possible? And how does it challenge, and cause us to re-think, traditional theories concerning international security?
3. In some parts of the world, countries are investing huge amounts of money in securing their borders. In other parts of the world, border controls are being completely removed. At the same time, phenomena such as the Internet, environmental pollution and epidemic diseases transcend most efforts at territorial control. What role do borders play in theoretical conceptions of international relations? And what role should they play, given the apparently changing (and perhaps contradictory) realities of today?
4. Both the normative and strategic premises of the conduct of international conflict have been based largely upon distinctions between "peace" and "war". In today's world, these distinctions appear to have less and less relevance. How have international relations scholars attempted to come to terms with the new realities of international conflict? Cite relevant concepts, authors, and examples.

## **INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION/ GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

1. In what sense (if any) do members of the secretariats of intergovernmental organizations exercise power in international relations? Provide concrete examples from at least two intergovernmental organizations to illustrate your answer.
2. Why do states join intergovernmental organizations or regimes? Does the logic of membership vary depending on the issue area the organization or regime is concerned with? If so, how could one explain the phenomenon of states operating according to varying logics in different areas of international relations? Illustrate your argument with examples from at least two intergovernmental organizations or regimes.
3. In his examination of the role of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in world politics, Paul Wapner claims that many of the important developments in global governance occur "beyond the state". What does he mean by this? What are the various ways in which global governance has been defined, and which definition is most useful for capturing important dynamics in

international relations? Defend your answer with reference to at least two specific empirical examples of global governance.

4. Susan Strange argued against attributing too much importance to international institutions: "All those international arrangements dignified by the label regime are only too easily upset when either the balance of bargaining power or the perception of national interest changes among those states who negotiate them." How valid is her critique? Discuss with specific reference to at least two intergovernmental organizations and/or regimes.

**PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
NOVEMBER 16, 2007**

You must answer a total of three questions in this examination. Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

**MAJORS:** One question must be selected from the IR theory section, and one question each must be selected from two of the other sections. You will have five hours in which to write your answers.

**MINORS:** One question must be selected from the IR theory section, and one question from another section, while your third answer may come from either of those two sections.

Please remember to save your work frequently on the computer you are using.

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

1. Structural realists argue that there is "little room for trust among states" (Mearsheimer 1994). Discuss and assess three mechanisms for increasing trust in international relations. Under what conditions, if any, are these mechanisms likely to successfully induce trust among states?
2. A recent article in *International Studies Quarterly* is subtitled, "What if Mueller was Right?" John Mueller argued in his 1988 book *Retreat from Doomsday: the Obsolescence of Major War* that a defining feature of contemporary international politics is the absence of war between states. If Mueller is right (you may dispute this if you wish) what would it mean for theories of international relations? Would or should there still be such a field if the questions of war and peace were no longer socially significant?
3. One observer commented some time ago that contemporary international relations theory is the continuation of a long dialogue between Hobbes, Grotius, Rousseau, and Kant. Is this an adequate characterization of the field and its historical development? Can the newer offerings of constructivists, Marxists, and post-modernists be included in the conversation? How do they fit in? Or if they don't, why not?
4. Does the international system have cultural content? Does the answer to this question vary depending on issue area or geographic region, and if so, why?

## **INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

1. How useful is military might in addressing the security challenges contemporary states face? Does the answer depend on the type of state we are considering? If so, what are the relevant distinctions?
2. Have the fundamental characteristics and causes of armed conflict changed over time, or have scholars of international security merely changed their ways of examining these questions? Whichever is true, what are the reasons for such change?
3. The strategy of deterrence has been and remains a key element in states' security policies. Analysts, however, suggest that the meaning and role of deterrence today has changed substantially since the end of the Cold War, some arguing that it is no longer a viable strategy. Discuss this argument, citing relevant authors and examples.
4. Are international relations theories generated to explain interstate war appropriate for the study of intrastate war? Defend your answer with an overview of three theories of international conflict and your assessment of their explanatory leverage with respect to intrastate war.

## **INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION/ GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

1. Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) tend to persist even after the challenges that led to their creation are resolved or become less relevant. What explains the longevity of these organizations? Discuss with specific reference to at least two IGOs.
2. How would you assess how important a particular intergovernmental organization (IGO) or international regime is in contemporary world politics? Conversely, what indicators would lead you to believe that an IGO or regime is largely irrelevant? Illustrate your argument with specific examples from at least two IGOs and/or regimes.
3. Why do states (sometimes) comply with international norms? Discuss possible contributing factors to compliance and indicate which one(s) you believe to be strongest – and why.
4. Explain the ways nongovernmental organizations influence global governance. How significant are NGOs in shaping actors and institutions? Please be sure to define your terms precisely and defend your argument with appropriate examples.

## International Relations Comprehensive Exam

18 April 2007

### Instructions:

The exam is from 9 am to 1 pm for candidates for whom International Relations is a MINOR field. You must show comprehensive knowledge of IR theory and one other section. You must answer three questions: one question from the IR Theory section, one question from any other section, and the third question from *either* the IR Theory section *or* your other section.

Each section contains 4 questions so there is plenty of choice. Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

### Part I: International Relations Theory

1. The Bush Administration has arguably sought to redefine international relations and America's approach to it more forcefully than its recent predecessors, with an emphasis on either aggressively seeking to modify international institutions and/or rules, or bypassing them if it fails to do so in ways that adequately reflect its interests. How successful do you think the Bush Administration has been in challenging the contemporary fabric of multilateralism? What do the results say about different theories in international relations, particularly concerning what they have to say about the content and role of international institutions, law and norms?
2. Has there been progress in the scholarship and practice of international relations over the last half-century or so? Be sure to define "progress" in your answer.
3. A recent survey of IR scholars in the United States indicated that those surveyed rated the following scholars as the most influential over the last 20 years: #1) Keohane; #2) Waltz; #3) Wendt; #4) Huntington and #5) Mearsheimer. Would your own rankings agree with those results? Why or why not? If not, who would you rank in the top five? What do you think these rankings indicate about the discipline of international relations?
4. What constitutes power in contemporary international relations? Have the "ingredients" of power changed since the end of the Cold War? Cite relevant authors and consider the implications for the types of actors that can be said to have power in contemporary world politics.

## **Part II: Security Studies**

1. In light of the end of the Cold War and the record of wars since then, scholars of international relations have seen the need to revise and rethink their theories of deadly conflict and its causes. Describe and explain what you believe are the three most significant theoretical insights that have been developed in the post-Cold War period in this regard. Cite relevant authors and general research findings.
2. As originally developed the concept of security community was applied to the study of Western Europe. However, in the past decade, increased attention has been given to the application of the concept and associated interaction processes and conditions to the study of other regions. Choosing two regions, other than Western Europe and North America, discuss the extent to which they qualify as security communities. Is this concept a relevant and useful one to achieve understanding of the security dynamics of the regions you have chosen? Explain, providing citations to relevant authors and events.
3. "The concept 'regime security' rather than 'national security' provides the key to describing and explaining the foreign and security policies of most states in today's world." To what extent do you agree with this statement? To what extent does agreement with this statement effectively negate the validity and utility of much of the literature on international security? Cite relevant authors and their arguments.
4. Can there be human security without state security? What are the implications of your answer for addressing the problem of weak or failing states?

## **Part III: International Organization/Global Governance**

1. In 1984, the United States, a founding member of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), withdrew from the organization. In 2002, President George W. Bush announced that the United States would be rejoining UNESCO following concerted efforts by the organization "to institute financial and management reform and resumed efforts to reinforce founding principles, including an emphasis on international press freedom." In 2006, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice announced that the United States would not seek a seat on the new UN Human Rights Council, having voted against its creation on the basis that the criteria for membership were not "strong enough to keep human rights abusers off". What role can opting out of (or back into) sub-units of an international organization play in the ongoing development and change of those

units and the organization as a whole? Is it a role that is potentially open to all the members of an organization, or just to select states?

2. British Columbia NDP MLA Jenny Kwan recently sent a letter to Louise Arbour, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, calling for her help in preventing the loss of low-income housing in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside in the lead-up to the 2010 Winter Olympics. Does the UN have a role to play with regard to this sort of issue? Why, or why not? What do your answers to these questions tell us about the relationship between the UN and its member states, and between the UN and individual human beings?
3. In discussing the UN Security Council, Ian Hurd suggests that "the presence of an international organization that states accept as legitimate means that we should not continue to talk of the international system as anarchy [because] legitimate institutions suggest the existence of centres of *authority*." To what extent (if at all) do international organizations modify the anarchical nature of the international system? Discuss with specific reference to at least two intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).
4. Not all international institutions are created by the world's most powerful states. The International Criminal Court (ICC) and the 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Ottawa Convention) provide examples of institutions created without the USA's support, though you may also think of other examples. Does this present a challenge to realist perspectives of the role of international organisations in world politics? Discuss with specific reference to at least two international institutions.

## **International Relations Comprehensive Exam**

**18 April 2007**

### **Instructions:**

The exam is from 9 am to 1 pm for candidates for whom International Relations is a MINOR field. You must show comprehensive knowledge of IR theory and one other section. You must answer three questions: one question from the IR Theory section, one question from any other section, and the third question from *either* the IR Theory section *or* your other section.

Each section contains 4 questions so there is plenty of choice. Your answers should, at a minimum, demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge of the relevant literature and familiarity with the main perspectives and debates in each area. You should choose and construct your answers to avoid repetition with respect to content and literature.

### **Part I: International Relations Theory**

1. The Bush Administration has arguably sought to redefine international relations and America's approach to it more forcefully than its recent predecessors, with an emphasis on either aggressively seeking to modify international institutions and/or rules, or bypassing them if it fails to do so in ways that adequately reflect its interests. How successful do you think the Bush Administration has been in challenging the contemporary fabric of multilateralism? What do the results say about different theories in international relations, particularly concerning what they have to say about the content and role of international institutions, law and norms?
2. Has there been progress in the scholarship and practice of international relations over the last half-century or so? Be sure to define "progress" in your answer.
3. A recent survey of IR scholars in the United States indicated that those surveyed rated the following scholars as the most influential over the last 20 years: #1) Keohane; #2) Waltz; #3) Wendt; #4) Huntington and #5) Mearsheimer. Would your own rankings agree with those results? Why or why not? If not, who would you rank in the top five? What do you think these rankings indicate about the discipline of international relations?
4. What constitutes power in contemporary international relations? Have the "ingredients" of power changed since the end of the Cold War? Cite relevant authors and consider the implications for the types of actors that can be said to have power in contemporary world politics.



## **Part II: Security Studies**

1. In light of the end of the Cold War and the record of wars since then, scholars of international relations have seen the need to revise and rethink their theories of deadly conflict and its causes. Describe and explain what you believe are the three most significant theoretical insights that have been developed in the post-Cold War period in this regard. Cite relevant authors and general research findings.
2. As originally developed the concept of security community was applied to the study of Western Europe. However, in the past decade, increased attention has been given to the application of the concept and associated interaction processes and conditions to the study of other regions. Choosing two regions, other than Western Europe and North America, discuss the extent to which they qualify as security communities. Is this concept a relevant and useful one to achieve understanding of the security dynamics of the regions you have chosen? Explain, providing citations to relevant authors and events.
3. "The concept 'regime security' rather than 'national security' provides the key to describing and explaining the foreign and security policies of most states in today's world." To what extent do you agree with this statement? To what extent does agreement with this statement effectively negate the validity and utility of much of the literature on international security? Cite relevant authors and their arguments.
4. Can there be human security without state security? What are the implications of your answer for addressing the problem of weak or failing states?

## **Part III: International Organization/Global Governance**

1. In 1984, the United States, a founding member of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), withdrew from the organization. In 2002, President George W. Bush announced that the United States would be rejoining UNESCO following concerted efforts by the organization "to institute financial and management reform and resumed efforts to reinforce founding principles, including an emphasis on international press freedom." In 2006, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice announced that the United States would not seek a seat on the new UN Human Rights Council, having voted against its creation on the basis that the criteria for membership were not "strong enough to keep human rights abusers off". What role can opting out of (or back into) sub-units of an international organization play in the ongoing development and change of those

units and the organization as a whole? Is it a role that is potentially open to all the members of an organization, or just to select states?

2. British Columbia NDP MLA Jenny Kwan recently sent a letter to Louise Arbour, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, calling for her help in preventing the loss of low-income housing in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside in the lead-up to the 2010 Winter Olympics. Does the UN have a role to play with regard to this sort of issue? Why, or why not? What do your answers to these questions tell us about the relationship between the UN and its member states, and between the UN and individual human beings?
3. In discussing the UN Security Council, Ian Hurd suggests that "the presence of an international organization that states accept as legitimate means that we should not continue to talk of the international system as anarchy [because] legitimate institutions suggest the existence of centres of *authority*." To what extent (if at all) do international organizations modify the anarchical nature of the international system? Discuss with specific reference to at least two intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).
4. Not all international institutions are created by the world's most powerful states. The International Criminal Court (ICC) and the 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Ottawa Convention) provide examples of institutions created without the USA's support, though you may also think of other examples. Does this present a challenge to realist perspectives of the role of international organisations in world politics? Discuss with specific reference to at least two international institutions.