

Please answer one question from each of the two sections. You have six hours to complete the exam.

**Part I – Approaches: Critical Theory**

1. Discuss the relationship between *power* and *resistance* using at least three thinkers who advance different approaches to critical theorizing. Pay particular attention to any normative resources that critical theories bring to resistance.
2. In *The End of Progress: Decolonizing the Normative Foundations of Critical Theory*, Amy Allen argues that critical theories need to stop relying on dialectical approach which centers around progress and development. Her key claim is that in disregarding the role of *empire* and empire-making, critical theory fails to rid itself to a Eurocentric and racialized approaches to immanent critique. By engaging with three thinkers, in what ways do you think Allen’s concerns are shared by other thinkers?
3. Reflect on the relationship between positionality as a scholar and critical theory in relation to both colonialism/imperialism and gender/intersectionality.

**Part II – Thinker: Iris Marion Young**

1. Audre Lorde has famously written: “There is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives.” Discuss whether Iris Marion Young’s thinking, especially her views on women as a social collective and female embodiment, runs afoul of Lorde’s sentiment. Discuss at least two of Young’s interlocutors in the course of your answer.
2. In “Radical Justice: On Iris Marion Young’s Critique of the ‘Distributive Paradigm’”, Rainer Forst argues that Young’s critique is particularly powerful because of “its double-sidedness: not only does the distributive paradigm misconstrue important aspects of justice and turn questions of rights and power into questions of the distribution of goods; it also fails to reach the heart of the matter of distribution itself, i.e., the questions of how things to be distributed come into existence and who decides about a scheme of distribution.” Discuss what Forst may mean by this characterization. Make sure to include at least three thinkers overall.
3. What are the trade-offs for political theorists, if any, in recognizing difference in order to address structural injustice as Young argues versus limitations and problems such recognition introduces to such theorizing? How do we best balance these competing considerations? Discuss at least two of Young’s interlocutors in the course of your answer.