

**University of Notre Dame**  
**Department of Political Science**  
**International Relations Comprehensive Exam**  
**January 26, 2008**

Answer **three** of the following questions. Your answers will be judged by (a) how well you make a well-written and reasoned answer; and (b) how well you bring the reading of the field, via citation of authors and articles and books, to bear in your answer.

(1) Chinese spokesmen have claimed that their country is embarked on a "peaceful rise." That is, China will emerge as a major world power in a peaceful manner, without major disruption to the international system. Some scholars think, however, that a change in the general distribution of power in the international system occasions major war, or comes about through major war. Without necessarily discussing the specifics of the Chinese case, survey the relevant international relations and foreign policy literature and speculate on whether "peaceful rise" is a theoretically plausible concept.

(2) Some scholars suggest that economic globalization limits the autonomy of the state. Other scholars, however, suggest that the constraining effect of economic globalization on state policy-making autonomy is minimal. Critically evaluate both claims. Has globalization tightly restricted the flexibility of national economic policy making? Be sure to discuss the literature from both schools of thought and expose the assumptions of various analysts who argue one way or the other.

(3) Ethnic conflict is a subject of major interest for IR scholars. How different is ethnic conflict from interstate conflict? Do the two forms of conflict share similar causes? If so, which? If not, how are they different? Compare and contrast these two forms of conflict using major theories found in the causes of war and conflict prevention and resolution literatures. Be specific when citing theories, arguments, authors, and when marshaling empirical evidence.

(4) Alexander Wendt argues that "anarchy is what states make of it." How does Wendt's approach -- and social constructivism, in general -- pose a challenge to realism and liberalism in international relations theory? How are the approaches similar? On what specific conceptual grounds do they differ? Be sure to offer your opinion of the constructivist challenge. Use empirical examples from more than one substantive subfield of international relations to illustrate your argument.

(5) A world of defensively-armed states would be a peaceful one. Discuss.