Answer one question in each section. You must do a total of three (3) questions. Be sure each essay has a clear line of argument, addresses as many dimensions of the question as possible, and offers relevant, persuasive evidence from specific secondary sources wherever appropriate. Good luck!

Section I.

A. Historians are preoccupied with periodization. British historians tend to divide the history of the British empire into two distinct phases: the early modern, or first empire, and the modern (second) empire. Is this a fair categorization of the British empire? Can the shortcomings of such an approach be fixed? Or is a new scaffolding required? How would you write a history that reconfigures this divide?

B. What is the right and proper role of dissent and disorder and disruption in the history of Britain/empire, 1688? What, in other words, might a world history from below of this period look like?

Section II.

A. Develop a syllabus for a 200 level undergraduate survey course for British History 1688-Present. Divide the term into three units and address each third of the course to a different student body: Nottingham, Calcutta, and an American public university. Your essay should include a 3 page rationale for the course; 3 sections, each addressed to one of your audiences, that organize thematic readings and provide briefs for each; and 2 pages which serve as the basis for your introductory lecture for the course (i.e., that outline what the stakes are for viewing the field this way).

B. How would you tell the story of modern imperial capital in Britain and its empire through labor reallocations, racialized work modes, mobile bodies and and gendered materialities? What periodizations would you use; would this be a linear narrative; and how would you narrate multiple sites and spaces?

Section III.
A. The Scottish independence referendum took place on September 18, 2014. Discuss this event in terms of its relationship to the study of the British Empire. What are the political, economic, and legal threads that link the empire to the referendum? Does it matter from this post-colonial vantage and if so, why? How does this history reveal the shifting ground of imperial anxieties and hierarchies? How can one convey the complexities of this relational story while providing some coherence to the narrative?

B. To what extent has the core-periphery model of nation and empire/home-and-away been supplemented, even superseded, by transnational, intra-colonial and global alternatives? Is the story of the Island Race primarily a metropole-colony one or an assemblage? If the former, how does one plot the state and its agents? If the latter, what is the impact of migration, mobility, commodity and labor flows in shaping its parameters? (Why) have these questions been asked mainly outside Britain proper, by ex-colonial peoples doing anti-colonial history? What is, in short, a postcolonial history of empire-Britain?