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. Given that many modern global histories produced in the west have been derivative of the career of the British empire, what are the advantages and disadvantages of mobilizing the global as a category or a method in/for Middle Eastern histories? Nominate a few key global thinkers, elaborate their themes and methods and address their portability, or not, for world history on the ground in Egypt, the Arab world and/or other Middle East contexts.

B. You have been invited to develop and teach a fifteen-week survey course in Global History covering the period 1500 to the present. While your department chair has given you a great deal of flexibility in terms of how to structure the course, she would like to see “non-Western” histories fully incorporated into the survey's approach and questions of method addressed as well. In a carefully constructed course proposal, identify the three major pedagogical goals for the course and then go on to discuss the central themes that will be addressed over the weeks. Discuss three or four key readings that you will require of your undergraduate students and explain their significance to the intellectual architecture of the course.

Section II

A. What is gained and what is sacrificed by choosing a south-south approach to global histories? How do you define this approach, what practitioners have used it to most effect, and by what criteria do you assess their usefulness for the kind of history you want to see set in motion by the category of the global?

B. According to Karl Liebknecht, “like a cyclone, imperialism spins across the globe . . .” What is the relationship – temporal, spatial -- between empires and “globalization,” historically and as seen from now? What proportional role can we, should we, assign to empires in accounting for global history?

Section III

A. “The global” is both a gargantuan category and a shorthand for everything neoliberalism to transnationalism to developmentalism to imperialism. When does the global begin? What is its relationship to the local? What are the best working definitions of the term for students aiming both to engage with and contest the colonial and postcolonial entanglements of the world before the 21st century?

B. An emphasis on mobility has been a key feature of global histories in the last 10 years. Assess this phenomenon, weighing the pros and cons of the preoccupation with migration, circulation and bodies across a variety of connected landscapes. Does mobility, as a category and/or method, upend Eurocentric narratives? If so, how does it? And what kinds of alternative cartographies might it have the capacity to sketch out?