You must do a total of three (3) questions. Section A is MANDATORY. You may choose two from Section B.

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 A: MANDATORY -- answer this question:

1. You are designing a course titled “Global South Asia” at the 100 level. Develop a rationale for the course. In this rationale you should (1) explain the temporal and geographic limits of “Global South Asia” and (2) justify its inclusion in a general education curriculum for first year undergraduates at a US university. In addition to the rationale for the syllabus, develop three broad subsections and provide 1-2 page abstracts of what each will cover and what readings will be used as well.

Section B: Answer TWO of the following four questions:

1. To what extent did South Asian diasporic actors either challenge or consolidate structures of imperial power, and with what local consequences, over the period from the 1870s to 1970s? What analytical frameworks have historians used to grapple with this question?

2. What role has South Asia played in the construction of the 'Indian Ocean World’ over the period from 1500 C. E. to the mid-twentieth century? What sorts of periodizations and interpretive themes have historians employed to answer this question?

3. Global or oceanic histories of South Asia most often track the transnational itineraries of mobile people – indentured laborers, traders, etc. – or focus on diasporic communities. On the other hand, agrarian histories focus on relatively immobile peasant men and women who are “fixed” on the land they till. How would you write a global history of an agrarian locality in South Asia? Is it possible to write global histories of immobile peasant men and women? Discuss your approach with reference to agrarian histories of South Asia.
4. What are the analytical and theoretical frames through which historians have approached an intellectual history of global South Asia? How does a global approach to South Asian intellectual history challenge or complicate histories of identity and nationalism in South Asia? How have intellectual historians addressed (or failed to address) conjunctures and dis-junctures between circulations of ideas and circulations of peoples and commodities?