Answer one question in each pair. You should pick questions that will enable you (over the course of the exam as a whole) to discuss a wide range of scholarship, pertaining to both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

**Pair 1:**
A. In what ways have historians of capitalism in the last two decades built on and/or transformed research questions and methods that animated the field of US labor and working-class history during the previous three decades? Had the field of labor and working-class history itself changed with regard to methods and research questions in ways that anticipated the emergence of what is now called the history of capitalism? Reference specific works in the latter field that demonstrate continuities and/or reorientations that illustrate the relationship between the two.

B. What, if anything, would mark Charles Sellers’ *The Market Revolution* (1991) as having been published in the late twentieth century rather than the last decade or so? What can this book tell us about historiographical continuity and change in the study of U.S. capitalism?

**Pair 2**
A. Pick two or three significant moments in the periodization of American electoral politics. How well have historians connected these political shifts to economic developments? Do you think that even greater attention to capitalist development should lead political historians to rethink the ways they have periodized these shifts? If so, how?

B. Discuss the role of cultural and intellectual questions in the analysis of changing regimes of capitalist production provided by historians of capitalism. What important dominant and/or contending ideas about human motivation, social interaction, and morality do these historians connect to particular forms of capitalism, and why? Focus on at least two key regimes of production (e.g. agrarian, industrial, post-industrial/finance), identifying some of the main cultural and ethical debates associated with them and explaining the importance of these debates to the history of capitalism historiography.

**Pair 3**
A. How does extending our analysis of U.S. capitalism to imperial terrains affect our understandings of its exceptionality and place within larger histories of global capitalism?

B. The history of capitalism has (re)emerged in tandem with a spatial turn in the analysis of economic and cultural relationships, both local and global. How do analyses foregrounding the “production of space” inform historical analyses of changing systems of capitalist production? Consider this question comparing and contrasting what you identify as two important examples of such production in relation to such spatial questions as mobility; the significance of place at the local, regional or national scale; changing relations between “centers” and “peripheries” of capitalist circulation; or transformations of private as opposed to public or common space.