Instructions: Answer three questions, one from each pair. You should be sure to discuss a broad range of books touching on all three of your geographic areas. Be sure your essays have a clear line of argument and engage with both history and historiography, discussing both scholars and scholarly work where appropriate.

Part 1:
A. In the past ten years or so, historians of gender have tried, with varying degrees of success, to move beyond a heteronormative framework in writing histories of human sexuality. In your readings, which author (or authors) have accomplished this with the greatest amount of success; how and why?

B. “Feminist historians of the global North have accepted the critique that their tendency to universalize Euro-American women’s history across human experience has done significant violence to the possibilities of conceptualizing and writing accurate histories of women in the global South.” Discuss.

Part 2:
A. How can a comparative perspective across your three geographies help us understand the ways that women’s oppression as women has been entangled with racial and/or ethnic forms of oppression? Do such comparisons reveal any significant regional differences or do they tend more to illuminate common patterns?

B. In a recent essay, Rebecca Edwards claimed that “historians of women and gender are moving beyond the boundaries of the nation-state, recognizing that the tenacious, commanding narrative of ... national development still shapes – and perhaps warps – our understanding of women’s history.” To what extent has this effort to “move beyond the boundaries of the nation-state” affected the scholarship on women's and gender history and the history of sexuality in your three geographic areas? In what ways – if any – has this scholarship suggested that nation-centered approaches have warped our understandings of women's history?

Part 3:
A. How has Joan Scott's essay on gender and the politics of history affected scholarship on imperial ideologies and policies, if at all? Should any of the scholarship on gender and empire that has emerged since 1988 be read as a critique of Scott and if so, in what ways?

B. What do historians of masculinity have to learn from historians of femininity?