Historiographical Paper on Comparative History

Due: Monday, February 14
 Hard copy due in class with the grading sheet on the reverse attached
 Electronic Copy submitted to the D2L Dropbox in doc, docx, or rtf file format.

Length: 5 to 8 pages, double-spaced in 12-point font

Topic: Historians have been debating the definition, purpose and value of comparative history for more than a century. By 1980, Raymond Grew, the editor of the journal *Comparative Studies in History and Society*, felt it necessary to write an article entitled, "The Case for Comparing Histories." More than three decades later, Philippa Levine wrote, "It would not be unfair to say that Raymond Grew's claim...that comparative history is 'more widely admired than consciously practiced' still holds true" (pp. 331-332). A different perspective comes from Sebastian Conrad who wrote in 2017 that, "global/world history is currently booming" (p. 1) and "comparative history in recent years has taken a global turn...and indeed there are no inherent contradictions between the two approaches" (p. 39). In contrast, Levine, argues that, "there is a tendency to conflate world history, transnational or cross-national history, and comparative history, a tendency related to the fallacy that comparative history always works cross-nationally."

Keeping these debates in mind, write a historiographical paper that argues for your own definition of comparative history, and based on your definition, explains how the comparative field has developed since Grew wrote in 1980. In writing the historiography, be sure to evaluate the purpose and value of new approaches to comparative history that Levine and Conrad discuss. Your main sources for writing the paper are the works by Grew, Levine, and Conrad. Additional research in library sources is allowed, but not necessary. NO INTERNET SITES ARE ALLOWED UNLESS LEHMAN LIBRARY PROVIDES DATABASE LINKS TO THEM.

The paper should include citations and a bibliography. Cite Grew, Levine, Conrad, and any other sources in proper Chicago A (Turabian notes-bibliography) or Chicago B (Turabian author-date) format. *The Chicago Manual of Style* (Z253 .U69 2017) and Turabian's manual (LB2369 .T8 2018) are available at the library reserve desk. Online summaries of the two styles can be found linked to the Skaff website>Study Aids>Writing and Citation Help.

Evaluation of Papers: 80% of the grade will be based on content. Grades of A will be awarded to papers that persuasively define comparative history, thoroughly review the historiographical developments in the field, and persuasively explain the purpose and value of new approaches to comparative history.

The other 20% will be based upon grammar and word usage (4%), spelling, capitalization and punctuation (4%), organization (4%), readability (4%), and citations and bibliography (4%).

Grading sheet (attach to paper)

I. Content (80%)

Definition of comparative history:	Excellent _	Good	Fair	_Poor
Historiographical development of comp. history:	Excellent _	Good	Fair	_Poor
Purpose & value of approaches to comp. history:	Excellent _	Good	Fair	_Poor
A=72-80, B=64-71, C=56-63, D=4	8-55, F=47 or l	ower		
II. Writing mechanics (20%) A=4, B=3.5, C=3, D=2.5, F=2 or lower				
Grammar and word usage (4%)				_
Spelling, capitalization, and punctu	ation (4%)			
Organization (4%)				
Readability (4%)				
Citations and bibliography (Chicag	o A or B, 4%)			_

Total

Correction Symbols Used in Grading Paper

agr	wrong agreement (noun-verb or noun-noun)
awk	awkward sentence
cit	citation needed
frag	sentence fragment (usually a sentence that lacks a verb)
org	organization problems
redun	redundant (using different words to say the same thing more than once)
rep	repetitious use of the same word
run-on	run-on sentence
sp	wrong spelling
trans	poor transition (between sentences or paragraphs)
tn	wrong verb tense
unc	unclear phrase, sentence, or paragraph
wf	wrong grammatical form of word
WW	wrong word usage
¶	new paragraph needed