

**Preview for the  
Ferociously Fascinating & Freshly Felicitous Final™  
History 464 (2010)**

The Ferociously Fascinating & Freshly Felicitous Final™ very much resembles the Maddening and Mind-Boggling Mid-Term™ in its structure, with one notable exception: a significant essay component that goes beyond the more limited composition exercise of the Treacherous and Trying Triads™. As before, the different parts of the exam collectively assess both factual knowledge and analytical prowess. It goes without saying that only fanatical devotion to the task of preparation will allow students to come to terms with an exam that is so fascinating and felicitous. The point allocations listed below are approximate and may be different on the exam itself.

The question arises as to whether the exam is "cumulative" and "comprehensive" (as if it could possibly be anything *other* than those things). To this I respond that whereas the bulk of the exam (and in particular the factual portions) will focus on the second half of the course, nonetheless a good performance on the exam will require familiarity with *all* of the material in the course. This principle is especially important for the essay portion of the exam.

**PART ONE. Chronology (15 points).** *Back by popular demand!* As before, I do not ask you to know specific dates, but you should be in a position to arrange clusters of significant events in chronological order. Recall that material on the website provides extensive and mind-blowing guidance on issues of chronology. As before, there will be some (limited) element of choice in this section of the exam.

**PART TWO. Short Answer (30 points).** This section is based on the proposition that fanatical devotion to the course will have equipped you with extensive factual knowledge of European history in the twentieth century. Be sure to read all questions carefully and to provide only the information requested. Think always about which answer(s) represent the *best* response, as opposed to one that is defensible only with several paragraphs of argumentation. (The place for analysis comes in the triad and essay section of the exam.) There will be some (limited) element of choice in this section of the exam. An example follows:

Name two ethnic groups forcibly deported from their homelands by Stalin towards the end of WWII.	<i>Chechens-Ingush &amp; Crimean Tatars</i>
--	---

**PART THREE. Triads (30 points).** No exam would be complete without triads. I scarcely need to say much about this, aside from reminding you that establishing connections and having a strong topic sentence are the core issues at stake. Recall that at a minimum (note: *at a minimum!*) your response in each case must provide enough specific evidence and development in order to sustain the thesis being offered at the outset. Recall also that your performance on this part of the exam tells me how fanatical your devotion to this course actually is.

You will be asked to write on two triads. In terms of choice, the final exam will include a new arrangement that is predicated on my determination to prevent students from writing several times about the same issues. Thus on the exam itself, the triads below will be arranged *in sets of two*, and you will choose *a set* of triads on which to write. Selecting a particular set may in turn restrict your choice on the essay portion of the exam below.

World War II Deportations Genocide	Czechoslovakia Nazi Occupation Communism	Wartime collaborators/ criminals Retribution Forgetting
NATO ECSC (Coal & Steel) West Germany (FRG)	Paris & Prague (1968) democracy Normality / normalization	Decolonization European Union* democracy
Mikhail Gorbachev Communism in Eastern Europe USSR	German reunification Collapse of USSR Nation-state	Croatia & Bosnia Serbs Ethnic Cleansing

---

\* For this triad, you may use the term ‘European Union’ to include all the institutions, beginning with the ECSC, that led to the EU.

**PART FOUR: EXCELLENT ESSAY (25 Points).** Below you will find two essay questions. On the exam you will be asked to choose one of them, but your choice may be constrained by the set of triads on which you choose to write. This is to ensure that you write on a diversity of issues on the exam. Be sure that your essay actually answers the question. Be sure also to provide evidence for the more important of your assertions. This means that there should be reference to *specific* events, people, processes, and groups. You should also be sure that your essay encompasses the *entire* twentieth century, since it is my supposition that only by treating the whole century can we provide anything approaching a full answer to each question. How long does the essay have to be? Long enough to be effective & convincing.

**(1) IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT IN THE 20th CENTURY.** One way of conceptualizing European history in the twentieth century – or at least in the "short twentieth century" of 1914-1991 – is as a grand contest among several major ideological systems. Write an essay that develops this conceptualization by identifying the main ideologies involved in this contest and the circumstances in which this contest emerged and developed. How were these ideologies related to one another, despite the fact that they were obviously in competition? In which places and in which circumstances did these different ideologies gain adherents and where were they implemented? How many of the main developments in European history may be ascribed to these ideologies and the competition among them? Was there a "victor" in this competition, and how should we define "victory"?

**(2) NATIONALISM & ETHNIC CLEANSING.** A central theme in this course has been the implementation of the national idea in Europe since the start of World War I and the problem of ethnic cleansing. Write an essay exploring the relationship between these two concepts. To what extent was ethnic cleansing a logical or even inevitable consequence of nationalism? (Here be careful to avoid the temptation of presuming that because something happened it *had* to happen – that there were no real alternatives.) In what specific ways did nationalism and ethnic cleansing alter the demographic and political landscape of Europe? At what points in the twentieth century were nationalism and/or ethnic cleansing especially prominent? Were there states or polities that sought to construct viable alternatives to ethnically homogeneous nation-states, and what was the fate of these efforts in the longer term? To what extent is Europe in 2010 a reflection of the complete triumph of the national idea?

Note that parking may be limited around UNLV because of the rodeo finals next week. Please be sure to factor this in when planning when to leave in order to make it to the exam on time. Those arriving late for the exam will be penalized and may be denied an examination.