RESEARCH SKILLS AND CULTURAL LITERACY:
PEOPLES OF THE SOVIET EMPIRE

ALEXANDER MAXWELL, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY, WELLINGTON

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

Most university instructors have chosen careers in academia because of their passion for their subject; indeed, many academics share their enthusiasm for their research at parties, family gatherings, and so forth. Both in private life and in the classroom, such enthusiasm may prove infectious. Nevertheless, enthusiasm is not enough when instructors design a university syllabus: faculty should design their courses to achieve specific pedagogical goals. The following syllabus for a second-year course on Soviet history course, designed for students in Wellington, New Zealand, reflects my research interests, but also addresses two distinct pedagogic objectives. It teaches writing skills, assessed in a research essay; and inculcates cultural literacy, assessed in a final exam.

University graduates with a history degree should possess general researching and writing skills. The course therefore gives student practice with formal prose writing. On the theory that students learn to write by writing, the course assigns three essays. Two are “short essays” based on course readings; for each, students choose from three set topics. These assignments give students writing practice and provide an incentive to do course readings. However, the course primarily teaches academic skills through a longer research essay, for which students choose their own topic.

A research essay on a self-chosen topic, as assigned in this course, seems to be an unusual assignment in New Zealand history courses. Few of my colleagues allow (force?) their students to select their research topics, or to devise their own thesis statements. My colleagues apparently fear that students, left to their own devices, will select an overly-ambitious topic, or have trouble finding an argument. They believe, perhaps correctly, that students will write better papers if presented with a list of options devised by the professor. Some of my colleagues even assign essay topics even during the ‘honors year’ an optional fourth year sharply distinguished from New Zealand’s normal 3-year Bachelor’s degree. (Honors coursework somewhat resembles MA coursework in the United States).

While I concede that many New Zealand undergraduates have difficulties selecting an independent paper topic and finding a thesis statement, I nevertheless suggest that university graduates who are never asked to devise an individual research topic are not receiving proper training. Many of my advanced students expect to have a fully-formed argument as they start researching and are mentally unprepared when their research agenda shifts as their knowledge increases. My research essay gives many of my students their first experience with self-directed academic writing. I would rather my students’ face difficulties with self-directed research than graduate never having attempted it.
Guiding students to a self-chosen research topic poses certain pedagogical difficulties. The course attracts around 80 students and individual mentoring is impracticable, so I briefly explain the research process in class lectures. Selected course lectures end with “pep talks” of 4-5 minutes, in which I give research tips. These “pep talks” are not listed on the syllabus itself, but I describe them in Figure 1.

I ask students to describe their paper topics to me before or after the lecture, and manage to have at least one brief conversation with almost every student. In most conversations, I find myself telling the student that he or she has a good idea, but will need to concentrate on something more specific. I can often recommend further reading: Stalinism and its horrors attract perennial student interest; I recommend the usual suspects. I typically end the conversation urging students to speak to me again when they have clarified their topic. Students who speak with me again typically want assurance that their new focus is all right, though a few change their topic entirely.

To guide students through the researching and writing process, I assign three “milestones,” which function mostly as anti-procrastination devices. Milestone 1 (“present a bibliography”) and milestone 2 (“present 8 pages of research notes”) are straightforward, but milestone 3 requires some explanation. Students must bring a draft of their research essay to tutorial in week 8, where students exchange drafts with each other. Imagine that student A receives a draft from student B. Student A reads the draft and writes a “peer review” containing suggestions on how to improve it. He or she then emails the review to both student B and to the instructor. Next week, when students submit their research essays, student B attaches student A’s review at the back of the research essay. I mark student A’s review immediately after marking student B’s essay, as the content of the latter is relevant for assessing the former. All students thus receive peer feedback on an early draft of their essay, which in turn implies that they write at least two drafts. Students who do not complete a draft on time lose both feedback and the opportunity to write a review (5% of course marks).

When I began assigning peer reviews, both the quality of student essays and my teaching evaluations improved dramatically. I should give due credit to Auckland University’s John Hattie, whose 2008 talk “The Black Box of Tertiary Assessment” inspired the assignment. Hattie generally emphasized the importance of feedback; his research suggests that students find peer feedback as helpful as instructor

---

comments. The main drawbacks of the peer review assignment concern logistical difficulties. Inevitably, some students attach the wrong review to the back of their essay; forget to write their name on their review, and so forth. Straightening out such mistakes imposes an administrative burden on the instructor.

I avoid formal benchmarks when evaluating research essays. Researching and writing essays may be generic and transferable skills, but evaluating student mastery of those skills is inherently problematic and subjective. Student essays are idiosyncratic in both their strengths and weaknesses, and I do not assess with a “one-size-fits-all” rubric. I suspect that instructors who trust to benchmarks as objective measures of student learning are deluding themselves.

The course’s second pedagogical aim is to provide cultural literacy. History graduates should possess cultural capital. Students may someday travel to Russia, or to some other country in the former Soviet sphere. Even students who stay at home may someday have personal or professional contacts in the region. All students, as future citizens, have some interest in understanding the news. Students successfully completing my course should therefore acquire an understanding of previously unfamiliar cultural narratives, historical tropes, and sensitive issues.

I often explain the value of cultural literacy with an anecdote. In 2006, the Ben and Jerry’s company, a premium ice-cream manufacturer in the United States, introduced a new ice cream flavor for St. Patrick’s Day called “black and tan.” The term “black and tan” describes a blend of pale ale and dark beer, and is typically made with Guinness, a Dublin beer. Unfortunately for Ben and Jerry’s, the term also describes British paramilitaries responsible for various atrocities during the 1919-1921 Anglo-Irish war. The phrase “black and tan” is anathema to Irish nationalists; associating it with St. Patrick’s Day is provocatively offensive. Ben and Jerry’s convincingly pleaded ignorance and sincerely apologized, but might have avoided a public relations disaster had somebody in the marketing department studied some Irish history. Amusingly, the Nike Corporation made the same mistake in 2012 by introducing “black and tan” trainers! Knowledge of early twentieth-century Irish politics might appear unrelated to the fields of gourmet ice cream sales and athletic shoe manufacturing, but in this case appearances would deceive. One never knows what cultural knowledge may come in handy, so one does well to acquire as much as possible.

Secondary schools in New Zealand, unfortunately, seem uninterested in providing cultural knowledge about the diverse national histories of Eastern Europe and Northern Asia, or indeed about any non-Anglophone world regions. Secondary schools provide no overarching narratives of world history; they emphasize case-study modules instead. The case studies typically examine either New Zealand or the United Kingdom. The National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) standards for the final year of secondary school, for example, ask students to write about either “England 1558-1667” or “New


3 That said, I once researched my own marking behavior and discovered that my course marks correlate to the number of citations. After marking one year’s batch of essays, for example, I graphed final marks against the number of footnotes and found that, on average, an extra 13 footnotes boosted student grades one notch (e.g. B++> A-). I now routinely share this result with students in an attempt to inspire diligence.
Zealand in the nineteenth century.”⁴ Students in their penultimate year (NCEA level 2) study a wider geographic range, but nevertheless focus on “themes,” without discussing any non-Anglophone society in detail. Students may spend “Five to six weeks” studying “Government and Political Change,” for example, and instructors are free to illustrate this theme with examples from the United States, Australia, Russia, Germany, the UK, or New Zealand. Yet even instructors who opt to cover “Revolution in Russia” are expected to emphasize “thematic links” with other cases, rather than engaging with Russian history in its own right.⁵ I vehemently reject this “thematic” approach to history. Treating foreign cultures merely as case studies neither does justice to their richness nor provides cultural literacy. Students should be confronted with unfamiliar narratives in order to appreciate perspectives that they do not share.

“Peoples of the Soviet Empire” introduce New Zealand students to a variety of unfamiliar cultures by placing them in the center of the analytical spotlight. The course covers both the U.S.S.R. and the Eastern Bloc: the course title speaks of the “Soviet Empire” rather than the “Soviet Union” to include the former satellite countries. Each week of the course contains two lectures. The first examines Russian experiences, the second the national experiences of a non-Russian people inside the Soviet orbit. My institution operates twelve-week semesters, so I have twelve opportunities to discuss non-Russian peoples. My course specifically examines indigenous peoples of Siberia (the Nenets and Chukchi), Jewish Russia, Poland, Turkestan, Ukraine, Latvia, the Volga Germans, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Georgia, Chechnya, and Belarus.⁶

Obviously, my twelve “non-Russian” lectures do not exhaust the diversity of national experiences in the Soviet Empire. Were my institution to add two weeks to the semester, I could add two additional studies. Yet even a 14-week semester would not suffice for all 15 Soviet Republics, and I aspire to discuss both countries beyond the Soviet frontier and Soviet nationalities not granted a full-fledged Soviet Socialist Republic (e.g. the Nenets, Chukchi, Jews, Volga Germans, and Chechens, as discussed in lectures 1.2, 2.2, 7.2 and 11.2, respectively). Since comprehensive treatment is impracticable, I have tried to be representative. For example, I have a lecture each on the Baltic, Central Asia, the Northern Caucasus, and the Southern Caucasus. An anonymous reviewer for Syllabus suggested that the satellite countries in Eastern Europe deserve more attention, but since Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia already comprise a fourth of the case-study lectures, I personally feel more keenly the paucity of Asian perspectives. Had I one additional “case study” lecture, I would probably devote it to Mongolia.

The final exam assesses cultural literacy, ignoring writing skills. I avoid essay questions and pose short-answer questions, an exam format I have discussed in greater detail elsewhere.⁷ All of my lectures end with a list of 8-12 “key terms”: names, events, places, organizations, slogans, and so forth. The exam asks students to define the key terms in a small box, as shown below. I also give students four images to
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⁶ Some “case study” lectures actually discuss more than one non-Russian people. The “Volga Germans” lecture also discusses the Crimean Tatars. The “Czechoslovakia” lecture talks about the Polish Solidarity movement. The “Belarus” lecture includes a segment on Turkestan.
⁷ “Assessment Strategies for a History Exam, or, Why Short-Answer Questions are Better than In-Class Essays,” The History Teacher, vol. 43, no. 2 (February 2010), 233-45.
interpret, and ask them to comment on a short video. The video and the images have individual grading rubrics, which I often adjust after marking a few exams. In last year’s exam, for example, one image depicted a military parade held on Red Square on 7 December 1941. The Kremlin, St. Basil’s cathedral, and Lenin’s tomb are all visible. Students earned one point for identifying two of the three landmarks, and an additional point for the third. Realizing that 7 November is the anniversary of the October Revolution (under the old calendar) earned one point. Knowing that Stalin gave an important speech at the ceremony (an assigned video from week 6) earned two points. Realizing that the Battle of Moscow raged only a few miles away earned another two points. Since the maximum score was four points, students had many different paths to success.

My course structure reflects my idiosyncratic research interests. Though I did my graduate training under a Russianist, I am not myself a Russian specialist. My research concerns nationalism in East-Central Europe, and the “non-Russian” lectures reflect my personal interest in the collective experiences of small nations. I hope that my enthusiasm for the subject material improves the quality of the lectures.

Nevertheless, the course structure addresses pedagogic ambitions distinct from my personal interests. The course broadens student horizons by introducing them to unfamiliar cultures and histories. Students are familiar with the holocaust, for example, but lecture 2.2 shows them that Jewish history in Eastern Europe contains more than massacres; that week’s tutorial readings (the memoirs of a self-proclaimed “Zionist feminist”) also hint at the richness of Russian-Jewish intellectual life. My students seem particularly challenged by lectures 6.1 and 6.2, discussing Russian and Latvian experiences in the Second World War. New Zealanders are reared on patriotic narratives about New Zealand’s glorious contribution to Nazi Germany’s defeat. I draw an unflattering comparison between New Zealand’s sacrifice and suffering, and indeed the sacrifice and suffering of the entire Anglophone world, and those of the Soviet peoples. Students find the comparison sobering and fascinating; several teaching evaluations praise these lectures in particular.

The syllabus as presented below differs somewhat from the document my students receive in their course readers. I have removed contact information, class times, dates, and various fine print imposed by my institution. I have also deleted the statements on plagiarism and penalties. I pay close attention to page layout, adding decorative images as necessary to ensure that, e.g., essay instructions do not cross a page break. In the version given here, much of this formatting has been lost. Since the “schedule of lectures” is organized week-by-week, I have left the box I place around each week’s lectures, readings, and due dates. The last page, finally, is not part of the syllabus: I have provided a sample page from the exam to show how I assess student knowledge of key terms.
Course Goals

This course introduces the nations of the Soviet Empire, discussing both the federal states within the U.S.S.R. itself and dependent states beyond the Soviet frontier. Lectures contrast the evolution of Communist rule at the Russian core of the empire with the experiences of various non-Russian nations on various imperial peripheries. Chronologically, the course runs from the late Romanov Empire to the present.

Learning Objectives

Students should learn the basic facts of Soviet history and become familiar with the federal system of the USSR and its dependent states in Eastern Europe. Students should become familiar with some of the diverse national experiences inside the multi-national Soviet system. Students should also demonstrate research skills by writing a lengthy research paper on a self-selected topic. Students should demonstrate:

1. Familiarity and comprehension with the basic facts of Soviet history, historiography, and geography.
2. Appreciation of the ethnic diversity of the Soviet Empire.
3. The ability to write a research paper that draws on both primary and secondary sources.

Course Assessment

- 10% Short essay 1 1,500 words
- 10% Short essay 2 1,500 words
- 5% Peer review 500 words
- 45% Research Paper 3,000 words
- 30% Final Exam

Tutorials

Tutorials begin the second week of the semester, and take place every week except the last week of the semester. Students must participate in six (6) tutorials to pass the course. Students who participate in all ten tutorials will get 1% added to their final course mark. Students who participate in nine tutorials receive full marks. Students who participate in eight tutorials will have 2% deducted from their final mark. Students who participate in seven tutorials will have 5% deducted from their final mark. Students who participate in six tutorials will have 8% deducted from their final mark. Students who fail to participate in six tutorials have not completed course requirements and will not pass the course. Students may attend a tutorial other than their own in case of extraordinary schedule conflicts. Missed
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**tutorials cannot be made up under any circumstances,** no matter how legitimate, because it is not possible to re-assemble the tutorial for the benefit of one absent student. Use your absences wisely!

To receive credit for participation in a tutorial, students must (1) attend, and (2) fill in a “response form” about that week's reading, specifically the reading listed in **bold type** in the syllabus. The response form ensures that students come prepared for the discussion, but more importantly gives students a chance to think critically about primary sources.

**HOW MAKE A RESPONSE FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Take an ordinary blank piece of A4 paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Write your name in the top right-hand corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Draw a horizontal line across the middle of the page, halfway between top and bottom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>On the top half of the page, describe the author of the text. Describe any elements of the author’s background that you consider relevant to understanding the text. You may wish to focus on variables such as social class, political affiliation, and place of origin, religion, ideology, gender, and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>On the bottom half of the page, describe what historians can learn from the text. What does it tell us about the person, society or historical period that produced it? Focus on what the text can teach us as historians, not your personal reaction. Comments such as “I liked this text,” “it was boring,” or “I did not understand some parts” are not helpful: you can do better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response forms will not be graded for content: write what you really think. Some interpretations may be more insightful than others, but students are not expected to provide any specific “right answer.” Response forms do not need to be word-processed.

**SCHEDULE OF LECTURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🎧 Siberian Throat Singing (recent video of a traditional song) 1:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🎧 Russian orthodox chant: <em>Basso profundo</em> “The Lowest voices.” 1:47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Syllabus
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**Lecture 2.1** Romanov Russia to Nicholas II  
Lecture 2.2 Jewish Russia: from the Pale to the Bunt

- Menshevik manifesto (1905)  
- Election Manifesto of the “Union of the Russian People” (a.k.a. the “Black Hundreds”) (1906).  
- Waclaw Święcicki “Warszawianka” (1905); Gleb Krzhizhanovsky’s Russian translation.

---

**Lecture 3.1** From 1905 to the October Revolution  
Lecture 3.2 National Awakening in Muslim Central Asia

- Milestone 1: bibliography (including 3 primary sources) due in this week's tutorial!  
- Sergei Rakhmaninov, movement from Vsenoshchnoe bdenie aka Vespers (1915)  
- Vladimir Lenin on Anti-Semitism

---

**Lecture 4.1** The Russian Civil War and Vladimir Lenin  
Lecture 4.2 Restored Poland: Józef Piłsudski and the Soviet-Polish war

- Vladimir Lenin, “To the Toiling Masses...” (1918).  
- Vladimir Lenin, “Hanging Order” (1918)  
- Odessa Steps,” Sergei Eisenstein, Battleship Potemkin (1925)

---

**Lecture 5.1** Josef Stalin and the Terror of Stalinism  
Lecture 5.2 Ukrainian tragedy: The collectivization of Agriculture

- Short Essay due!  
- Josef Stalin, “Dizzy with Success” (1933).  
- Prisoner’s letter to the Bolshevik Congress (1926).  
- Government Documents on the Collectivization of Livestock (1932).  
- “On Blacklisting Villages” Ukrainian Memorandum on the grain Problem (1932).  
- The Battle on Ice,” Sergei Eisenstein, Aleksandr Nevsky (1939)
Lecture 6.1 The Great Patriotic War  
Lecture 6.2 Latvia between Hitler and Stalin

**Milestone 2: Eight pages of research notes due in tutorial!**

- A.A. Vlasov: *Why have I taken up the Struggle Against Bolshevism?* (1943).
  - Josef Stalin, *Speech of 7 November 1941*  
  - Dmitri Shostakovich, *7th Symphony, Leningrad* (1942)
  - Soviet Propaganda Cartoons from the Second World War

Lecture 7.1 “Victory over Fascism”: The Soviet Triumph and Empire  
Lecture 7.2 The “transfer of populations”: Volga Germans, Tatars, and Poles

**Memorandum on the Crimean Tartars (1944)**
- Josef Stalin, *Toast to the Health of the Russian People.* (1945)
  - The Soviet Victory Parade, Newsreel excerpt (24 May 1945)

Lecture 8.1 Khrushchev’s relative liberalization  
Lecture 8.2 1956: the Hungarian Uprising

**Milestone 3: Peer Review due in tutorial!**

- Excerpts from Nikita S. Khrushchev’s *Secret Speech* (1956),  
  - *Gimn Sovetskogo Soyuzu* [Soviet National Anthem], (1944).
  - “Nixon in USSR” (1959)
Lecture 9.1 Stagnation under Brezhnev
Lecture 9.2 Czechoslovakia from “Socialism with a human face” to Charter 77

➡️ Research paper due! ⇐

Cosmonaut’s letter to Brezhnev (1965).
Charter 77 (the original document!)
- Yuri Ozerov, Osvozhdeniye [Liberation] (1968), Battle of Kursk; watch only 1:10:00 - 1:16:40
- Sergei Bondarchuk, Oni srazhalis za rodinu [They Fought for the Motherland] (1975) 8:15
- Vyacheslav Kotyonochkin, Nu Pogodi! [I'll get you!] Episode 5 (1972) 9:16

Lecture 10.1 Glasnost’ and Perestroika under Mikhail Gorbachev
Lecture 10.2 The Unhappy Independence of Armenia and Georgia

Vladimir Bukovsky, “Who is for Peace?” (1982),
- “Russian village huge human nuclear experiment,” Sky News (date unknown) 3:59
- Simon Reeve, “Places that Don’t Exist (Nagorno-Karabakh)” BBC (2005) 4 parts, watch parts 1 and 2. 8:00

Lecture 11.1 From Boris Yeltsin to Vladimir Putin
Lecture 11.2 The Chechen Wars

➡️ Short Essay 2! ⇐

Stephen Kotkin “Terror, Rehabilitation, and Historical Memory: An Interview with Dmitrii Iurasov”
- “Brutality of Russian agresors [sic] in Chechnya (part 1)” (no date). 8:09
SHORT ESSAYS

For each short essay, answer one of the two questions given. Short essays test the student’s understanding of the course readings and ability to use evidence while making an argument. The short essays are not a research assignment. Cite page numbers from the course reader and do not conduct any additional research.

SHORT ESSAY 1 (1,500 WORDS)

Answer one of the following questions:

(1) Lincoln, Wallace, Rakovsky, and Dubnow describe various failed policies of the Romanov government. How did the Romanov government attempt to implement its policies? Why obstacles did it face?

(2) Soucek, Lenin, Chokayev, Figes, and Coates all describe nationalist tensions. How did the idea of “socialism” help the Bolshevik government make alliances with non-Russians?

SHORT ESSAY 2 (1,500 WORDS)

(1) Stalin, Khrushchev, the Cosmonauts, Brezhnev and Gorbachev all set goals for the Soviet state. How do their changing objectives show the evolution of Soviet society? Discuss similarities as well as differences.

(2) Vlasov, Rothberg, Havel, Charter 77, and Bukovksky all advocated opposition to Soviet power, but their tactics differed. How do their changing tactics show the evolution of Soviet society? Discuss similarities as well as differences.

THE RESEARCH PAPER (3,000 WORDS)

This assignment requires the student to write a research paper on any topic of Soviet history, including the history of Soviet puppet states. Papers must be written from the point of view of people living inside the Soviet Empire. Students must use both primary and secondary sources relevant to their research project. The final bibliography should only include sources actually cited in the text of the paper, and must include at least 12 sources, including four primary sources. Students are encouraged to exceed these limits.
Milestones: Students must pass certain milestones to demonstrate that they are making consistent progress over the course of the trimester. Students who fail to meet a milestone on time will have 4 points deducted from their final paper grade for each milestone not completed on time (= 2% of the total course mark). Milestones may be completed early, but will normally be checked in tutorials. The student has the responsibility to ensure that the instructor sees that the milestones are completed.

Milestone 1: Finding primary sources in English translation may be challenging. Students must present an introductory bibliography for their research project. This bibliography must include three (3) primary sources. Write a one-sentence description of each source explaining why it is useful. Online sources must be of citable scholarly quality.

Milestone 2: The research paper will require considerable research; procrastination will be harmful. Students must therefore present eight pages of research notes, showing that they have begun work on their essay. The expected format for research notes will be discussed in class.

Milestone 3: Many students feel they have finished their paper when they have completed the first draft, and hand in work that could be greatly improved with minor re-working. Furthermore, some students are more able and/or willing than others to ask their friends to read a draft. In tutorial, therefore, students will exchange draft papers with their peers. (The peer review is described below). Authors must include their review with their paper, and should attach a single page explaining whether or how they modified their paper in response to the criticism.

Sources: students are marked partly on their ability to locate interesting material relevant to their research question. It is the student’s responsibility to choose a research topic for which source material is available. Digital sources are acceptable, but only if they have at some point appeared in print. In other words, students may cite articles or books found through JSTOR, Google Book Search, or similar digital archives, but should not cite Wikipedia, course lectures, television programmes, blogs, etc.

PEER REVIEW (5%)

On Tuesday 13 September, all students will receive a draft paper from another student. Students must read the draft and give suggestions on how to improve it. The reviewer will then email the suggestions BOTH to the author AND to the instructor. The review must contain the following elements:

(a) The title “Review of (student name)’s paper by (student name).”
(b) A paragraph on the use of primary sources. Could the author make better use of his/her sources?
(c) A paragraph on the use of secondary sources. Could the author make better use of such sources?
(d) Any other suggestions about how to improve the paper.

The quality of the review does not depend on the quality of the paper under review: a reviewer may give brilliant advice to a terrible paper, or terrible advice to a brilliant paper. Good peer reviews will contain useful, practical suggestions to improve the paper. For example: “Add an H to ‘Solzhenitsyn’ on p. 2, line 5” is more helpful than “Correct spelling mistakes.”
The final exam tests cultural literacy. The material tested in the exam will be drawn from the course lectures and the music-film clips assigned in the syllabus. The date and time of the exam will be announced in class after the exam schedule has been drawn up. The exam will have two sections.

In the first section, worth 60% of the exam, students will receive a list of “key terms.” All will have been mentioned in lectures. Students must write a brief definition of the term and explain its significance. Students unsure what to write should imagine that they are explaining the term to somebody unfamiliar with it. Alternatively, students may focus on answering the following questions: (1) Who or what is it? (2) Where and when did it exist? (3) Why was it important?

In the second section, worth 40% of the exam, students will discuss three images and one audio-visual clip. Students must explain the political or cultural context of the image or film clip. Explain any relevant metaphors or symbolism, and discuss what political or cultural commentary the image makes on the people or events that it depicts.
FINAL EXAM SECTION A:

Explain 25 of 30 of the following key terms in the space provided. Each answer is worth three points. If you answer more than 25, your best 25 answers will be counted and weaker answers will be discarded.

1. Lavrenti Beria

2. Helsinki Watch

3. “February Revolution”

4. Color Revolutions

5. Yezhovshchina

6. Warsaw Pact