

Section I

Question 1: James Scott's *Seeing Like a State* and Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger's *The Invention of Tradition* present two different frameworks for analyzing how modern states function. Discuss at least two examples to which Scott's framework more readily applies and at least two in which Hobsbawm and Ranger's framework is more relevant. In each case, discuss how the historians ascribe agency to the citizens and/or subjects in the states they describe.

Question 2: The various European empires we discussed in the course (including territorial empires within Europe and overseas empires) can be viewed as existing in states of unstable equilibria, each harboring the seeds of their demise. Discuss the rise and fall of at least three such empires, as analyzed by the historians we read in the course, and their aftermaths from the perspective of their colonial subjects.

Section II

Question 1: Over the past generation, multiple historians have used the case of Eastern Europe to offer revisionist accounts of major issues in modern European history, including nationalism, World War One, and the Holocaust. Describe how this decentering project alters our interpretation of each of these three issues.

Question 2: In *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*, Lynn Hunt describes her task as "get[ting] at the common historical and imaginative processes that animate" the literary and artistic sources she uses, allowing her to answer questions that more traditional historical sources don't allow her to fully answer. Discuss how different cultural historians covered in this class accomplished this task in their work. Which historical questions do their approach allow them to answer, and which theories do they borrow (from philosophy, psychology, linguistics, and other disciplines) to assist them in this task?