History

HIST 466  The Balkans  credit: 3 OR 4 hours.
The political, economic, and cultural history of this region's peoples, including the Rumanians, South Slavs, Greeks, and Albanians; the impact of Ottoman rule; the rise of nationalism and the formation of national states; and the Orthodox Church. 3 undergraduate hours. 4 graduate hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRN</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40146</td>
<td>Lecture-Discussion</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>09:30 AM - 10:50 AM</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>307 - Gregory Hall</td>
<td>Hitchins, K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit Hours: 4 hours
Restricted to Graduate - Urbana-Champaign.
Topic: The Peoples of Southeastern Europe between Empires: The Ottoman, the Russian, and the Habsburg, 1650-1918.
Description: The political, economic, social, and cultural history of the region between the second half of the 17th century and the end of the First World War as it evolved from medieval to modern institutions and mentalities and exchanged Ottoman Turkish predominance for independent states. We study how the peoples of Southeastern Europe--the Romanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, Greeks, and Albanians--interacted with neighboring empires (Ottoman, Habsburg, Russian) and were able to preserve their distinct identity in the 17th and 18th century and build ethnic nations in the 19th century. Among the subjects to be investigated are Ottoman institutions and the effects of Ottoman political and economic predominance south of the Danube (the Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks, and Albanians) and to the south (the Romanian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia; Transylvania) in the 18th century, the rise of national consciousness and nationalism, the emergence of modern elites (the upper middle class and lay intellectuals), the struggles for independence and the processes of nation building in the 19th century, and the role of empires in all these movements. We have also to examine the ideologies of development (liberalism, conservatism, agrarianism, and socialism), especially the acceptance or rejection of Western Europe as a model. All of this raises fundamental questions: Why did Southeastern Europe follow a course of development different from that of Western Europe? Are we justified in treating the region as distinct from the rest of Europe? If it is distinct, what are the characteristics that define it?

| 30383 | Lecture-Discussion    | U3      | 09:30 AM - 10:50 AM | TR   | 307 - Gregory Hall | Hitchins, K |

Credit Hours: 3 hours
Restricted to Undergrad - Urbana-Champaign.
Topic: The Peoples of Southeastern Europe between Empires: The Ottoman, the Russian, and the Habsburg, 1650-1918.
Description: The political, economic, social, and cultural history of the region between the second half of the 17th century and the end of the First World War as it evolved from medieval to modern institutions and mentalities and exchanged Ottoman Turkish predominance for independent states. We study how the peoples of Southeastern Europe--the Romanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, Greeks, and Albanians--interacted with neighboring empires (Ottoman, Habsburg, Russian) and were able to preserve their distinct identity in the 17th and 18th century and build ethnic nations in the 19th century. Among the subjects to be investigated are Ottoman institutions and the effects of Ottoman political and economic predominance south of the Danube (the Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks, and Albanians) and to the south (the Romanian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia; Transylvania) in the 18th century, the rise of national consciousness and nationalism, the emergence of modern elites (the upper middle class and lay intellectuals), the struggles for independence and the processes of nation building in the 19th century, and the role of empires in all these movements. We have also to examine the ideologies of development (liberalism, conservatism, agrarianism, and socialism), especially the acceptance or rejection of Western Europe as a model. All of this raises fundamental questions: Why did Southeastern Europe follow a course of development different from that of Western Europe? Are we justified in treating the region as distinct from the rest of Europe? If it is distinct, what are the characteristics that define it?