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Following World War II, the landscape of Western Europe—physically, politically, and economically—was chaotic. The conflict left the major manufacturing centers and countryside devastated. The globe faced the daunting task of shifting back from a war-time economy. And severe political division persisted following the establishment of Soviet-led satellite states along the Iron Curtain. Add to this veritable mayhem, two major countries in this region—Germany and Italy—had just been vanquished, regarded initially with lingering suspicion, and many other nations—France especially—were still recovering from humiliating defeats. With the state of Western Europe in such a shadow of confusion, cynicism, and uncertainty, nationalism persisted—such a driving force pre-1914—ceased to be an alluring and achievable creed. The center of political, economic, and cultural center of gravity had shifted from the European continent to the peripheries—to the Soviet Union in the East and to the US in the West. As Europe to effectively reassert its traditional influence and dominance on the world scene, it would have to act not as individual
nation-state but collectively and collaboratively. For many proud Western Europeans, political and economic integration was the only truly admirable, effective solution to a Pan-Continental Renaissance. Yet, during the 2nd half of the 20th Century, such a vision faced numerous significant roadblocks: the lingering still-potent threat of Communism, ancient national rivalries, and most powerful, the national sentiments that unwilling to forfeit their country's sovereignty + cultural traditions to a polyglot European entity.

Visions of a united Europe rising from the ashes of WWII seldom often exhibited simultaneous quixotic fantasies and practical considerations. Winston Churchill's 1946 speech at Zurich demonstrates both of these elements. As one of the principal architects of Allied victory in WWII, Churchill now advocates a resurgent spirit of reconciliation between the former belligerents, France & Germany. Churchill articulates the need for the two greatest continental powers to be spiritually great and form the foundation for a united Europe (Doc 1). While Churchill's vocabulary is certainly optimistic, history is both ignore the deeply-seeded Franco-German distrust, his
Observations also smack of realism. He implicitly acknowledges Western Europe's weak position vis-à-vis the USA or, especially, the USSR. To counter this development, Churchill initiates the unified Europe movement with words of hope and a plan for the future. Acknowledging the movement's momentum, only 5 yrs later, the French Foreign Minister, Schuman invites West Germany to form a common coal and steel market. This rapid abandonment of ancient Franco-German rivalry dating back to 1648, demonstrates just how vital for European economic future this cooperation - integration truly are. (Doc 5)

Other pro-European Union advocates united Europe advocates base their views on more far-reaching goals than economic prosperity. Konrad Adenauer envisions a world community achieved much closer together via the world of modern communication, and thus speaks of the necessity of "learning to think, act in larger terms." Adenauer's message of greater cross international collaboration has at its end a more noble and more moral goal of "active peaceful life" for prosperity. (Doc 6).

In addition, European collaboration - both politically
"Economically, it was necessary in order to counterbalance the influence of the Eastern Russian colossus. Jack Lynch, Irish Prime Minister, and Spanish P.M. Felipe González both see greater cooperation as necessary security measures. Lynch speaks of the irrelevance of "cold neutrality" in interacting w/Europe (Doc 10) v. González deems NATO as "a vital step toward the consolidation of democracy." Although dreams of European unification so oftentimes come off as fanciful imagination, the ultimate move to greater cooperation was necessitated by practical national security and economic considerations.

However, the road to a united Europe was not without its share of potholes and detours. The most consistent and resolute critic of any Western collaboration was the Soviet Union. The deputy foreign minister, Vyshinsky, viewed the Marshall Plan which resurrected the Western European economy as the desire of the U.S. to place W. Europe under its "economic and political" control (Doc 3). Likewise, the Soviet political cartoon depicted the W. German Finance Minister haphazardly destroying European tariff barriers and national sovereignty (Doc 6). To the Soviets, Western economic
integration represented the devious machinations of exploitive capitalists and fiercely attempted to oppose and criticize its implementation. Another hurdle for European union was the entrenched National rivalries—esp. between France and Germany. De Gaulle relays his fears of Western European unification as ‘with a suspicion of a “revival of German power” and even “more perilous”, an “enlarged Germany.”’ (Doc 2). As you can see, many in Europe were still viewing internal affairs with the classical lens of Rismarkian Realpolitik, which needed to be abandoned if unification could ever conceivably become a reality. Finally and most pressing, the concerns over the loss of national traditions and sovereignty also served to stall the move to unification. Margaret Thatcher articulates her fear that some people’s united Europe vision would fail to “preserve the diff. traditions, parliamentary purrs, sense of pride in one’s own country.” (Doc 12)

For a region that had exercised such a lengthy and powerful dominion over world affairs, Euro unification and cooperation was a controversial proposal. However, as the drift
in that direction becomes more permanent
the many criticisms of the earlier periods are being
resolved. The product is a Europe that is
endowed with a greater global prominence and
influence but one also that is infinitely aware
of its many unique constituent cultures,
traditions, and histories.
The various views of Western European unity from 1946 to 1989 can be loosely classified as "for" or "against." Suspicions on the motives of the USA and Great Britain as well as national interests of states hindered the immediate unification. Certain states, however, would be benefitted by a more united Europe. The attitudes towards unity from 1946-1989 maintained marked changes before 1956 and after 1956 in the countries that would form the European Union by 1989.

Before 1956, there existed a fairly strong pro-unity sentiment. Although France questioned the effects such a plan would have on Germany, they seemed fairly willing (according to an Englishman, Sandys, who could have "misinterpreted" de Gaulle) to join Britain (doc. 2, 5). In fact, after de Gaulle's first term ended, France, according to Schuman, was in direct accord with both Churchill's words in his Speech at Zurich and the
West German chancellor's ideas
falling for the end of nationalism
(doc 2, 5, 6). Of course, the Soviets
suspected the USA of instigating the
unity idea in order to capitalize on
Europe's post-war status (doc 3, 4).
Obviously, the Soviets would disagree with
a proposed democratic union in Europe.

After 1956, however, certain Western
nations have a change of heart. Great
Britain, for example, becomes concerned
with its Commonwealth's health (according
to MacMillan, who just wants an "initiative...
[that will benefit us all"), and Thatcher
in'72 fears the loss of sovereignty.
de Gaulle returns & now more than ever
suspects the US and Britain of serving
their own interests while he tries to
further sovereignty in France (doc 5, 8). The
"late bloomers" of Spain & Ireland seem
slightly resentful for past "isolation",
but also willing to further democracy
as a whole (doc 10, 11). Brandt of West
Germany clings to the fact that "Marshall
caused Europe's stifled self-confidence" and "progressive
thinkers… "were not prepared for this change" (doc 9). Yes, this may have been true for these countries then (doc 1, 5, 6 validate it), but some have stepped back now. Even through the anti-US sentiments of de Gaulle & Britain's desire to protect the Commonwealth, and even Ireland and Spain arriving late on the field of debate, the EU found a hold. There is no document showing if any Eastern European Soviet satellite, specifically East Germany, would have been for or against this change, but obviously if it were up to the Soviet government they would have been rather hostile. In the end, despite changes in the key nations of Britain & France, unity became a reality.
Throughout its history, the idea of a unified Europe has met with support since its early days. However, views from particular countries have varied as to how unity would best suit its interests. There have been those who fully support the idea, those who strongly oppose, and those who accept the idea with caution. These stances have alternated with the passage of time among the European countries.

In 1946, the British Churchill voiced strong support and encouragement towards a "United States of Europe."

When the idea for a union of Europe began to gain support back in 1946, the idea was most supported by Britain, opposed by the Soviet Union and accepted but conditionally by Charles de Gaulle. Winston Churchill was a strong supporter of a "United States of Europe" and gave it much encouragement. The Russians viewed it as a sort of threat to something against their interests, and denounced the idea. De Gaulle showed interest in the idea, but had to hesitate because of the resentment between France and Germany that was still alive after World War II. And so, he withheld his complete support. Views of each country rested to a significant degree on its momentary interests.
The various views pertaining to each particular country generally changed throughout the within 1940 to 1989 regarding Western European unity. Views tended to worry between the accepting, rejecting, and a blend of both.
Pre-industrial Britain was generally home to upper classes (the landed gentry), middle classes (the merchants and skilled artisans), and lower classes (the peasants). The women, which represented these classes, were defined by the times in which they lived.

And as the Industrial Revolution arrived and matured, these women saw their roles changing in the home and the workplace.

In 1700, the Industrial Revolution had not yet reached England. The upper class woman—she whose father or husband owned land—was not expected to sit at home and remain idle. She was to run the household and manage as host social functions. She was not expected to raise her children. They had governesses, and were sent to Eaton while still small. As the girls remained with the mother, learning social skills until it was time for their entry into society and marriage.

The merchant pre-industrial woman played an even more active role. She might manage her husband’s books, or even learn the skills of his trade. She was aware of the finances and was considered a secondary associate in the shop. Her sons might be sent off to learn another skilled artisan’s trade; or more probably, learn their father’s, while her daughters would stay home and be taught the skills of the needle, maybe important aspects of the family business.

The peasant pre-industrial woman was generally married, but owned no servants. She was in charge of physically completing many duties in the home, as well as planting the land, if the husband had gone to rent himself out for work in
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Financial crises. Her duties in addition to this included the loom—she would make textiles, which merchants would collect door-to-door, paying her for her services. Her daughters would stay with the family until she was old enough to find a servant's position—perhaps a maid to a rich family—and then work until her early 20s in hopes of making enough money for a dowry to increase her appeal in marriage.

The advent of the Industrial Revolution had little impact on the landed aristocracy and their women. However, it did change the roles of women in the lower classes. As the skilled artisan disappeared, to be replaced by standard consumer production, the bourgeois middle classes took on new forms. The woman of the shopkeeper was replaced by the women of the overseers, and it became a mark of respectability for her to not work (the middle class aspired to be respectable above all else).

The lower class peasant woman was likewise affected. With the invention of Hargreaves' spinning shuttle, the making of textiles ceased to be a home business. Thus many farm women became factory women, as they and their husbands moved to the cities. Young farm women also migrated to cities to find jobs, but as urban population rose and the job market tightened, many turned to prostitution when they could do nothing else. Meanwhile, married factory women...
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found themselves working outside the home, side by side with their husbands and children in factories. This was nothing new. Women of the lower classes had always pulled as much weight as their men. The old order also showed itself later, when women continued to work the same assembly lines while their husbands were promoted to overseers. Unfortunately, the old order in a way remained: these women remained under the control of men, despite their migration to the factories.

Women from the 1700s to the 1850s did not change roles. Particularly true of lower class women, while their aristocratic counterparts remained little affected by the Revolution, the poorer females migrated and adapted to the same situation in a different context: breaking one's back in the factory instead of the farm.
Before the 1700's in England, women had no rights. Their were laws that bound them to abusive husbands. They had many children to help run family farms and businesses, and their main job was always to watch over the house in kids. They were inferior to men. But in the period from 1700 to 1850 everything changed for women. New social and economic developments were made that affected them greatly.

First of all, new work arose for women outside of the household. They could work in factories or industries and eventually stores. After the invention of the Spinning Jenny and the loom, women were able to make clothing more quickly and faster than they used to. Working conditions weren't great for them but by selling the cloth to manufacturers who made it into clothing and other things, they were able to obtain small wages that they could in return use to support their families. Women were also beginning to be able to work in "men's jobs."
They could work in mines and transportation. As the years went, things got better for women. Around the 1800's the idea that women should remain in the household came back. Jobs that required women to get dirty or put much effort into were looked down upon. Women were beginning to be seen as delicate pieces of china. They were expected to maintain the household, keep it nice and tidy, watch over the children, and cook for their husbands. They were once more inferior to men. But this day in age the government had changed the laws to where wives could divorce their husbands if they treated them disrespectfully or abused them.

A final development was a women's maternal instinct to love her child. Children began to be seen more as a level of social status than workforce. Women had less children and became emotionally attached to the children that she did have. This had huge affects on whether or not a woman would have a happy or unhappy marriage.

In conclusion, women started off as low, unimportant figures but eventually
Worked their way up the ladder. Eventually women gained full rights and the same equality as men.
During the 18th and 19th centuries, the roles of women have changed immensely. The social and economic development of women in England during this period was obvious. In the early 1700s, women's roles in the family were usually domestic. In the 18th century, women were housewives. Their responsibilities were to cook the meals of the day, clean the house, and bear children. The husband of the household would go out and work the farm with the other male children.

This all changed with the Industrial Revolution. The Industrial Revolution brought about new technologies which at first made agriculture easier, but then limited it. The agricultural families began to move to rural areas to work on the farm. These families would usually find work in factories and live in tenement housing.

As a result, women began to join the workforce. They were forced to work by the high demands of society.
The price of food and having so high, women began bringing home money to pay bills. As this changes came about in women's social and economic development came about. Women were not only in the workforce but as a result of working they were no longer able to bear as many children. Prices for food and bear necessities became so high to take care of children became too expensive. Women also began to want more freedoms and rights. They felt if they worked just as much as a man why not get paid just as much? Women began fighting for their rights of equality a constant struggle that to this day hasn't ended.

In conclusion throughout the period of the 1700's and 1850's European women's social and economic lives have changed. Although today women have more rights than ever before, were they still continue fighting for equality.
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Key features of the development of new monarchies from 1450 - 1550 included pacification of the nobility, control of church & increase in trade & economic prosperity, as seen in the 15th & 16th cent. English & Spanish monarchies.

In the middle ages, centralization of power, which is vital for monarchical success, was undermined by the power of the nobility. In order for the new monarchies to establish themselves, the issue of renegade nobles had to be addressed. England was fortunate in that by the ascension of Henry VII, much of the nobility was eliminated in the War of Roses between Lancaster & York Houses. Henry VII sealed the conflict completely by uniting the two houses by his marriage. Thus, English nobility was, for the time being, tamed. True Spanish unification began with the 1469 marriage between Isabella of Castile & Ferdinand of Aragon. These were the 2 biggest provinces in Spain & their unification, as well as the monarch's alliance with the merchant class, put the nobility at a great enough disadvantage that the monarchy was able to effectively consolidate their power. Thus, we see that unification & subsequent pacification of nobility was a key feature of "new monarchies," as it allowed them to grow.

Next to the noble, the Roman Catholic Church &
the Papacy were the next biggest threat for monarchies, because the Church ultimately commanded the loyalty of the unity. Both England's Henry XIII and Spain's Charles V were able to command the Church to serve it to their own advantage. Around 1534, Henry XIII, son of Henry XII, began to unite his nation by proclaiming himself "Head of Church of England". This was driven by his want of divorce from Catherine of Aragon, a move which would bear him no heir. Because the Pope would not sanction the divorce, Henry passed the Act of Supremacy, which made him the aforementioned Head of Church. Subsequent acts cut payments to the Pope, cutting England off from the Papacy and ensuring unity. This act did not signify religious rebellion, for Henry XIII proved himself loyal to Catholicism in his Six Articles' denouncement of Protestantism. Charles V had similar success by securing his election in 1519 as Holy Roman Emperor, constituting Spain as exclusively Catholic. Before him, the 1492 Granada was anti-Muslim, wars & Jewish expulsion under Isabella & Ferdinand cleared Spain of those factions & made Catholic unification easier. By commanding religion, further new monarchies were able to secure power.
Expansion of trade lead to prosperity, exploration was an integral part of to new monarchies, Spain pioneered to movement with Isabella and Ferdinand's sponsoring of Columbus. The new world was discovered in 1492. Subsequent voyages, such as 1501 Vasco de Fanez, cortes and Magellan, secured for Spain a steady flow of precious metals. Ironically, to surplus of gold caused inflation & contributed to Spain's later downfall. England's control of to Americas & East & West Indies, like Spain secured for them wealth, trade, power & prestige. Unification in to taming of nobility, control of to Church & expansion of trade & exploration were all major characteristics of to 'new monarchies'.
The period from 1450 to 1550 in Europe saw the rise of the new monarchies and the triumph of the modern state. Out of this period arose dominant European powers who, by shaping and uniting their nations, changed greatly the face of the European continent. Among these great nations were France and Spain. Henry Navarre of France came to power by adopting the ideology of a politique and by appeasing the wishes of certain religious factions, while Ferdinand and Isabella also used religion as a means of assuming power, instead of appeasement. They purged Spain of all that wasn't Catholic and manipulated religious homogeneity as a way to increase nationalism. Both monarchies also used economics as a means to secure their power.

The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries left France in a state of turmoil and disorder. Nobles and leaders were competing for the monarchy by manipulating the religious of the people. Henry IV of Navarre rose to power because of his ability to adopt the politique ideology, originally developed by French philosopher Jean Bodin. Henry of Navarre, originally a Huguenot or French Protestant, realized after escaping St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre where
Thousands of Protestants were slaughtered that he would have to sacrifice his personal religious sentiments in order to bring France into a state of order. Henry IV rose to power after converting to Catholicism, saying that "Paris is worth a mass." However, in order to ameliorate Protestant dissent, he issued the Edict of Nantes, granting Protestants in France civil liberties and the right to private worship. Once in power, he and his chief advisor Scylla secured the power of the monarch by installing a system of tax collection and building up a somewhat strong national army.

After the unifying of Castile and Granada and thus the formation of Spain under the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella in the late fifteenth century, the Spanish monarchy began its quest toward religious homogeneity and the triumph of Catholicism. The King and Queen expelled the Jews and the Muslims and even set up an Inquisition which questioned and tortured the converts to Catholicism-the Moors and the Moriscos. The Inquisition inspired a form of religious-Spanish nationalism which solidified Spain's role as a nation-state. Similar to Henry IV
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of France, the Spanish monarch used economics to build up and secure their role as a European power, although instead of tax collection Isabella initiated the foundation of a mercantilist policy in Spain.

Both monarchs manipulated religion as a means to gain power and built up the economy to assure this power.
From 1450 to 1550 many countries in Europe began to experience a phenomenon known as the "New Monarchy." New monarchs were generally extremely staunch supporters of centralization and enlightenment. Two states who directly experienced these new monarchs were Russia and Spain.

In Russia, the actions of tsars like Peter the Great and Catherine the Great led to westernization and an increase in the power of the tsar. Westernization led to the modernization and secularization of the historically orthodox population of Russia. St. Petersburg was built, beards were shaved, and Russia was never the same again. Tsars now had power that literally put them in control of their subjects' lives. The rise of this new breed of rulers in Russia was spurred initially by the spread of Enlightenment in Europe and also by the inability of the peasants to do anything about it. For centuries they had been reduced to nothing and were in no position to stand up for themselves against these new tyrants either.

In Spain, the New Monarchy came via Ferdinand and Isabella. These two
A fostered Centralization simply by conquering or expelling anyone or anything that wasn't the standard. The conquered the Turks and expelled the Jews; both actions proved desirable for the future of Spain. The factors that led to the rise of these new monarchs mostly have to do with a sense of Spanish nationalism felt by its citizens and also unity under the Catholic Church. These two groups to which the Standard Spaniard belonged led to a feeling of community and when Ferdinand and Isabella made some moves to strengthen and protect this community, the population couldn't do anything but support them.

Spain and Russia are just two in a long list of countries that came under the influence of New Monarchs during this time period. This increased influence led to general centralization and spread of the Enlightenment through almost all of Europe.
Martin Luther and King Henry VIII both broke away from the Catholic Church during the Reformation. Martin Luther broke away only after failing to initiate reform because he opposed the sale of indulgences, while Henry VIII broke away and declared himself head of the Church of England because the Pope refused to grant him a divorce.

Luther did not originally intend to create a new church when he wrote his 95 Theses. This document attacked many Catholic traditions, such as the sale of indulgences, and the authority of the Pope and his system of hierarchical cardinals and bishops. Luther believed that the Bible was the chief authority of the church and that the authority of the Pope was not justified. He also believed that men were saved by faith, not confession of sins. The Catholic Church refused to consider his views that services should be conducted in the vernacular language. When the Catholic Church refused to consider Luther's proposed reforms, Luther broke away to form his own church based on his religious beliefs.

Henry VIII, on the other hand, was not inspired so much by religious belief as by his desire to divorce his wife. He asked for a divorce, and like Luther he was turned down by the supreme Papal authorities. Henry reacted with the Act of Supremacy, declaring himself head of the Church of England whereupon he immediately granted himself a divorce.

Luther's Church developed a following in his native
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Germany. Henry VIII's Act of Supremacy forced the church on the citizens of England, many of whom remained loyal to the Catholic Church, even though Henry's wife had not produced a male heir to rule the future English throne. Both Henry VIII and Luther were guided by their beliefs: Luther believed in salvation by faith, and Henry believed in the necessity of a male heir. However, Henry's beliefs were more. However, Luther's ultimate decision to break away was guided by faith, while Henry's was guided by political and personal political interests, which involved producing a male heir.
The Age of Reformation which began with Martin Luther’s 95 Theses in 1517 (Germany) motivated other courageous men to do the same, one of which happened to be England’s own King Henry VIII who decided to break with the Catholic Church (like Luther) in the mid-16th century. These two men brought about religious change with their strong devotion, earnest desire, and current unhappiness with previous outcomes. Luther and Henry VIII were willing to risk everything to make the jump to reform.

Martin Luther and King Henry VIII were both deeply devoted to the Christian religion at first, but soon changed their belief after the discovery of reform. Luther was presenting a monk teaching at the University of Wittenberg, Germany (1517) when he nailed his 95 Theses to the church door on All Hallows Eve. He had trained to worship Christianity from birth on, and it was not until his confessions that he realized the horrific church abuses. In his book, Luther denies the 7 sacraments, the importance of the scriptures, the sale of indulgences, church relics, and frequent priests’ illiteracy. Like Henry VIII, Luther is willing to make a stand against the Roman Catholic Church, and here after is attacked by Pope Leo X and SURPRISINGLY Henry VIII himself (“The Defender of the Faith” for denouncing Luther). However, Luther wins the admiration of the German princes and helps them establish sovereignty and quit paying Rome titles. Henry VIII also rebels early on by forming his Church of England under Anglicanism and establishes himself as the head, mainly because he wanted a divorce with Catherine of Aragon.
These two men won't let anything stand in the way; not even those devoted to them. Luther quickly gained the support of the German peasants, but reviled them in "Against the Riddle of Richness, Peasants (1925), where after they were attacked by the nobility.

King Henry VIII beheaded his own chancellor Thomas More after More refused to acknowledge the king's supremacy of the church - he was a strong Christian. Both Luther and Henry VIII had the desire to succeed in their supremacy, not in their plans of action.

Martin Luther was officially a monk when he proposed his ideas to be read and the world, but Henry VIII quickly agreed to the establishment of Anglicanism in England. Henry VIII was also a very popular and strong ruler, where all Martin Luther made enemies nearly every where he went (minor, peasants, wives). Henry immediately abolished 40,000 Catholic church laws and followed some Catholic procedures (priests, mass - but all in English).

The motives of Martin Luther and Henry VIII were similar in the way that they shared the same desires of reform, but they approached their solution a different way each with a different approach.
At a time when classes were strictly separated, only religion was a common characteristic of all. Martin Luther rebelled against the Catholic Church because he believed differently and Henry VII rebelled because of marital problems. Martin Luther posted his 95 theses to show his strong belief that the Catholic Church was wrong. His views differed from things like faith to the selling of indulgences. While Luther started a new religion he didn't support rebellion in all aspects of life. Luther forced no one to adopt Protestantism. He left the choice of religion to the people.

Henry VII of England was in favor of Protestantism because he needed a divorce and the Catholic Church wouldn't allow it. He had no differing beliefs other than he wanted a divorce. He wasn't changing religions for a valid cause. Henry converted his religion.
Protestantism to solve his want. Luther and Henry's actions are not the same, while they did go against the accepted social norms, Henry's motivation was purely selfish. Luther made a sacrifice and helped open the world to different religions. Luther acted on strong belief and Henry VIII on personal gain.
During 1880 and 1914, mass politics began to rise because of the entrenched establishment of the ideas of liberalism and nationalism that were propagated especially during the 1820s. This new trend of mass politics was apparent in the liberal nationalistic states of Britain, France, and Italy.

After the extension of the voting rights to the middle class in the mid 19th century, British politics began to alter. This enlargement of the political process led to a focus in the discontent of industrialism. Ultimately, British mass politics contributed to reforms in working conditions. Part of that movement of course, was due to the greater presence of union who mobilized masses to demand reform. The mass politics extending into nationalism as the people voiced their support for the British Empire.

France made the move to mass politics during the Third Republic. While a relatively more subdued period in contrast to
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.

the ephemeral glory and embarrasing defeat of Napoleon III, as well as the anarchy of the Paris Commune, politics spread to the people even more (after all the French public had been quite active from 1789 to 1870. As in Britain, mass politics only fed nationalist feelings in France. This phenomenon was also exemplified by Man-Scandal which was seen in the Dreyfus Affair.

By 1880, Italy had been united for little over a decade. While immigration was extremely high in the South as well as poverty in the North of Italy, at least became involved in the period of mass politics. In Italy, this led to nationalist sentiment that brought about the conquest of Libya and Ethiopia. Mass politics also increased about the rise of groups such as anarchists who were particularly active in Italy.

The roots of this mass politics phenomenon have much to do with a rise in the European standard of living. As literacy
increased, Europeans could be better informed
as to what was going on around them.
This along with more liberal laws regarding
freedom of the press led to an exchange
of ideas. Also as the general standard
of living rose in Europe people had the
ability to focus on politics rather than
be concerned with the daily task of
survival. In addition the spread of nationalism
sentiment urged people to value something
greater than their family, town or province.

Ultimately this was politics, which was
partially a result of nationalism, began to
further strengthen nationalism and imperialism
in Europe. Ultimately, this would lead to
WWI after which much of Europe would
abandon the more political model for the
totalitarianism in hopes of achieving the
stability that mass politics did not provide.
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.

Many events led to the rise of mass politics and in turn had many effects on European politics. Major changes in how governments ran took place which set the stage for the rise in mass politics. Because of these significant changes, European politics of the time felt its effects.

This rise came about because of many changes in European's government's. Power had shifted from the monarchy to the parliament, voters, and other high-ranking officials. Suffrage was issued to an increasing number of people and the class barriers became increasingly smaller. This led to people of all types and backgrounds speaking up for themselves and what they wanted. It was these significant developments that brought up mass politics in the period of 1880 to 1914 in Europe.

The changes had a vast effect on politics, because the people had more say and voting rights, campaigning grew and increased. More opportunities were created because now parliaments made decisions and not one soul monarch. But also, it increased involvement, an example being the 1914 events that led
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5.

To World War I. Austrian heir Francis Ferdinand was assassinated but notice it caused World War not Austrian War. Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United all joined by choice. A choice might not have been an option in the past. The rise of mass politics changed the face of European politics forever.

The changes in how governments were ran and an increase in citizens' involvement led to the rise of mass politics. These changes led to many new opportunities in governing and in living the greatly effected Europe's political make up.
The phenomenon of mass politics was definitely on the rise from 1880 to 1914. During these times, people's ideas on how to rule a nation were changing dramatically. Mass politics consisted of new rulers and ideas evolving from country to country. This rise of mass politics had a big impact on European politics mostly. Throughout this time, the ideas of kings and queens were disappearing and new ideas of democracy and communism came about.

In democratic-based countries like the U.S., people were given freedom and choices and chances of equality. Some European countries also followed behind in the ideas of democracy for their people.

While some countries insisted on communism, in those communist countries or even in the democratic ones, there were constantly people rebelling and beginning their own ideas and rules that they felt would work better in their country. So there were people constantly trying to overthrow the current leader to have the position for themselves, like Hitler and Mussolini. They had their own views and ideas and wanted to have others follow them. They also had an advantage because of their alliance with the military and previous jobs in the government. Politics was a big thing in Europe. Each ruler could be challenged by someone who wanted to overthrow
Thru. Politics in Europe grew as communism spread. These dictators were an example of politics and how things can turn out. Politics during this time was based on power.
Karl Marx, in his book *The Communist Manifesto*, would outline his political and economic beliefs for the future. During and then after the Russian Revolution of 1917 the Bolsheviks would try to carry out Marx's ideals but in the end politics and individual goals would have a bigger impact than would Marx's ideals.

The Russian Revolution would start with workers' marches and demonstrations protesting the war and bread rationing. Women marched in Petrograd. This would set off strikes and other demonstrations, with the tsar quickly having to admit defeat and abdicate. This was in conjunction with Marx's belief that it would be the workers who would overthrow the oppressive governments. During the Russian Civil War, to win the Bolsheviks would nationalize industry and agriculture but afterwards Lenin would allow limited capitalism to revive the economy. The nationalization of industry supposedly put the means of production into workers' hands, but in reality the government was now in control. After the end of the war, Lenin would provide for temporary fallback
from Marx’s ideals with the National Economic Plan (NEP). This would allow people to return to capitalism for their own profit.

After the death of Lenin, there would be an internal conflict in the Party between Stalin and Trotsky, those who wanted to keep the NEP and those who favored a return to Communist ideals, including the spread of Communism around the world. Stalin would emerge from this conflict as the leader and he hadn’t truly supported one side or another of the debate. While Stalin would return to collectivization, from that point forward the Soviet Union wasn’t so much a Communist state as a Stalinist state. While Stalin continued to be guided somewhat by Marx’s ideas, most policy was what he decided upon. The workers, who Marx said would be the leaders all-together, weren’t in control but were at the mercy of Stalin’s machinering. Stalin would use the excuse of not complying with party doctrine to get rid of people who opposed him.

Marx’s economic and political ideals
were ostensibly realized after the Russian Revolution but would be superseded by loyalty to the state and, therefore, Stalin.
The communist revolution, as envisioned by Karl Marx, would be marked by violent proletarian uprisings, foreseeing the oppressive role of capitalist aristocrats and taking everything as property held in common by everyone who worked it. This was not an agricultural revolution of land-starved peasants, as occurred in Russia, nor was it to be headed by anyone person but a collection of people representing the people. There was to be no Lenin, no autocracy, and his vision called for an already industrialized country in which he saw the proletariat as capable of communal life, rather than the backward and agricultural society of the peasants in Russia. Lenin's attempt to fix this lack of industry resulted in the growth of an autocratic government which, rather than being of and serving the peasants and lower classes, resulted in abysmal conditions of poverty and morale that decimated the population. Yet through all this hardship and seeing incongruity with Marxist thought the communist ideals shown through and, though they were never fully realized, continued to motivate the Russian communist state.

The revolution, in Marxist thought, that would bring about the fall of capitalism was to begin in the lowest classes of society, the industrial workers. This proletarian
was to seize control of the factories in which they worked and overthrow the government—particularly the indolent middle class, or bourgeoisie. Yet in revolutionary Russia there was no great heaving mass of angry workers, because the country was not industrialized. This not only created inequalities within the communist revolution itself but serious economic hardship for the Bolsheviks following their seizure of power. Stalin, in an attempt to rectify this fact which, had all that Marx predicted come to pass, would not have existed, due to a strong industrial economy, introduced legislation in which all farms and factories be held in common rather than factories. Yet this also proved disastrous, for according to Marx people would do this willingly, provided they keep the profits of their labor, whereas Lenin had the produce of communal farms shipped to provide for those people otherwise exploited. Economically, the commune was established at its profit spread resulting in the un-Marxian discontent of the communal laborers. Economically as well, Lenin and the communist beliefs of the Russian government failed to follow exactly the teachings of Marx. For in marxism all citizens of a country were to be equal and agreement would function only in so much as to defend its happy workers from outside invaders. Russian communism.
However, in response to discontent with the economic situation, first coins five-year plans and then an increase of power in the hands of an individual veered away from the egalitarian prediction of Marx. Such consolidation of political and military control was, however, necessary in order to quell dissent and threats to communism within Russia. For in the Marxist view following a bloody rebellion the worker would be just as well served by communism that there would be no need of KGB's, internal exile and totalitarianism as was found necessary in Russia to preserve its communist state.

Through the revolutions of 1917 and the downfall of the monarchy would have served as a logical beginning—bloody revolution—to Marxist predictions. Pre-existing economic conditions of Russia made a true communist revolution and government not possible. Ill equipped through their lack of industrialization to handle the economic fallout and political realities of Marxist philosophy, postrevolutionary Russia under Stalin did so to the best of its ability. In order to survive as a functioning government and attempt to provide for their people some ideological sacrifices were made and though the U.S.S.R. remained communist in philosophy practical concessions were politically necessary.
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Karl Marx believed that industrialization would cause a proletariat revolt in which the government would be overthrown, and a new economic system would take power. These ideals of this society were put into action in postrevolutionary Russia. Economically, collectivization of farms and large factories occurred. Politically, a single ruler was put in charge to ensure that people were given equality. Socially, the gap between the rich and the poor. Thus, to a great extent, the ideals of Karl Marx were achieved in postrevolutionary Russia from 1917 to 1939.

Karl Marx believed in a leveling of the economic playing field. He found it to be unjust that some people owned large factories while others had next to nothing. He therefore felt that all people should be valued equally, and profit equally from the work they do. In postrevolutionary Russia, the National Economic Plan (NEP) instituted by Lenin as well as Stalin's Five Year Plans, worked to collectivize farms and factories. This would help to bring all farms under government control, so the people would all work together to produce the same amount, and then the government would be given as much of the products
as they needed. People no longer made

Politically, Karl Marx believed that after a stage of Socialism, where the government regulated the production and consumption of goods, the need for the government would disappear and all people would be treated as be equal. In post-revolutionary Russia, the first Socialist stage, was established by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Under his rule, the economic changes occurred so that the government owned all of the land and regulated how much of each good was produced and how much each person received. This continued under Stalin, and more was done to gain control of all of the land. However, Russian communism never reached the Karl Marx's point where the government was no longer needed, as Gorbachev's reforms resulted in a more capitalistic society and the end to this Communist period.

Socialism, communism Karl Marx's ideas were also intended to cause great social change. In the proletariat's rise against the bourgeoisie, the class hierarchy of society would vanish. In Russia, the collectivisation of farms and factories caused people with large plantations to lose their land, so they had just as little as those with
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Nothing. Factory owners lost their factories to the government, causing them to be in the same position as factory workers. This, therefore, resulted in a closing of the gap between the rich and the poor.

Karl Marx's ideas were against everything capitalism stood for, and post-revolutionary Russia became a nation with a different political system than all other European nations. Economically, collectivization of farms and big businesses leveled the economic playing field and ended capitalist aggression. Politically, the government took control of the economy and worked to meet the needs of the people. Socially, the usurpation of land from large landowners closed the gap between the rich and the poor. Thus, post-revolutionary Russia was able to achieve, to a great extent, the social, political, and economic ideals of Karl Marx through the establishment of a society with whose peer capitalistic aggression no longer existed and the people were equal.
The period of time from 1650-1800 was a time of great exploration, discovery, and overall freedom for Western European countries. All of these things led to its domination of world trade over the rest of the European countries. Because of new technology, economic systems, and freedom, Western Europe dominated world trade from 1650-1800.

There were many new technological devices that were discovered by explorers and navigators from 1650-1800. One of these things was the astrolabe, a widely used instrument which pointed north, showing navigators which way they were traveling. The astrolabe led to the magnetic compass, and finally the compass that is used today. Another new technology was the cannon, which enabled ships to destroy competitors on the seas. A third new technology was a new ship, which was designed so that it would not need as much wind or man power to move around, and it travelled faster than the older ships. All of these technologies led to more overall
navigation and travel by sea, which led to discovery of new places. In new places were new goods and items, foreign and enticing to the rest of European countries, causing those other countries to want to trade with the western European countries, particularly Spain (which had Christopher Columbus) and the Netherlands (the Dutch East and West India Trading Companies). In that way, Western Europe had the technology to dominate trade from 1650-1800.

A big economic factor that caused Western Europe to dominate trade was mercantilism, which was practiced mostly by Spain from 1650-1800. Spain collected gold and silver from its colonies in the New World and became extremely rich that other countries wanted to trade with it, helping Western Europe dominate trade. Britain also had its American colonies (before the Revolution in 1776), and it brought back goods uncommon in Europe, causing other countries to desire to trade with Britain, as well, which also helped Western Europe flourish.
Another reason Western Europe dominated world trade from 1600-1800 was because it was so institutionally advanced. Groningen College was built, which specialized in technology training. Explorers to travel to the New World and seek goods which they could bring back and trade. In addition, Western European countries granted freedoms to their people, allowing them to do new things and explore, while some other countries, such as Russia, still practiced feudalism or other ways of enslaving the majority of their people. Since Western European countries allowed their people to try new things, learn, and explore, it was their people, not those enslaved in other countries, who could navigate the seas and come back with goods to trade, making Western Europe dominate world trade.

All of these things—the new technologies, economic policies, colonies, institutions, and freedoms—were factors that brought back new goods from other places to Western Europe. These goods, which were new and exciting to other countries, truly
Sparked their interests in trading, which led, ultimately, to western Europe dominating world trade, from less to 1000.
Europe not only dominated world trade from 1650 to 1800, but also dominated almost every other aspect of life in the world in that period. Due to Europe's strong economic position, thriving technological advancements, and supreme use of institutional power and placement, they were able to control the world's trade from 1650 to 1800.

Economically, Europe was stable throughout this period. During the industrialization process in the late 1700s to early 1800s, Europe's economy thrived, growing constantly as factories took over once calm countrysides. Europe was also in control of colonies that produced goods exported throughout the world. By controlling profitable colonies, Europe was making a huge profit of the exports from colonies as well as imports. Europe had industrialization and extremely profitable colonies to keep them economically well off in this period.

Because of the industrialization, Europe was the leader in technological advancements in the period of 1650 to 1800. Along with industrialization came the invention of machines including the spinning Jenny, the steam engine, and the printing press years before. These inventions enabled Europe to start the trend of a consumer economy. With the ability of mass production, Europe was able to easily provide goods for its own countries as well as ship around the world. Transportation by way of boat
had improved greatly as well as the make-up of air transportation. Technological advancements allowed greater amounts of imports as well as easier methods of transportation.

Finally, institutional factors that made Europe dominate world trade include powerful countries as well as ownership of colonies. Europe itself was comprised of a multitude of powerful countries including Britain, France, Italy, Germany, and Russia. Powerful countries provided a basis for domination of trade industries and a background of knowledge in domination. Having powerful monarchies allowed Europe to use its power to manipulate smaller countries and thus control trade. Also, as stated before, owning colonies in strategic locations as well as with useful goods gave Europe the upper hand with trade.

So Europe's domination of trade is easily explained by looking at its economic stability and technological advancements through the industrialization and its institutional factors of being comprised of powerful countries owning useful colonies.
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.

Prior to 1650, events occurred in Western Western Europe and spread across to the Eastern half. The agricultural revolution created the food surplus needed to allow a peasant migration to more urban settings. Inventions that made agriculture more efficient led to the enclosure movement which put small farming peasants out of business. An out of work farmer had a few options, either seek employment from the noble who enclosed the shared land and migrate to a city to seek employment or work domestically as part of the cottage system which was taking flight during this time. All of this lead to the Industrial Revolution starting in England and spread from there to France and later Germany.

The decline of the Spanish dominance as an economic power changed the focus from colonization to mercantilism. Mercantilism was the belief that countries should try to
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be self-sufficient; that even amounts of both silver and gold exist and that if you export more than you import you are offsetting the gold balance in your favor. If one is attaining gold then it must be coming from one of your rival countries. France and England became the centers for trade instead of Spain or Portugal.

Later in the period of 1650–1800, mercantilism would die out and enlightened despotism would surface with Joseph II, Maria Theresia, and Frederick the Great. They would change how Europe was run by freeing surfe, expanding commerce, and other things. By the late 18th century the spotlight turns to Europe as a whole and until Europe is sought after.