The Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries revolutionized thought and learning. Scholasticism and humanism were replaced with rationalism and the scientific method—empiricism. Scientists were aided by funding by some governments, while others could reject findings that conflicted with their authority. Scientists, or philosophers, were both praised and condemned by religious authorities for either glorifying the intellect of God through research or delving into matters of which only the Scriptures had intellectual authority. The society of other scientists allowed them to combine ideas, while women's expected role kept them from succeeding in the same realm. All in all, we see that political, religious, and social factors could both aid and hold back the work of scientists.

As science was popularized in the Enlightenment, governments found they could gain wealth and prestige through funding and encouraging scientific research. Jean Baptiste Colbert, finance minister to absolutist Louis XIV, knew this well and suggested that they cause "the arts and science to flourish" by establishing "several academies for both letters and sciences." This would increase the "splendor and happiness of the State." (Doc. 1). In fact, Louis XIV had visited the French Royal Academy six years before Colbert sent him this letter, as shown in Document 10, showing his consideration for the activities and possible funding of the Academy. Still, political patrons of the sciences had power to censor or reject the findings of their protégés. One French monic and natural philosopher, [Name],


Marxene, told his patron directly in writing, "If you object to anything, I am ready to remove it entirely." (Doc 5).

That said, he went on to assert the validity of his experiments. Marxene was willing to make his work acceptable to his noble patron because he needed the funding. Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher, reasoned that humans were inherently guilty in the state of nature and that they required a strong leader to create order out of the chaos that would naturally ensue. In his 1658 work, "Leviathan," he reasoned that "few men care what the truth may be, since it affects no one's ambition," but if truth (science) "conflicted with the interests of those who rule,... it would be suppressed." Thus, Hobbes' thinking shows how political patrons or leaders in general had absolute authority even over scientific findings.

Scientists/natural philosophers' work was also affected dualistically by religious factors. Many scientists were religious themselves and sought to reconcile their discoveries with teachings of the Church. Early in the period, Nicolaus Copernicus, dedicated his book, "On the Revolution of the Heavenly Spheres," to Pope Paul III because of the pope's "love of letters and science." He asserted that he believed his "labors contribute even to the well-being of the Church." (Doc 1)

This is illuminating, considering many felt his concept of a heliocentric universe to be insulting to the human race, God's ultimate creation. Later in the period, a religious German philosopher, Gottfried Leibnitz, showed analytically that since "God governs minds," the products of human minds could better enforce the "happiness of the good and the
punishment of the evil." (Dec 12). Even a non-scientist theologian, John Calvin, called astronomy an art which "unfolds the admirable wisdom of God." (Dec 2). On the other hand, some religious people felt that science threatened religion. According to Italian monk Giambattista della Porta, Galileo should have "deferred to the authority of those who have jurisdiction over the human intellect in matters of the interpretation of scripture." He wrote this in reaction to the Galileo's discoveries and interpretations of light differences on the moon. The more reasoned that his opinions could lead to the questioning of the Bible, over which the Galileo had no authority. In Dec 8, Walter Charleton, not a member of the clergy, negated the idea that atoms could have Godlike abilities—being "eternal or self-governed." Only God could control the "creation and arrangement of the atoms." Thus, he set boundaries on how far science could go in explaining the universe. Only God could have set it in motion.

Finally, scientists benefited from scientific communities within society, while society kept women scientists in their place. In general, science was seen as a benefit to society. Francis Bacon, the founder of empiricism, defined the goal of science as "this: that human life be endowed with new discoveries and powers." A scientist himself, he was probably enamored with this goal. Throughout the Enlightenment, Academies across Europe scientific institutions and societies sprang up during this era. As a result, scientists were able to work...
together and share ideas. Henry Oldenburg of the English Royal Society recognized that "philosophy" would be raised to its greatest heights through "friendship among learned men." The only real negative societal factor shown through these documents was that of gender roles. Women scientists were thought to neglect their households, which was where a woman was meant to be. They could not keep up with fashion and just were not appealing to society. Many thought women's minds were inferior to those of men. Those who were neutral on the subject kept them out of Scientific organizations because they were simply too distractingly out of the norm. Margaret Cavendish came across these hurdles as she attempted to succeed in natural philosophy. In December 9 she learnt that because she is a woman, she cannot "set up her own school of natural philosophy" as she would like.

Thus we see that politics, religion, and society could affect the work of scientists in both negative and positive ways, but through it all science prospered.
- From the 16th century on, the studies of scientific explanations and investigations in the world of science were inevitable. More and more people were anxious to receive scientific explanations to that they didn't know. Science became a major subject in human life. For that reason, the interest in science increased. The development of science was affected by religious, political and social factors.

Politically, science was promoted by a great amount of powerful leaders, who sought to give science the same importance as philosophy. As seen on document 10, leaders like the ultra-religious Louis XIV enjoyed visits to the newly opened French Royal Academy, showing interest for the new art of science. Even his advisor Colbert, admitted the importance of science to enrich the culture of a nation, in this case France. (Document 11)

Soon enough, scientists realized that in order to improve their scientific developments, it was necessary to cooperate with neighboring countries. This was suggested by the Secretary of the E. R. S Henry Oldenbury. (D. 6). But perhaps what affected the scientists' work most, was the social factors. Of course, if the sciences would interfere with the leader's policies, they would be suppressed. (D. 7) According to Hobbes,
Science would be permitted as long as it didn't become too big. Science of course made a great appeal to the population of a country. People were anxious to hear about the new inventions or achievements, ...

"human life be endowed with new discoveries and power." (Bacon, D. 4). It was part of Bacon's plan, not a scientist himself, to spread the word about the new scientific discoveries. The appeal of science to society could be all but negative. Discoveries lead "to an Infinite Wisdom and Power." (D.8)

Some people even started to do research of their own. Unfortunately they did not succeed. It can be deduced that women (failed due to) like Margaret Cavendish, would fail or fail, due to their genre. Most science was not meant for women. Genre was not only the problem. Just like in the art world, it was necessary to have a patron to sponsor them, and be able to develop their theories. (D.5)

Otherwise, they would fail certainly fail.

Religiously, science was either criticized and accepted, depending on how radical the ideas were. Science was considered a dangerous subject, for it was simple men playing with the rules of God, or religion. Then again, most scientists were religious. Copernicus, one of
the most important astronomers showed his respect to Pope Paul III, showing how his discoveries would be beneficial for the church. (D.1).

John Calvin even admitted that "this art (astronomy) unfolds the admirable wisdom of God." (D.2)

Gottfried Leibniz suggested a theory sort of like Deism, in which God created the world, leaving the rest to the humans. (D.12) Against scientific theories, were people who thought that scientific would be harmful for society and the church. (D.3)

So, in other words, scientists benefited from political, social, and religious factors in order to develop the new scientific discoveries.
Scientists of the 17th century faced obstacles that
coordinated with desires of the government. Religion
being one of the problems that scientists faced was
due to the fact that science challenged faith.
Religion was a motive of the government that allowed
rulers to influence controls and give a government
stability; such as Louis XIV actions on the Edict of
Nantes show, or Elizabeth's I methods of taking control
creating stability. However, until the Scientific Revolution,
scientists were not and the decline of religious authority,
moved notably the Peace of Westphalia in 1648,
scientists were not supported by the government.
fully supported by the government, social, political,
and Religious barriers got in the way of scientists
until the potential of science was completely understood.
The introduction of science pulled away from the
flow of society and was therefore unimpeded by
religious belief. Scientists such as Copernicus, Nicolas
Cassinius were immediately infringed and criticized
by their contribution to science. Even
though certain establishments, such as the Jesuits,
were well aware of the potential the scientists
had to offer, it was important that religious
beliefs, that influenced society so greatly, would not
be brought down by the new introduction and of these.
Scientific analogies. However, as Marin Mersenne shows; the acceptance of science was progressing, and creating a skeptical view of the world. John Calvin, and Giovanni Campani were members of society that still questioned the scientists.

As science progressed to the 18th century, the impact of science became stronger and developed a new understanding of life. However, it wasn't until the Enlightenment period, that science had such a big impact on social issues. Nevertheless, gender roles began to develop and coordinate with science. Women also played a role. Marin Mersenne, Margaret Cavendish, were among them. The impact of scientists and social behavior brought the foundation for change.

As I mentioned, the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 helped the progress of scientific study as religion was beginning to lose authority. The government began to refine the production of scientific study. Louis XIV was influenced, created many institutions that helped the growth of science, while his finance minister, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, also supported, along with the elegance and splendor of the French art, scientific study. Colbert's policy for expanding France certainly coordinated with the growth of science, as did Henry Oldenburg.
While scientists from the 1500s to the 1700s were shaped by social, religious, social, and political circumstances and events, it would not be long until the science would drastically and easily change their lifestyle. The Scientific Revolution would pave the way for attempts at social reform in the Enlightenment, and indeed certainly play a role in the development of the French Revolution. An interesting trend of change.
In the 16th and 17th centuries, religious and sexual prejudices, in addition to bad harvests, caused a large number of people to die as suspected witches. The decline in this outbreak can be accounted for in a reduction in religious tension and better harvests.

This period was a time of intense Protestant-Catholic tension. By the end of the 15th century, the two groups had polarized into opposing camps which frequently fought for ascendancy. One explanation for the witchcraft trials could be that each group was accusing its opponent of heresy and witchcraft because of opposing beliefs. These tensions also created an atmosphere of deep suspicion, which further contributed to the witch hunts. These suspicions were supported by the churches, both Protestant and Catholic, that always included witches as part of religious doctrine. Most of the witch hunt victims were elderly women. Social and economic factors greatly contributed to their persecution. Women at the time were considered to be morally and intellectually inferior, and therefore more susceptible to possession by the Devil. These views made women easy targets for societal problems. These possessed women were said to have caused the
bad weather, and therefore failed crops that characterized this period. In addition, the elderly were targets because the community no longer had the resources to support them, and because of the wide variety of diseases that afflicted the elderly. These prejudices contributed to the choice of victims.

Recent scholarship suggests that the worst instances of witch persecution were also the coldest winters in the 16th century. This evidence further connects the economic climate with the persecution. In all stages of European history, there is a general trend toward societal unrest in times of economic hardship.

This economic hardship was alleviated, however, in the later part of the 17th century. The religious tensions of the previous century had not gone away, but conflict such as the Thirty Years' War seemed to show people the destructive nature of religious conflict. In short, Europeans were tired of war and conflict. With economic prosperity came an increased desire for peace. That is not to say that religious or sexual prejudice had been eradicated, but the economic...
and social factors that drove the paranoia were on the decline. The areas that had the most religious tension were the areas with the largest number of witch trials. Once the religious issues became less important, the religious conflict and decline, in addition to personal animosity and sexism, were the primary causes of the witch hunts of the 16th and 17th centuries. While the tensions did not entirely disappear, the economic conditions that had made the factors prominent were improving. Better harvests and warmer weather paralleled a decrease in witch trials.
As is in modern politics today, in the case of a bad situation or crisis, the easiest thing to do is blame someone or some group of people, regardless of their degree of involvement. The growth and decline of the witch hunts from 1560 to 1650 worked in much the same way. People were used as scapegoats to account for many of the problems of the time that could not have been explained by any one way without the knowledge that we possess today.

Witches, often old, poor, ragged widows, were accused of being bewitched for various reasons to explain various problems. While the witch hunts were more concentrated in certain parts of Europe than others, they often occurred in the places with the greatest turmoil. For example, if a town suffered a serious crop failure, someone may be accused of being with having cursed the fields in order to starve the town and eat its children. Though the likelihood of this being a true story was slim to none, it was better to accuse them by accusation.

The attitude only escalated the situation to account for plague, crop failure, or even in some cases political troubles. Witches were an easy way to explain these troubles, and were almost always unable to defend themselves from the town mill.
As time wore on, and more and more accusers were accused, there came the need for a hundred men, endorsed by the Church to help identify witches in a town.

The decline of the witch hunts fell pretty well in line with the fear in the examples of the time. There was greater political stability, fewer accusations of the plague, and greater crop yields. The need for a scapegoat ceased to exist, and thus the need for witches also ceased to exist.
**Part B# 2**
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The Growth and Decline in European Witch Hunts was due to various elements. The main reason for the witch hunts was the uncertainty of women and religion.

Throughout the 1500's until the 1650's the witch hunts tried and executed people who were believed to be witches and possessed by demons. Over 90% of the people executed during the witch trials were women. The main group targeted for the trials and executions were women in rural parts of Europe who mixed Christianity with the old pagan rituals such as home remedies. These victims were usually poor peasants and farmers. Other people who were targeted in towns owed someone money or had some type of disability. The decline of the witch trials happened when most people began to realize they were killing innocent people and everyone was living in fear. The Church played an important role in the trials because anyone whom did not seem to be extremely religious was assumed to be a witch. Women were mainly targeted because they had no rights and the Church thought they were inferior to Men.
In the early 16th century, scientific innovations brought many aspects of what had traditionally been accepted into question. In particular, the relationship between religion and humanity was challenged by Enlightenment thinkers, believing that God had created a perfect universe and then left it for humanity to discover. While many Enlightenment thinkers, such as Voltaire, were critical of traditional beliefs, believing that God had created a perfect universe, others believed that religion was an obstacle to human progress. Voltaire, one of the most ardent advocates of enlightenment, believed that God had created a perfect world and left it for humanity to discover. The Enlightenment was a time marked by confusion and conflict. While many Enlightenment thinkers put great emphasis on reason and human progress, they often felt that religion was an obstacle to human progress.

The Romantics, however, believed in the complexity of God's plan. They believed that man did play a role in a universe in which God was supreme. Unlike the Enlightenment, however, the
Romantics did not believe in the supreme power of reason. They believed that an individual's role in the God's scheme would not be revealed until death, but that in order for the individual to better carry through their mission, they must have faith in the holy scriptures. The Romantics did not like the enlightened thinker Blaise Pascal; they believed the perfect answer, in which they live, was proof of the existence of a divine being or creator.

While enlightened thinkers believed religion to be the enemy to reason, Romantics believed reason to be the enemy to the religion. While reason could serve to make life better here on earth, our existence would remain a mystery until death.
With the introduction of humanism by Petrarca, it started an era in Europe called the Renaissance. The ideas that came out of the Renaissance then blossomed into the Enlightenment and other major movements like Romanticism. There was a clear difference with the way people of this new democracy perceived the individual and God compared to the Middle Ages.

The key aspect of the Enlightenment was the idea of reason over faith. Rationality was the movement and it was the idea that with reason, the people would discover and innovate and thus lead to progress. There were people like Voltaire who preached ethics over faith. Governments and leaders believed in the education of ethics and human interaction and not faith, and religion would lead to peace and the lack of greed for the world. Voltaire was a strong supporter of reason and despised anything not related to it. It was reason that inspired Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau to create theories for society.

However, for the Romantics it was different. Unlike the Enlightenment, the Romantics went back to the Middle Ages. A time when the Church influence was strong and all ideas revolved around God. But Romantics were not concerned too much with God itself, but rather the influence it
On the individual. Rousseau didn’t pretend them from
accepting works of art and sculpture to religious figures and
realized it was these things that moved feelings and
emotions amongst people. In the end, Romantics were much
more accepting about religion than Enlightenment thinkers.

The Enlightenment and Romanticism had very different
views about the individual, rather they looked at the individual
in two different perspectives. The Enlightenment, inspired by
humanism and the belief that things should be done for oneself
and not done for the sole purpose of the alliterate. They
viewed the individual as his role in society and the
rights they deserved. This can be seen through the works
of Voltaire, Rousseau, Locke, Hobbes, and Montesquieu. In
all their works, they suggest their own opinions for
how society should be governed and structured, but in
mind of the role of the individual and the impact each would
have on the rights and the welfare of the individual. The
Romantics on the other hand viewed the individual from
a much deeper psychological point of view, more interested in
the feeling question, and thought that people professed.

They were intrigued by the imagination and intangible
aspects of the individual, so instead of the welfare of the
people as a whole, like the Enlightenment thinkers, they preferred
looking at the welfare of the individual and the inner
battle instead of the political battle.
The Enlightenment writers can be seen as the outer conflicts in a story, embodying the actory rights and role of the individual and the domestic life, as the inner conflicts, embodying the emotions, sensations, and imaginations one experiences.
Upon analyzing the views of the Enlightenment and the Romantic era about the relationship between God and the individual, a clear comparison can be drawn. From the beginning, Enlightenment (in the early 1800s) was about reason, about humans and their projectability. Romanticism (from late 1800s into the early 1900s), on the other hand, emphasized inspiration, instinct, emotion. Out of these worldviews developed their views towards God. While similar in their emphasis on individual growth and perspectives on God, Enlightenment views emphasized a distant, non-interactive and non-essential deity, while Romanticism called for an inspiring, almost equal relationship with Him.

Both the Enlightenment and the Romantic era agreed that each individual could decide their view on God. Tired of centuries of religious wars, the ideas of separation of church and state had firmly taken root. Thomas Hobbes, in his popular book "Levita Mar", and scholars such as John Locke had made clear their
views on the equality of men, their natural rights, and ability to choose, apart from government, their religion. Enlightenment thinkers, such as Benjamin Franklin, who served as an American diplomat in Europe, did not waste time evangelizing their often deistic views - that is, that God created the world and then left it to its own devices. Romanticism also remained tolerant of the individual's choice.

The point at which the two eras differed was seen in the type of interaction usually believed to exist between God and man. Enlightenment-era people would tend to believe in the afore-mentioned deism. To them, man had been given all the faculties he needed to survive on his own. Reason reigned higher than any other god. Man was thought to be inherently good, perfectable, and the crown of the physical world. The Scientific Revolution and Industrial Revolutions had brought the sense that all things had been or soon would be discovered, understood, or created.
man, "the measure" of all the world, as was taken from Renaissance humanism. Thus God was not needed or interacted with for the average Enlightenment individual.

The Romantic view differed greatly from this in that while the individual was still extremely important—a reasonably his perfection came only through an interaction with God, or some Superior Being. Romantic reactionary views to Enlightenment ignorance of the heart emphasized beauty that was inherent to all beings. Art and poetry and literature and music in the European Romantic era, much of it celebrating the sense of satisfaction gained from God and His gift of creation to man. Turner and Constable painted scenes of the jury and quietude seen in God's creation; William Wordsworth and Samuel T. Coleridge glorified the closeness they felt to God in their emotions. In the Romantic view, God was part of every day, and interaction with him was gained through every daily routine, from looking out the window to writing a poem.
Both the Enlightenment and the Romantic era viewed humans highly, and the individual was an essential part of the universe, endowed with reason and natural rights. But in an Enlightened view, God was merely the creator, and interaction with Him was unnecessary, whereas the Romantic view was much more of a daily relationship with God, an interaction that made them a part of God, and He a part of them.
The Industrial Revolution may be seen as one of the most important events in human history. The technological advances and social changes of the time created an entirely new social class: the working class. Industrialization and urbanization benefitted the working class families in very limited ways, and did more to worsen the condition of the working-class families.

Industrialization started in the United Kingdom with the advent of the Agricultural Revolution and new technologies in the textile industry with the invention of the spinning jenny, power loom, and flying shuttle. Cloth could begin to be mass produced and factories began to emerge. Factories provided jobs with low pay for the emergent working class, who began to see themselves as a collective entity, a distinct social class different from the bourgeoisie middle class. As more and more factories were built, with new technological advances made, more and more workers became reliant on the behemoth factories owned by a few entrepreneurs who...
would employ hundreds of thousands of workers.

In England, Industrial towns such as Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham gradually grew, and the factory work found in cities pulled many working class families from the countryside to the city. This urbanization would ultimately bring multitudes of people to work in the cities, where slums such as the St. Giles slum in London became the established places where the working class lived.

The working class families during the Industrial Revolution were extremely poor, and had to struggle to survive. The entire family would be forced to work in the factories with small children working long hours with their parents. While prior to the Industrial Revolution the whole family could work under one roof in cottage industries, industrialization and urbanization forced the entire family to work for different factories, poorly even the children's meager incomes so that they might be able to eat. This fragmentation of the family was very disruptive to a family environment, and as a result the children grew up to be uneducated.
and with the unrefined manners of the factory workers. While the socle committee in 1832 and the Factby Act of 1833 helped to reduce the long number of hours that children had to work and placed age limits on child labor, many parents of the working-class could do little but to send their children to work in factories from a very young age, as their livelihood depended on what little that the children earned.

Urbanization forced many working-class families to live in the slums of the city, with families living together in one tiny room. The living conditions of the family were appallingly dreadful, and the low standard of hygiene were clear indicators of the working-class families' destitute. Squalid, filthy rooms that had no running water or electricity were sometimes had beds, and the working-class families of the industrial revolutions often died from diseases such as cholera and typhoid. When someone in the family became sick, their salaries were immediately stopped, and at the time there were no unemployment benefits or sick leave.
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are characteristics of working today. If the financial situation became absolutely unbearable the children of the family might be sent out to beg for money, and the family might eventually be convicted. The emergence of trade/worker unions in the 19th century helped to alleviate some of the troubles that came with unemployment and sickness.

Industrialization and urbanization only benefited came from the fact that the working class families tended to have more hope living in the city than they did living in agricultural life. The working class tried the best they could to work themselves out of poverty with the hope that the day they could be part of the middle class. The community spirit formed between working class families living in the slums can also be seen as the slightly positive effect of the Industrial Revolution. However, all in all, the working class families might have occurred for some working class families, but all in all, industrialization and urbanization brought about poverty for many working class families from 1750 to 1900.
Throughout time, the benefits and consequences of the industrial revolution have been weighed. Fact remains, industrialization and urbanization had a huge impact on middle-class families from 1950 to 1980. Conditions were deplorable and it wasn't until the period of the second industrial revolution did people such as urban reformers and urban socialists start urging for change in these local conditions.

Firstly, industrialization required mass migration to cities where factories were. Prior to this, there were cottage industries in which people were given supplies and materials at the home and were paid to make something like a shoe. Now with factories and machines, it was more organized. People were not used to working long hours. They never had been on a schedule. Free time was reduced. They were tripping orders from factory owners which created hostility in the working environment. Fathers could not spend much time at home with their kids. Cities were overcrowded because there were too
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Many people living in them, child laborers were restricted from play, as their wages were low. No skills were required for operating machines. So mind mentality went down. People were not intelligent because they did not need to use their brain. As they to poor sanitary conditions, these diseases spread quickly due to lack of hygiene and the proximity of living with others. People were not used to working with machines and therefore lost limbs or fingers. So another other impact of industrialization and urbanization were less loss of intelligence, unhygienic living conditions due to overcrowding in living spaces and loss of limbs or fingers. Physical deformations due to sitting and hunching all day or getting limbs or fingers caught in machines.

However, during the second industrial revolution, people from offices and wanted to change conditions for working class families. Optimistic socialists such as Robert Owen believed that cooperative communities should be built. 
everyone happy. For example, he created a factory town in Scotland in which workers were paid well and lived in good conditions, to see how it would affect productivity. It was very successful. Utopian socialists believed that some amount of work could be produced even if workers were treated well. Other utopian socialists, like Louis Blanc, believed that the government should intervene to improve working conditions. Also, women jumped on board and advocated for better conditions for women would improve conditions for workers. Others in Germany believed that bad living conditions affected all of society, not just the people living in them. Although not fully accepted at the time, their ideas developed and spread more in the 19th century. Further impacts the industrial revolution's urbanization led to worker class deformities, the formation of labor unions, for people were dissatisfied with conditions and wanted to see change. People were unhappy. This led to the development of more socialist ideas. For example, harsh conditions for the
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nearly, the working class led Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx to write the Communist Manifesto. In this book, the proletariat, or working class, were urged to unite in violent revolution in order to overthrown the oppressor and the government and form a classless society. This idea spread and were accepted by many people. One important group that accepted these ideas were the Bolsheviks, Lenin's socialist group that took over the Provisional Government in Russia during World War I.

All in all, industrialization and urbanization had a huge impact on working class families from 1850 to 1900 because it created new ways of living, labor, and social norms and conditions, which led to conflicts, riots, and the formation of labor unions to improve working conditions. People became radical and wanted to improve their lives. Like utopian socialists and the future development of a new system of government, advocated by Karl Marx, which was enjoyed by the proletariat, the ones who suffered the most from industrialization and urbanization.
Working class families were hard hit by early industrialization and urbanization. The harsh living standards of the urban areas, the emergence of industry and factory work, took their toll on the working-class family. However, as time progressed and conditions improved, the working class family found greater prosperity and happiness.

The lack of sanitation and the terrible living conditions at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution contributed to high mortality rates and overwhelming sickness and disease. Such hardships made starting and maintaining families in cities and towns extremely difficult. It was more likely for men to come to the urban areas and leave their wives and children behind in the countryside. The families that were attempted often suffered great child loss, with infant mortality at an all-time high.

With industrialization and urbanization came job opportunities. While the men were off at factory jobs, women were either at home caring for their children and houses or also off trying to support and add to the family income. No day care centers in existence in those days, women were forced to leave their
children in the hands of sometimes capable and other

times less capable runriess or take their children

with them to the textile factories. This was dangerous

for not only the child but also the mother,

and constituted a dampering in the happiness of

family life.

Once sanitation were

systems established, families found that they could

rebuild, knowing that their children would be safer,

and could be more healthy, educated

and happier. Families on average, in

the later 1800s family sizes tended to be smaller

as parents knew more children would survive and,

economically, the family would be more stable

by doing so.
Adam Smith's laissez-faire policies deeply opposed mercantilism. He called for no government interference in economics, believing that natural laws would allow citizens of society to make the right decisions and eventually prosper. Though his beliefs, outlined in Wealth of Nations, were supported by numerous classical economists of his time, mercantilist systems were not as terrible as he made them seem. In fact, Louis XIV's appointment of Colbert as his finance minister, who then advocated mercantilist policies, is a prime example of its effectiveness.

Louis XIV is known for his extravagant taste and superfluous funds (which unfortunately left France in heavy debt). However, the glorified Sun King was not the ruler of the "Golden Age of France" for no reason. His use of mercantilism, advocated by finance minister Colbert, proved his reign a success.
Louis XIV was able to create a successful empire. He promoted education for all, regulated taxes and emphasized equality, and began social reform and public welfare. Colbert bolstered France's reputation even more by creating a proficient navy. These institutions that characterized the mercantilist system were effective in France's prosperity and high regard. France's success, due to Colbert's mercantilist institutions, upset Europe's balance of power politics, leading other countries to fear the nation's complete control.

King Louis XIV's use of mercantilism spurred prosperity during his reign, thanks to sidekick Colbert. He proves that government interference is necessary in economics for ultimate success.
Mercantilism consisted of several policies and ideas designed to temporarily boost the economy.

Mercantilism was used in France under Sully and mainly Colbert. Probably the most important policy was to maintain more exports than imports. In fact, Colbert and other firm believers thought that the country should trade only export items and rarely import any. The downside of this was that it only temporarily boosted the economy as the finance minister found out and it also fueled anger from each other countries that didn't get the exports imported by the country that adopted mercantilism.

This idea of only exporting was aimed at increasing the exporting country's bullion or gold and silver. This would prevent the inflation of the other country's currency to enter the mercantilist country. A way of increasing the amount of exports was for a country to use their colonies as trading posts. This meant the mercantilist country could trade directly from their country and the trade their colonies. Finally, the large amount of exports would cause a rise in the factories and domestic production which again would aid the country.

Mercantilism was adopted by several countries including.
including France under the finance minister Colbert and Louis XIV.

It proved a way to increase the country's economy, but it proved to last only for a temporary period of time.
Merchandilism was a revolutionary system that paved the way for economic growth in Europe between 1600-1800. It was composed of guidelines that if followed guaranteed you success. As seen by the West European powers who used this originally beginning in France under Louis XIV; Cardinal Richelieu implemented this system. Merchandilism stated: a favorable balance of trade was to be achieved: more exports than imports. A self-sufficient economy and with the help of colonies and you could succeed. Also wealth is measured in gold.

Louis XIV started by expanding his empire with a myriad of wars that gained him land and power. The French colonies in North America flourished with its fur trade and goods brought back England had a vast number of colonies as in North America as well as the collaboration with the
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Dutch in Their Dutch East India Company, but later they were excluded from this. The Indian spices and goods were brought back and traded greatly thus helping the economy of England and the merchants were becoming rich.

The Spanish had major holdings in North America as well as South where they got a vast number of goods.

Mercantilism was the opposite of Adam Smith's laissez-faire because the government in control of the trade and the people didn't have a huge say in it. This went against the idea of the people having full control of the economy. Also, there were huge tariffs when Smith wanted free trade.

Going back to France, Cardinal Fleury and Jean Baptiste Colbert carried on the mercantilistic policies that would allow the country to remain economically stable and
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self sufficient Spain despite its huge and vast territories came to a downturn when they were continuing to buy their goods from foreign nations which is theory was asking their enemies stronger. They were incapable of manufacturing goods and imported all but more than they exported and all the gold they had caused inflation and this is wasn't worth gold and the prices sky rocketed.

A new era of economics was born through mercantilism and its teachings. It influenced nearly every person and was followed and scrutinized greatly. It was a formula for success and if followed were guaranteed success. In the future more economic systems would arise but from the 1600s the dominant force behind a great Country's Economy was the mercantilist system behind it.
After the First World War and the Second World War, the victorious Allied powers treated Germany in some ways different and in some ways the same. They had learnt what they should do again and what they shouldn't by watching the rise of the Nazi party after how they had been treated after World War One. The major difference in treatment was the political treatment. After the First World War, the major powers convened at the Treaty of Versailles which came up with a harsh punishment for the Germans. They had to pay for reparations and were given all the blame for the outcome of war (this wasn't really fair). Also, the Rhineland had to be demilitarized and the German army was reduced and it could not possess neither a navy nor an air force. This was one of the major reasons for Germany to seek revenge. This punishment was very harsh. The Allied Powers realized that the way they
treated the Germans after WWI was the cause of WWII and that is why they did not do the same mistake after World War Two. Another thing they did after WWII, they decided that they could reform Germany since evil people can become good people. That was the main goal of the Allied Powers. Another thing they did different was that after WWI, the Allied Powers left Germany alone but restricted it in many ways. After WWII, the Allied Powers decided to divide at Yalta to divide Germany between France, the USA, Britain and the USSR. They did this since they realized that if they did not keep an eye on Germany it might again try to rise up to power and cause another horrendous war. The Allied Powers learnt from their political mistakes and therefore treated the Germans differently after WWII.

Although the treatment had many differences, it did however have some similarities. The most obvious one is that both time, the Allied Powers blamed the Germans for the
Outcome of war. It is known that this is true for WWII, but for WWI it can be debated. Another treatment that was the same was that the USA invested money into Germany after WWI and WWII. After WWI, America came up with the Dumas Plan which helped Germany get back on its feet and pay some of its war debt and help the German economy to progress and become important again in European affairs. After WWII, the Americans started the Marshall Plan which pumped money into West Germany and other Western countries, but none part of the Eastern block. They realized that this was necessary for the American economy to keep going. If they wouldn't have invested in Germany, the American economy wouldn't have been able to become so strong since it need other countries to trade with and so. The Allied Powers kept the economic treatment the same in order to help their own economy become stronger.

The Allied Powers treated Germany politically different but economically the same after each
World War. They realized that the way they had handled Germany politically after WWI was ineffective and harsh and led the Germans to seek revenge. On the other hand, the Allied Powers realized that by investing money into Germany the world economy would prosper, and the United States economy would become much stronger.
After the first world war Europe was in a state of shock at the disastrous outcome of the war and looked for someone to blame. After the second world war Europe was still in turmoil but was less shocked by the wreckage. In both instances the allies blamed the war on German aggression, but the allies learned from the harshness of the first peace treaty that assimilation is better and safer than resentment.

Since the Germans declared war on both Russia and France before the first world war and marched through neutral territory the allies were quick to blame the Germans for the ensuing war. Hitler's aggression prior to the start of world war II made the Germans easy to blame again for the disasters that followed. The Allies in both instances, wanted to ensure that the Germans would not be able to attack Europe again. After the first world war Clemenceau and the British Prime minister imposed harsh reparations on Germany whose economy was already devastated by the war. wanted to severely punish Germany for causing the war. By 1945, however, it was evident that German resentment of its harsh punishment after world war I had played a significant role in its aggression at the
The Allies implemented a harsh peace on Germany after the First World War. Reparations payments demanded by the Allies were impossibly high, especially for Germany's already devastated economy. Germany was in shambles after the war and its government, the Weimar Republic, was as unstable as its economy. Germany was forced to sign the arguably unfair Treaty of Versailles since it was in no condition to return to a state of war. This unfair blame and cruel treatment of Germany initiated the later desire for revenge.

After the second world war the Allies divided Germany into 4 sections, each of the major powers of the US, the USSR, Great Britain, and France taking a piece. The three western powers combined their lots and implement a new republican government. The Marshall Plan, in which the US offered aid to a devastated Europe, included Germany in the countries it offered aid to.

After both wars the Allies demanded a reduction of the army and naval forces, but these demands were less stringent after the Second World War. For fear of repeated violent
Action the Allies attempted to help Germany rebuild after World War II, instead of destroy anything left over as they had done following World War I.
"The Shames of The Twentieth-Century"

Both world wars left not only Europe, but the entire world in a state of economic disaster, depression, shame, and regret. Both wars ended with extreme tragedies which cannot be comprehended or forgiven. Despite the controversy that shrouds these two wars, Germany is often dealt the blame. However, Germany's treatments after the First World War, differs greatly from their treatment after the Second World War due to different levels of clarity and diplomacy.

(1914-1918)

After World War One, the Allies hammered Germany with the brutal and harsh Treaty of Versailles - that for a period of time, completely devastated Germany. Because of the treaty, which Germany was forced to accept, Germany had to accept the blame for World War One, pay expensive reparations to the Allies, and reduce the power and size of their military forces. This put Germany into a state of economic crisis and social difficulties. Difficulty.

(1939-1945)

After World War Two, where unlike the first war, Germany was obviously, in great fault - the international community had reached a new state of diplomacy. After World War Two, Germany was not stricken with a harsh treaty, but instead, was given the chance to repent. International organizations such as the United Nations were formed and a number of conferences. (Yalta, Tehran)
were held. (However, such conferences did not condemn Germany or any other nation). Therefore, Germany was not directly punished after World War Two - but instead, along with the International Community - worked to prevent another world war.

The differences and similarities in the treatment of Germany are derived from the evolution of the International Community. After both wars, Germany was held responsible for the tragedies of each - however, this can also be related to Germany's involvement in each war. The differences in how they were treated is based on the world's increasing diplomacy and lack of radical views and decisions.

Germany's treatment after both World Wars are indeed controversial and arguably either "right" or "wrong". Nonetheless, Germany faced both extreme and severe condemnation and diplomatically handled relations.
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- Much as European Identities and nationalism resulted in the creation of many the creation of new European countries in the 19th Century so too did these factors play a role in decolonization. However, decolonization after the Second World War was more complicated. These events of decolonization were the result of Cold War conflict. For some, education of certain native leaders which allowed them the idea of Liberalism and nationalism and Domestic problems that colonial powers faced at home.

  with the start of the Cold War
  it was now almost solely the Western block that had colonies. These powers used colonies to strengthen their economies at home and increase their power in general. It is then for only natural that Soviet and Communist nations opposing the Western block to encourage decolonization. Many of these countries supplied arms and Mutilation to these rebel groups in order to this trap peace. The Civil War in Angola was an example of
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Hope Marxist rebels were "funded" by thesecommunistnations. Disrupting the colonies would disrupt their enemy.

Many of the free leaders of Independence movements were educated abroad. These leaders were thought to have written "Ideals of Democracy, Nationalism and Social Liberalism." These leaders were deeply moved by these ideals and determined to spread them. tribal, "Ideals in their native countries". Western nations (the Colonial Mother Countries) did nothing to stop these leaders from receiving foreign education. An example of this can be seen in British India with Mahatma Gandhi and his peaceful opposition to unfair British rule. Gandhi had received his education in Britain and for a considerable portion of his life lived in South Africa. In African Nations such as Kenya, this idea of foreign education can also be seen. Many Mother Powers also had large domestic problems at home. After the economic miracle of the 1980s and
very early 1960's the world economy stagnated, oil prices rose and domestic economies seized to be improving or only a fraction of the miracle years with domestic economies failing and the increase in cost to keep colonies many nations found it easier to just let go of their colonies. Many colonies saw some of their colonies as a weight dragging them back especially after the increased independence movements which frequently asked for costly military intervention. This can be seen in many of France's old colonies such as Algeria or Senegal and the Belgian Congo where it had just become a nuisance to have these colonies.

While the route to independence was unique and individual for many of these newly formed nations each pointed contained collective one of the principles illustrated in this essay. These factors helped propel the independence movements, and even though it took some
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- adding longer than others
After the Second World War, there were many factors responsible as to why foreign policy in America and Western Europe began to focus on decolonization. Due to massive economic debt, the overall morale of the people, and the ever present "Soviet question" and threat of nuclear war, nations shifted their foreign policy in an attempt to do anything necessary to avoid a third world war.

After World War Two, many nations had been devastated by the battles and constant warfare. No longer did nations like Great Britain have the monetary funds available to keep up with all of their colonies around the world. After suffering horrible loss of people and sustaining huge amounts of architectural damage. Great Britain and other European nations found themselves largely in debt to the United States. They simply couldn't afford to be spending money promoting colonies.

Nations also had to account to the overall morale of their citizens. After two major world wars, and tension
With the Soviet Union, people could not emotionally handle the thought of somehow getting forced into new conflicts in colonial areas. It was time to focus on rebuilding their own nations, not gaining control of more land. Psychologically, many people went through a period of isolationism. After the horrible Blitzkrieg in Great Britain, the people didn’t want to continue to be involved in world politics. The tension between the Soviet Union and the United States and Western Europe (or NATO vs. Warsaw Pact) left people much more concerned with staying out of another world war. Conflict was now a last resort, as opposed to a means of seeing who had the most power. All of these factors influenced a major foreign policy shift in Europe and America. Nations went from colonialization to containment and decolonization. Most nations were too focused on preventing the spread of communism to put all their money and manpower in their colonies. This is when many colonies became their own sovereign nations. Decolonization was just no longer a realistic goal post World War Two or in the modern political world.
The Second World War left in its wake several powerful nations on the brink of bankruptcy. These powerful nations had to rebuild their countries after being devastated by years of warfare on homeland and foreign soil. However, the end of the Second World War gave the colonies a chance to fight for independence, since the mighty European nations had been severely injured by fighting a war all over the Eurasian and African continents. Morocco, Algeria, Congo, and India were all colonies of powerful nations such as France and England. However, these powerful nations could no longer afford to keep any colonies; their militaries had to be rebuilt, the governments were literally bankrupt. Decolonization would not have been possible at this point if the Second World War had not happened. A weakened European country was the only reason that the colonies were able to actually get independence. The loss of European colonies was all the fault of Germany, since they were the ones who began the actual World War. If it had not been for the rise of Nazism and Socialism in Germany during the late 1920s and the early 1930s, The entire decolonization would have been started by the Germans and caused the other European to fight a couple more wars with the colonies which lasted well into the late 1950s. This decolonization concept ended in the 1950s with the Algerian War for independence from the French oppressors. Ultimately, France was the nation that lost the most due to decolonization, soon followed suit by England. The colonies were a major source of income for the oppressors and the loss of their colonies left some resentment in towards the Germans which adds some extra hold on West Germany. Germany has been to blame or partially blamed for many of the problems in the first half of the twentieth century such as backing Austria in WWI, WWII, the extermination of 6 million Jews, and
ultimately decolonization. If the Second World War had been avoided, England and France might still be in control of their colonies in Africa and in Asia. However, World War II was such a heavy burden that simply cost too much which led the oppressors to put up little resistance against the colonies since they could no longer keep on fighting.