

Comment: Congratulations! The fruits of hard work and critical thinking skills :)

Part 1 of 1 -

100.0 Points

Question 1 of 4

25.0 Points

1) Explain the concept of mercantilism. Give concrete examples of governments pursuing mercantilist policies. Is mercantilism still alive today? Explain your answer with examples and details.

When looking at history and looking at the many different governments that have been in place, we can see many different types of policies have been used. One policy that has been used by some governments many centuries ago is that of mercantilist policies. Countries such as Great Britain and Spain used mercantilist policies to run their governments. After looking at these mercantilist governments the paper will look to see if mercantilism is still alive today.

When looking at mercantilist policies it is important to understand the concept of mercantilism. Mercantilism was the major economic theory of the sixteenth and seventeenth century and was a “system of economic regulations aimed at increasing the power of the state” (McKay, 2009, 646). The mercantilist policies were carried out by increasing exports and then collecting precious metals in the return of the exports (McKay, 2009). A great example of a government using mercantilist policies was Great Britain. The government in Great Britain passed the Navigation Acts in the seventeenth century in which showed that the government wanted to increase its military power but at the same time increasing the wealth of private individuals. By looking at these Acts one can see that Great Britain was clearly pursuing mercantilist policies. Another government that used mercantilist policies was Spain. Spain put policies in place such as not allowing foreign ships to enter colonies ports without a license, because all of the imported goods to the colonies were sent through Spain (Rempel, 2000). Spain also put into place policies that kept some colonies from making certain goods, because Spain wanted those certain colonies to be its export markets (Rempel, 2000). Both Spain and Great Britain used mercantilist policies many centuries ago.

Now by understanding the use of mercantilist policies from many centuries ago we can look to see if mercantilism is still alive today. There have been arguments made that the government of China has put policies in place that would resemble mercantilist policies. One of the policies that China put into place was that “China has embraced export-led economic growth” (Samuelson, 2007, p. 1). China has another policy that helps it build a strong state and that it has “a wildly undervalued exchange rate” (Samuelson, 2007, p. 1). With that being said both of these policies allow China to build a strong state. It is important to note that the form of mercantilism that China is using is similar to that of Great Britain. The reason is because there are private individuals that are getting wealthy and also helping build the state of China. The people are making money and using that money to build more factories which in turn is raising the amount of exports that are taking place (Samuelson, 2007, p. 1). As a result of this taking place, it is causing China to become a stronger state. The main difference is that China is

not using precious medals in return for the exports. They are getting money and then using that to build up their state.

Throughout history there have been many different policies that have been carried out by different governments. One policy that has been used is that of mercantilism, which was widely used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mercantilism is not as widely used in today's time but forms of it can be seen in China.

References

McKay, John. Et all. (2009). *A History of World Society*, 8th ed. Vol. 11: Since 1500. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Rempel, Gerhard. (2000). Mercantilism. *Western New England University*. Retrieved January 21, 2015 from <http://mars.acnet.wnec.edu/~grempe/courses/wc2/lectures/mercantilism.html>.

Samuelson, R. J. (2007). China's Wrong Turn on Trade; By Accident or Design, China Has Embraced Export Led Economic Growth. *Newsweek*, 149, 55. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/214270376?accountid=8289>

Comment: Nice work and interesting conclusions regarding mercantilism today. China is a great example!

Question 2 of 4

25.0 Points

2) Historians have called the extension of European hegemony after 1882, the *new imperialism*. What were the key components of the new imperialism? How does the British takeover of Egypt exemplify the transition from the old to the new form of imperialism?

When looking at history we see many different time frames that shape the world into what it is today. The time frame of the new imperialism took place after the European hegemony after 1882. It is important to look at this time frame and know the key components of this period. After that is discussed the answer will look at how the British takeover of Egypt exemplify the transition from the old to the new form of imperialism. The New imperialism helped shape the world into what it is today.

When looking at the new imperialism it is important for one to know that it involved countries going at staking claim to other land around the world. In order to understand the new imperialism one needs to know the key components of this period. One of the major components of the new imperialism was to protect the economic interests (McKay, 2009). Another major component of the new imperialism was the moves that were taken was for strategic reasons and for national prestige (McKay, 2009). When looking at Great Britain, they started grabbing land in the 1880s due to when

other “European continental powers began to grab unclaimed territories” (McKay, 2009, p. 723). The British thought they should gain land and therefore started going after land as well (McKay, 2009, p. 723). It is also important to point out that another component of the new imperialism was the technology that took place during this time period. When looking at the new imperialism it is very interesting to see that the vast majority of Africa was seized by other governments during this time.

Now by looking at the British takeover of Egypt we can see a true example of the new imperialism taking place during this time period. When looking at when Egypt was taken over by the British it is important to understand one thing. That one thing is that once they were taken over they became a protectorate for the British (McKay, 2009). This means that if the British went to war then Egypt and their army would go to war as well with the British. Another way that the British were benefited by taking over Egypt was that they got control of the Nile River, meaning that they could control where the ships would go that were carrying goods (Laguerta, 2013). By understanding this we can see that the new imperialism is clear here because the British was wanting to protect themselves in an economic sense. The way that they protected their economic interest here is by getting another army to support them in the event that they had to go to war. Another way that the new imperialism is clearly seen here is that the British benefited economically by having control of the Nile River.

When looking at history we see many different time period. One of the time periods that took place in the late 1800 was the new imperialism. During this time the majority of Africa was taken over by other governments. It is important to have an understanding of this time because it did indeed help shape the world into what it is today. By looking at the British takeover one can see a true example of the new imperialism taking place.

References

Laguerta, Dianne. (2013). British Imperialism in Egypt & Why, How and When Did They Leave? *Synonym*. Retrieved January 21, 2015 from <http://classroom.synonym.com/british-imperialism-egypt-why-did-leave-21799.html>

McKay, John. Et all. (2009). *A History of World Society*, 8th ed. Vol. 11: Since 1500. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Comment: Excellent analysis of new imperialism in Egypt.

Question 3 of 4

25.0 Points

2) World War I and the Versailles Treaty had a profound impact on the historical development of Asia. Describe this impact. Can an argument be made that even without the experience of the First World War and the Versailles settlement, independence and change would have taken place in Asia?

During the history of the world there have been many different things that have helped shape the world into what it is today. One thing that helped shape the world into what it is today is World War I and the Versailles Treaty. The Versailles Treaty not only helped bring on the Second World War but it also had a profound impact on the historical development of Asia.

In order to understand the profound impact of World War I and the Versailles Treaty one needs to know what sort of impact Asia faced. The portion of the Versailles Treaty that really affected Asia was Article 22 (McKay, 2009). In this article it stated that territories that were considered to be unable to govern themselves would be assigned to nations that were developed and they could govern them (McKay, 2009). With that being said the major profound impact of the Versailles treaty on the development of Asia was that it caused countries in Asia to be ruled by other countries that were more developed. As a result of this taken place it did cause patriots to get upset and made them not to want to give up in regards to getting independence from the countries that had been given control of these areas (McKay, 2009).

Now by understanding the effects of the First World War and the Versailles Treaty on the development of Asia one needs to look to see if an argument can be made if independence and change would have taken place in Asia. Upon looking at this I think the argument can't be made that Asia would not have tried to change and gain independence. The reason is because I think that there had to be something to take place to cause the people in Asia to get upset and not want to support the people that were in charge. However, if there would have been something to take place to cause people in Asia to want to make changes then the call for changes and independence could easily happen. The reason why I feel this was is it is important to remember that "Asian nationalist were encouraged by Soviet communism" and how "Asian inhabitants of the new Soviet Union were complete equals of the Russians with a right to their own development (McKay, 2009, p. 847). Without the First World War none of this would have taken place I feel. Meaning that the Asian's would not have been given hope by the people in Russia. In other words, I don't feel the argument can be made saying that the people in Asia would have called for change and independence.

Throughout the history of the world there have been many things that have helped shape the world into what it is today. The Versailles Treaty not only helped bring in the Second World War, but it also had an profound impact on Asia. It affected Asia because it gave other countries the rule over territories within.

References

McKay, John. Et all. (2009). *A History of World Society*, 8th ed. Vol. 11: Since 1500. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Comment: Interesting perspective on WWI and the subsequent changes in Asia.

Question 4 of 4

25.0 Points

1) International affairs in the postwar era were dominated by the cold war. What were the key events in its development? What were the causes and consequences? Given the political, military, and ideological situations at the time, was the cold war unavoidable? Support your conclusions.

Throughout the history of the world there have been many events that have helped shape the world into what it is today. One of the major time periods that helped shape the world is that of the cold war. The cold war took place between the United States and the USSR.

In order to understand what the cold war was it is very important to understand who was involved in the cold war. The cold war involved the United States and the Soviet Union after the end of World War II (Trueman, 2013). One of the key events in the cold war was a speech that was given by Stalin in 1946 that was hostile about how communism and capitalism could not work together. (Trueman, 2013). The cause of this was that Stalin did not feel that the two could work together. The consequences of this is what really caused the cold war to take place. One can argue that this is what set the tone of the entire cold war. It would put the United States on the defense and make it where we should look out for our best interest and do what will benefit capitalism. Another key event that took place during the cold war was the Cuban Missile Crisis. The cause of the Cuban missile crisis was due to the United States of America not supporting the new regime of Castro that took power when his regime overthrew the last one (McKay, 2009). The consequences of this is that Cuba sided with the Soviet Union and it allowed the Soviet Union to start to install missiles in the country of Cuba. Meaning that it gave the Soviet Union access to easily carry out a missile attack on the United States. The Soviet Union stated that they should be allowed to be in Cuba since the United States was involved with Turkey (Trueman, 2013). The last thing that will be looked at is the Berlin issue and mainly the Berlin airlift. During the cold war the Berlin wall was put up to keep the communist east from the west which was not communist. With that being said the cause was to keep the two sides separated. The consequences was that the Berlin airlift took place to make sure that all of the people that were allies to the United States were flown out of the communist side before it was too late (Kelly, 2014).

Now by understanding some of the major events of the cold war one can look to see if the cold war was unavoidable. One can argue that the cold war was indeed unavoidable. The reason is due to the fact of the speech given by Stalin in 1946 really set the stage for the start of the cold war. One can argue that if Stalin would have taken the high road and tried to work together with the United States then the cold war would not have taken place. However, he decided to come out and say that communism and capitalism could not work together. When this took place it put the United States on the offense. Meaning that if we would have backed down then it would have made the United States of America look weak. With that being said if Stalin would have given a different speech stating that we should try to work together to make the world better and the cold war might not have ever taken place.

Throughout history there have been many things that have helped shape the world into what it is today. The cold war helped shape the world due to the events that took place during this time. However, by looking at this time one can see that this entire time in world history could have taken a different way if there was not a speech given by Stalin stating that communism and capitalism could not work together.

References

Kelly, Jon. (2014). The Six Key Moments of the Cold War Relived. *BBC News*. Retrieved January 21, 2015 from <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-26788606>

McKay, John. Et all. (2009). *A History of World Society*, 8th ed. Vol. 11: Since 1500. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Trueman, Chris. (2013). What Was The Cold War? *History Learning Site*. Retrieved January 21, 2015 from <http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/what%20was%20the%20cold%20war.htm>

Comment: Nice discussion of the Cold War and its inevitability.