Source: ⟦KBHistoryMasterIndex⟧

1 | **Unit 1 Essay**

1.1 | **General Information**

Due Date	Topic	Important Documents
Oct 12th	Hegemony and competition in the early modern world	Kennedy, Mann, and Friends

1.2 | **Prompt**

Economic: The Ottomans, the Ming and Qing Empires, the Mughals and the European kingdoms all responded to the globalization of commerce in the early modern period in dramatically different ways. **Why did they respond differently to the globalization of commerce and what were the consequences?** Comparing at least two of the regions above. Gelvin (World systems), Mann (silver), Kennedy and Arrighi might be good general frameworks, while Bulliet (Ottomans), Gilbert (Mughals) and McNeill (Europe) can provide some specifics.

1.3 | **Documents Corner**

- @⟦KBhHIST201HomogenosceneLN⟧ Current day, emphasis was placed around those in native American regions who were anti-Spanish, yet a large majority of the individuals who really brought globalization were Spanish
- @⟦KBhHIST201MannMing⟧ China's currency began to show strain as Bronze prices increase whist China deals with a botching reopening plan after closing the economy after Zheng He. See ⟦KBhHIST201ChinasDeclineWRTReopening⟧ and ⟦KBhHIST201ChinasDeclineWRTZhengHe⟧
- @⟦KBhHIST201Ottomans1500⟧ Enjoys control of the silk read; Huge landmass; Large army (and, large cannons + siege trains); Strong Navy! => deployed frequently in the Black Sea, Constantinople, North Africa

    - Enjoyed physical control: Strategic link between Europe + Asia at the Daranelles strait

- @⟦KBhHIST201ProblemsWithSilver⟧ — major globalization

1.4 | **Evidence bin**

- The Holy Roman Empire

    - "A ruler committed to such absolute values found it impossible to compromise, let alone to manipulate, his bargaining position."
    - Conservatism lead them directly to not compromise, getting the lower hand

- The Ottomans

    - …Established trade agreements "Such trade agreements, called capitulations, led to European domination of Ottoman seaborne trade. … Far from seeing Europe as the enemy that would eventually dismantle the empire, the Istanbul elite experimented with European clothing and furniture styles"
    - New styles infiltrated the government causing a lack of response or even capitulation

- The French

- "Though privately religious, Richlieu viewed his duties as minister in entirely secular terms. … 'The state has no immortality, its salvation is now or never.' In other words, states do not receive credit in any world for doing what is right; they are only rewarded for being strong enough to do what is necessary."
- French took the stance of absolute logic and assertion of contr

  - Ming

    - Tried to assert control — "Northwestern Foreigners are recalcitrant and their greed knows no bounds. I do not think our present trade with them will ensure us a century of peace. … As to the foreigners in the southeast, their goods are useful to us just as ours are to them. To use what one has to exchange for what one does not have is what trade is all about. Moreover, these foreigners trade with China under the name of tributary contributions. That means China's authority is established and the foreigners are submissive"
    - Pick and choose the outcomes only to establish authority

1.5 | **Claim Synthesis**

1.5.1 | **Development phase – How and So-What**

- Orthodoxy on religion => non-compromise
- New styles infiltrated the government => a lack of response or even capitulation => overeliance on multicultralism
- Absolute logic and assertion => overpower and compensation
- Assertion of control => internal collapse => over-reliance on globalization

Musing:

- Attempting to reach world hegemony in a multiculturalistic state will cause eventual economic infiltration and a loss of identity, whereas reliance on unification and control to achieve hegemony will result in economic implosion and loss of control.
- So… Per Arrigi

  - A "territorialist model" => economic implosion
    - Ming w/ the Mann
  - A "capitalist model" => economic infiltration

If you too multicultural, you may end up loosing your economic control. Empires are trying to include all these cultures in one territory.

The Ottomans, for instance, Established trade agreements "Such trade agreements, called capitulations, led to European domination of Ottoman seaborne trade. … Far from seeing Europe as the enemy that would eventually dismantle the empire, the Istanbul elite experimented with European clothing and furniture styles" => new styles infiltrated the government causing a lack of response or even capitulation (Bulliet)

If you tried to overly unify your cultural identity, you may end up loosing your civil control.

Mughals => tried model of unity — loosing support of Hindu nobels "The combination of anti-Hindu policy and sentiment at court and the reduction in the value of subsidies or land grants to Maratha mansab dars turned Shivaji into not merely a rebel but a rival." => causing the series of decline that the Mughals saw initiated with the Maratha rebelion.

If you try to, instead, exercise balance and raíson de'etat, happiness to everyone!

English example => "England's policy was based on throwing its weight as the occasion required to the weaker and more threatened side to redress the equilibrium. … England was the one European country whose raison d 'etat did not require it to expand in Europe. Perceiving its national interest to be in the preservation of the European balance"

And yes, there is a point where Raison de etat turns into territorialism. But, that becomes no longer Raison de etat, that's a tour de force: " Richelieu's raison d'etat threatens self- destructive tours de force…. But Louis XN gained no peace of mind from security; he saw in it an opportunity for conquest. In his overzealous pursuit of raison d'etat, LouisXN alarmed the rest of Europe and brought together an anti-French coalition which, in the end, thwarted his design."

1.6 | **Defluffifying**

- If you too multicultural, you may end up loosing your economic control. Empires are trying to include all these cultures in one territory.
- If you tried to overly unify your cultural identity, you may end up loosing your civil control
- If you try to, instead, exercise balance and raíson de'etat, happiness to everyone!

So what? So be the third thing.

Now, defluffify by re-writing the three points + so what in as little words as possible.

When attempting to reach world system hegemony, over-extension of multiculturalism will bring forth a lack of economic control whereas over-unification of cultural identity will cause losses in civic control; to achieve hegemony without losses in control, a state has to exercise principles of raíson de 'etat in a position of moderation instead of dominance.

From Me to Sushu Xia: (Privately)

Attempting to reach world hegemony in a multiculturalistic state will cause eventual economic infiltration and a loss of identity, whereas reliance on unification and control to achieve hegemony will result in economic implosion and loss of control.

From Sushu Xia to Me: (Privately)

Territorialist model that try to get big gets romanitis
How centralized control / multiethnic empires react to trade

From Sushu Xia to Everyone:

Writing what Kennedy wanted to write
If you're too conservative and controlling of your economy, then you will end up getting romanitis

From Sushu Xia to Everyone:

If you're too multicultural, you'll end up losing your identity
If you're too multicultural, you'll end up losing economic control
These empires are trying to include all these cultures in 1 territory

From Sushu Xia to Everyone:

On the other hand, if the empires are too centralizing, then overexpand, over-extend, too focused on conquering, and not on ruling?
Raison d'état failed bc they're too logical for their own good, over-extended
If you try to enforce the same culture???

From Sushu Xia to Everyone:

Economic control
How do different types of multicultural/centralized/whatever make it easier/harder for them to economic control?

Figure 1: Screen Shot 2020-10-02 at 10.11.57 AM.png