

Source:

#ref #ret #disorganized #incomplete

1 | Unit. Two. Essay.

les go.

1.1 | prompt:

Option 1: "[For] the philosophers of the period...the concept of the balance of power was simply an extension of the concept of the balance of power."
Henry Kissinger, Diplomacy

From one point of view, balance of power politics in the early modern period succeeded spectacularly, especially in the case of the European great powers.

Option 2: The European great powers of the early modern period (1500-1815) generally followed mercantilist policies.

Note: Your essay should cite evidence from a variety of secondary sources from the Unit 2 Reader.

Submission guidelines: 3-4 pages, size 12 font, double-spaced. Citations should be in-line and formatted in APA style.

Tips: See the essay rubric guide below for questions to ask yourself as you write and revise.
History essay rubric guide

1.2 | General ideas:**1.2.1 | Opt 2:**

Look at the free market / mercantilism

Where free market fails / succeeds and where mercantilism fails / succeeds

1. Go either way:

1. free market would have worked because it is a better system
2. free market doesn't work when others are not free market
3. free market is too drastic of an ideology for it to have taken effect

use places where one excels over the other

find examples (or in the negative) in texts

this aspect of the free market works well, it was applied here

OR:

The free market could not work due to the enlightenment

Enlightenment philosophy: reductionist, everything can be reduced to ideals. top down.

Free market completely uproots that with the idea of emergent properties

Body paragraphs...?

1. prove enlightenment is top down | prove free market is bottom up | ?

2. Other ideas which got rejected for the same reasons?

Free market vs resan detat? are they different?

More planning? Modern day, free market economies dominate – free market won

In {the time period}, mercantalism and resan detant dominated.

Why was this the case?

Mercantalism, the primary way resan detant is implimented, and what led to the balance of power dynamic, is fundementaly based upon the concept that wealth {trade?} is a zero sum game

This concept, however, is incorrect. With free market trade, wealth can actually be *generated* {through trade}, and this {realization? property?} is what allowed free market systems to dominate.

Thesis: Free market systems were unable to triumph do the common belief that trade was a zero sum game.

This lack of understanding arose out of the enlightenment?

Resan detant works by the state acting in its own self intrest, which manifests in mercantilism, the strategy of minimizing imports and maximizing exports. It also manifests in war, but to a much lesser extent.

An emergent property, 'Balance of Power,' arises out of a collection of these states all participating in resan detant.

This is all built upon the concept that trade, and by extenstion, wealth and power? is a zero sum game.

Need to prove

- Mercantalism is based in the idea that {trade?} is a zero sum game
- Free market can generate wealth
- An internally free market system is viable, and forces other to join it?

Outline

- Intro: lay out thesis
- Lay out how the system works and define terms? Resan detant -> mercantalism -> balance of power
- Mercantalism {and other aspects of the system?} are based on the idea that {trade? wealth?} is a zero sum game
 - wealth is zero sum as measured by bullion,
 - wealth is confused with bullion, according to Adam smith
 - In reality, welth when seperated from bullion can be generated through free market trade, making it not a zero sum game.
- Free market can generate wealth
- Conclusion

Qoutes?