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“Why the Industrial Revolution didn’t happen in China” Qs

1. Why does Mokyr think it’s important to understand the Industrial Revolution in the first place?
2. What was Mokyr’s explanation of why the Industrial Revolution began in Europe rather than in China, which had always been developmentally ahead of Europe?
3. How did ways of thinking and researching change in Europe, and how did that contribute to the Industrial Revolution?

How was the Enlightenment tied to the Industrial Revolution?

1. China had always been enlightened and innovative. How was it different from Europe in that regard? ( How did certain aspects of Chinese society and government in some ways subvert progress?)
2. Based on the article:

Give one CHANGE in Europe that allowed the Industrial Revolution to start there.

Give one CONTINIUTY in China that made it difficult for the Industrial Revolution to start there.

Another popular argument for why the Industrial Revolution started in Britain rather than China focuses more on economics. For one, Britain had overseas colonies that provided it with both wealth and raw materials. As British manufacturing and populations grew, its demand for wood increased, leading to deforestation and a shift to coal, which happened to be abundant in Britain. In addition, as manufacturing of those raw materials increased, so did the demand for labor, which drove wages up (some of the highest wages in the world). Wanting to find cost saving alternatives to labor, business leaders had the incentive to find labor saving alternatives, like the steam engine and machines, and it was worth it to spend the money researching because energy (coal) was cheap. Meanwhile, in China, wages were lower (in some places wage labor” wasn’t even really a thing), and coal was expensive, so inventing technology was expensive.

1. Which argument, Mokyr’s or the more economic approach, do you find more convincing? Why?