

**Chapter 1 : Timeline of second-wave feminism - Wikipedia**

*The greatest tragedy in history is easily WW II. The Russian Revolution was another great tragedy, especially because of all the hope people had for it. WW I was another tremendous tragedy, as was the influenza epidemic that followed it, which killed more people than the war did.*

Surrender of Cornwallis 2. The Reformation The Reformation was one of the greatest events in European history. Prior to this period, the Roman Catholic Church had close to absolute control over the people and governments of the Christian world. It was when many of the learned men of the time began to question the practices of the church in comparison to the Bible that trouble arose. The intent of the Reformation was to reform the Catholic Church and bring it back to its biblical roots. The end result was a rending of the church into two factions: The Reformation brought the religious texts into the hands of the masses and began the decline of the Catholic power. Both the wars it caused and the actions of the famous historical figures it involved still continue to shape the world today. Thinking of this only as a European event could be erroneous. Because of the Reformation, much of the New World, known as the Americas, was shaped, missionaries increased in number throughout the world, and thinkers who rose up from the Renaissance could proclaim their discoveries and beliefs with less fear of persecution. The Reformation gave us free thought while holding us down to the basics of life. The Life of Jesus of Nazareth Whether you are a Christian or not, you cannot honestly say that the life of Jesus of Nazareth did not dramatically impact history. If you follow the dating system that we use today, you acknowledge his impact. This article is published in A. At the time of his life, it might not have seen so dramatic to the world at large. It was only after he left earth that his teachings spread beyond his homeland and began to cause trouble for the ruling power of the time: When Roman rulers began to persecute the followers of Jesus, Christians, his life really began to ripple out around the globe. Over time, Christianity was accepted by the Roman rulers, which allowed it to spread even further. Today, Christianity is one of the largest religions of the world. Jesus set off an atomic religious bomb that is still felt today. Tearing Down of the Berlin Wall Tearing down a wall might not seem like much, but when you realize what all else came down with that wall, you begin to see it in a whole new light. At the end of World War II, there was relief at the downfall of a disturbed man who wanted to dominate the earth. However, there was also suspicion between countries and a desire to control as much land as possible. The nations that defeated Hitler and his friends began to quarrel amongst themselves. Should the defeated lands be democratic in nature or communist? The end result was a lesson from King Solomon: Germany was the embodiment of the war, and therefore, it became the most disputed area. In the end, it was split in half with one part under a communist government and the other under a more democratic style. Through the middle of Berlin, a large wall was built to separate the capital city and symbolize the wall that separated the communist world from everyone else. When the wall came down in , it signified the end of communist rule and birth of the voice of the people. World War II This is one of the few wars that literally involved most of the world. The scarring from this six-year fight is still seen today in the demolished buildings and the tattooed numbers on the arms of POWs. There was no one main objective or enemy. There was no main front. It was composed of the European, African, and Asian segments of the war. It ripped through every economic level, race, religion, and culture. Country after country fell into other hands. Men, women, and children were killed by the millions. Many lost their loved ones and had to seek new lands to call home as there was so much devastation. The world had changed and was never to return to the innocence it once claimed. It was the unmasking of an underlying evil that took an ugly shape in the Cold War. Only as the truth of the massacres, plots, and campaigns have revealed themselves has the world truly begun to heal. No one during that time could imagine anything worse. That is until they faced themselves with WWII and even more bloodshed. But WWI was not pushed aside. In truth, Kennan was right on the money. The hatred toward the world that many Germans felt led to the election of Hitler, the creation of concentration camps, and the fall of France, Poland, and many other countries. An unsatisfied closure to the Great War caused it to be the silence before the storm. Russian troops in trenches.

**Chapter 2 : What are some tragedies and triumphs in History?(Events, issues and people)? | Yahoo Answers**

*November 8, Triumphs of History Book Reviews, Medieval Book Reviews Book Review #3 I was looking forward to read The Franks by Edward James as it is a volume of The Peoples of Europe series that I plan on reading.*

In the second place who would not have been cautious in the case of a company with such a bad name? What makes this important to our study of the First Punic War is that the aforementioned Gauls are some of the same Celts and Gauls in active service in the First Punic War. As we will see, the Epirots and Illyrians certainly made poor judgements in placing their trust. Mercenary companies were fairly common in the classical Mediterranean world. Carthage, as general policy, usually employed large quantities of mercenaries as a major part of her military force. These came from Africa, Italy, Spain, and Gaul, among many others. These mercenaries were usually supplemented in large part by the forces of client-states of Carthage, such as Numidians, Libyans, and Liby-Phoenicians. Carthaginian citizens proper rarely fought outside of their own territory or abroad. For example, Carthaginian citizen-soldiers do not seem to have played much of a role at all in Sicily, but they did confront Regulus at the Battle of Tunis. This particular Gallic band seems to have served Carthage for the much of the duration of the war. They were at Agrigentum fairly early in the war, at the forefront of a conflict over pay. They may have done some looting inside the city, but apparently were appeased after a short time. They must have made their escape with much of the rest of the Carthaginian army under the cover of night to avoid the Roman host. However, their activity in the following few years would elevate them to probably being considered the most treacherous and notorious of Mediterranean mercenary companies in the classical age. It started when Hamilcar led his successful raid against the town of Eryx on Mt. As we have already seen, the Romans still had garrisons at the summit of the mountain in the temple complex as well as in a base at the foot of the mountain. Hamilcar would continue to lead attacks against these positions and others around Mt. Apparently Autaritus and his Gauls were assigned to this garrison duty during certain periods of time. It may be that they were not being paid enough as the Carthaginians were strapped for cash by this point in the war. Fortunately for Hamilcar, for whatever reason, they were unsuccessful in their attempt. However, in lieu of handing Eryx over, they decided to join what they probably saw as the winning team or at least the team who could pay them and defected to the Romans. The Romans made quick use of Autaritus and his Gauls and had them reinforce the garrison at the temple on the summit of Mt. It seems that they were just as discontent under Roman masters as they were under Carthaginian ones. While garrisoned there, this Gallic mercenary band looted and pillaged the area of the temple. The Romans, probably not wanting to risk losing the position by fighting them, put up with Autaritus and his men for the duration of the First Punic War, but then sent them away. About 260 BC, without their leader Autaritus, headed east after the Romans disposed of them and it is in service to the Greek state of Epirus that Polybius narrates the devious history of this company. After Queen Teuta became ruler in Illyria, she sent raids against her neighbors. During the course of one of these raids, the Illyrians anchored at the Epirot city of Phoenice to resupply. It just so happened that our Gallic mercenaries were a major part of the garrison of this port city. Apparently the Illyrians and Gauls hit off and were able to come to some sort of deal. This was a war fought between Carthage against many of her former mercenary forces being aided by Libyans. In this war, Autaritus was one of the leaders of the rebel army. At one point in the war, Autaritus gave a rousing speech that directly resulted in some Carthaginian captives having their hands cut off, legs broken, and limbs removed, followed by further mutilation and being thrown into a trench. Autaritus and the other leaders of the revolt were captured before the battle and were later crucified in view of the resistance to Carthage that remained. Not all mercenary companies were as deceitful as Autaritus and his Gauls and, in fact, the vast majority of mercenaries could be counted on as long as the price was right. The story of this Gallic band, besides being interesting, demonstrates just how interconnected the Mediterranean was in the classical age. Next time, we will return to our narrative of the First Punic War and examine the developments to occur before the last battle of the war.

**Chapter 3 : Epistemology - The history of epistemology | [blog.quintoapp.com](http://blog.quintoapp.com)**

*Dungeons and Dragons, the most successful RPG of all time, has seen many tragedies and triumphs over its long history, including being in the middle of the Satanic Panic in the '80s, to now be.*

Ancient philosophy The pre-Socratics The central focus of ancient Greek philosophy was the problem of motion. Many pre-Socratic philosophers thought that no logically coherent account of motion and change could be given. Although the problem was primarily a concern of metaphysics, not epistemology, it had the consequence that all major Greek philosophers held that knowledge must not itself change or be changeable in any respect. Plato Plato accepted the Parmenidean constraint that knowledge must be unchanging. One consequence of that view, as Plato pointed out in the Theaetetus, is that sense experience cannot be a source of knowledge, because the objects apprehended through it are subject to change. To the extent that humans have knowledge, they attain it by transcending sense experience in order to discover unchanging objects through the exercise of reason. Plato Plato, marble portrait bust, from an original of the 4th century bce; in the Capitoline Museums, Rome. Of the many literary devices Plato used to illustrate his theory, the best known is the allegory of the cave, which appears in Book VII of the Republic. The allegory depicts people living in a cave, which represents the world of sense-experience. In the cave, people see only unreal objects, shadows, or images. Through a painful intellectual process, which involves the rejection and overcoming of the familiar sensible world, they begin an ascent out of the cave into reality. That process is the analogue of the exercise of reason, which allows one to apprehend unchanging objects and thus to acquire knowledge. The upward journey, which few people are able to complete, culminates in the direct vision of the Sun, which represents the source of knowledge. Knowing also is a mental faculty, according to Plato, and therefore there must be a unique set of objects that it apprehends. Roughly speaking, those objects are the entities denoted by terms that can be used as predicates. Plato is here distinguishing between specific triangles that are drawn, sketched, or painted and the common property they share, that of being triangular. Unlike particulars, forms do not exist in space and time; moreover, they do not change. They are thus the objects that one apprehends when one has knowledge. Reason is used to discover unchanging forms through the method of dialectic, which Plato inherited from his teacher Socrates. Anyone who grasps these conditions understands precisely what being a brother is. In the Republic, Plato applies the dialectical method to the concept of justice. Suppose one borrows a weapon from a person who later loses his sanity. If the person then demands his weapon back in order to kill someone who is innocent, it would be just to lie to him, stating that one no longer had the weapon. In doing so he apprehends the form of justice, the common feature that all just things share. But how should knowledge in general be defined? In the Theaetetus Plato argues that, at a minimum, knowledge involves true belief. No one can know what is false. People may believe that they know something that is in fact false. But in that case they do not really know; they only think they know. Knowledge is more than simply true belief. Suppose that someone has a dream in April that there will be an earthquake in September and, on the basis of that dream, forms the belief that there will be an earthquake in September. Suppose also that in fact there is an earthquake in September. The person has a true belief about the earthquake but not knowledge of it. What the person lacks is a good reason to support that true belief. In a word, the person lacks justification. Using such arguments, Plato contends that knowledge is justified true belief. Although there has been much disagreement about the nature of justification, the Platonic definition of knowledge was widely accepted until the mid-20th century, when the American philosopher Edmund L. Gettier produced a startling counterexample. Suppose that Kathy knows Oscar very well. Kathy is walking across the mall, and Oscar is walking behind her, out of sight. In front of her, Kathy sees someone walking toward her who looks exactly like Oscar. Kathy forms the belief that Oscar is walking across the mall. Her belief is true, because Oscar is in fact walking across the mall though she does not see him doing it. Nonetheless, Kathy does not know that Oscar is walking across the mall. Aristotle In the Posterior Analytics, Aristotle (384–322 bce) claims that each science consists of a set of first principles, which are necessarily true and knowable directly, and a set of truths, which are both logically derivable from and causally explained by the first principles. The demonstration of a scientific truth is accomplished by means of

a series of syllogisms – a form of argument invented by Aristotle – in which the premises of each syllogism in the series are justified as the conclusions of earlier syllogisms. In each syllogism, the premises not only logically necessitate the conclusion. Thus, in the syllogism All stars are distant objects. All distant objects twinkle. Therefore, all stars twinkle. The premises of the first syllogism in the series are first principles, which do not require demonstration, and the conclusion of the final syllogism is the scientific truth in question.

Detail of a Roman copy 2nd century bc of a Greek alabaster portrait bust of Aristotle c. As he uses the term, the soul psyche of a thing is what makes it alive; thus, every living thing, including plant life, has a soul. The mind or intellect nous can be described variously as a power, faculty, part, or aspect of the human soul. What they acquire must be either different from the thing they know or identical with it. If it is different, then there is a discrepancy between what they have in mind and the object of their knowledge. But such a discrepancy seems to be incompatible with the existence of knowledge, for knowledge, which must be true and accurate, cannot deviate from its object in any way. One cannot know that blue is a colour, for example, if the object of that knowledge is something other than that blue is a colour. That idea, that knowledge is identical with its object, is dimly reflected in the modern formula for expressing one of the necessary conditions of knowledge: A knows that p only if it is true that p. To assert that knowledge and its object must be identical raises a question: Suppose that Smith knows what dogs are. Then, in some sense, dogs, or being a dog, must be in the mind of Smith. But how can that be? Aristotle derives his answer from his general theory of reality. According to him, all terrestrial substances are composed of two principles: All dogs, for example, consist of a form – the form of being a dog – and matter, which is the stuff out of which they are made. The form of an object makes it the kind of thing it is. Matter, on the other hand, is literally unintelligible. Consequently, what is in the knower when he knows what dogs are is just the form of being a dog. In his sketchy account of the process of thinking in *De anima* *On the Soul*, Aristotle says that the intellect, like everything else, must have two parts: The first is the passive intellect, the second the active intellect, of which Aristotle speaks tersely. According to him, sensation occurs when the sense organ is stimulated by the sense object, typically through some medium, such as light for vision and air for hearing. The first, Academic Skepticism, arose in the Academy the school founded by Plato in the 3rd century bce and was propounded by the Greek philosopher Arcesilaus c. That form of Skepticism seems susceptible to the objection, raised by the Stoic Antipater flourished c. To know that knowledge is impossible is to know something. Hence, dogmatic Skepticism must be false. Academic Skepticism, he insisted, is not a theory about knowledge or the world but rather a kind of argumentative strategy. According to the strategy, the Skeptic does not try to prove that he knows nothing. Instead, he simply assumes that he knows nothing and defends that assumption against attack. The burden of proof, in other words, is on those who believe that knowledge is possible. Pyrrhonists, while not asserting or denying anything, attempted to show that one ought to suspend judgment and avoid making any knowledge claims at all, even the negative claim that nothing is known. The judgment that Providence cares for all things, which is supported by the orderliness of the heavenly bodies, is contradicted by the judgment that many good people suffer misery and many bad people enjoy happiness. The judgment that apples have many properties – shape, colour, taste, and aroma – each of which affects a sense organ, is contradicted by the equally good possibility that apples have only one property that affects each sense organ differently. According to the Pyrrhonists, every possible criterion is either groundless or inconclusive. Thus, suppose that something is offered as a criterion. The Pyrrhonist will ask what justification there is for it. If no justification is offered, then the criterion is groundless. If, on the other hand, a justification is produced, then the justification itself is either justified or it is not. If it is not justified, then again the criterion is groundless. If it is justified, then there must be some criterion that justifies it. But this is just what the dogmatist was supposed to have provided in the first place. If the Pyrrhonist needed to make judgments in order to survive, he would be in trouble. In fact, however, there is a way of living that bypasses judgment. One can live quite nicely, according to Sextus, by following custom and accepting things as they appear. In doing so, one does not judge the correctness of anything but merely accepts appearances for what they are. Ancient Pyrrhonism is not strictly an epistemology, since it has no theory of knowledge and is content to undermine the dogmatic epistemologies of others, especially Stoicism and Epicureanism. Pyrrho himself was said to have had ethical

motives for attacking dogmatists: They are indeed in some mysterious way a part of God and seen in God.

**Chapter 4 : German addresses are blocked - [blog.quintoapp.com](http://blog.quintoapp.com)**

*Triumphs and Tragedies History Podcast I recorded the Introduction to my twenty part podcast series Triumphs and Tragedies - a Short History of the Catholic Church. This podcast series will be available free here on my blog, but also at my iTunes channel and through BreadBox media.*

One reason for this, which has long been acknowledged, is that the English term "history," like its cognates in many Western languages *histoire*, *Geschichte*, is normally used to refer to two distinct, though related, things. On the one hand it refers to the temporal progression of large-scale human events, primarily but not exclusively in the past; on the other hand, "history" refers to the discipline or inquiry in which knowledge of the human past is acquired or sought. Thus "philosophy of history" can mean philosophical reflection on the historical process itself, or it can mean philosophical reflection on the knowledge we have of the historical process. Philosophers have done both sorts of things, and this has led to a distinction between "substantive" or sometimes "speculative" and "critical" or "analytical" philosophy of history. The first is usually considered part of metaphysics, perhaps analogous to the "philosophy of nature," whereas the second is seen as epistemology, as in the "philosophy of science. This entry begins with the standard distinction, only to see it lose some of its usefulness in the course of the exposition. Philosophical Reflection on the Historical Process

The term "philosophy of history" originates with Voltaire in the 18th century, but it is most closely associated with German philosophers of the Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment periods: Kant, Herder, Hegel, and Marx. The lectures represent Hegel at the height of his influence, and their relatively brief less than a hundred pages introduction is as clear and straightforward as it is comprehensive. Soon translated into other languages e. What is more, philosophers who reflected on history before Hegel are often thought to have been engaged in the same kind of inquiry he was. But this is anachronistic, and misleading. The substantive philosophy of history is often described, in keeping with Hegel, as the search for the meaning and purpose of world history, and for the force that drives history toward its goal. While this describes many instances of reflection on the historical process, it is a simplification and is not necessarily an apt description of philosophical thought about history prior to Hegel. The most general description of the substantive philosophy of history is that the philosopher tries to "make sense" of the historical process, usually in the face of evidence to the contrary. But the "sense" that the philosopher seeks varies considerably: Philosophical reflection on the historical process seems to originate in early Christian philosophy, which is in turn indebted to the Jewish conception of time. The Hebrew scriptures introduce historical time into a world dominated by cyclical and ahistorical conceptions of time. Indian, Persian, and Greek thought are based on unchanging patterns and eternal recurrence, in which individual events, both natural and human, get whatever significance they have from reflecting, imitating, or instantiating these timeless forms. The sequence of individual events is not "going anywhere. In spite of the compelling historical accounts left by Herodotus and Thucydides, for Greek philosophers even political arrangements—constitutions such as aristocracy, monarchy, democracy—are portrayed, in the classical texts of Plato and Aristotle, for example, as following cyclical patterns of rise, fall and repetition. By contrast, for the ancient Jews, human events—both political and religious—get their significance not from a "vertical" and imitative relation to eternal patterns, but from a "horizontal" relation backward and forward to other events in real time: Christianity takes up this historical conception of time and intensifies it, first by affirming the coming of the Messiah as a central, real historical event, in the middle of history, as it were, pointing ahead to a final salvation in the second coming; and second, by extending the promise of salvation to all mankind through a progressive spread and universal triumph of Christianity. Creation, the fall, incarnation, and last judgment are unique, unrepeatable occurrences, and individual events and deeds, both human and divine, are arrayed along a line of time that extends from beginning to end. Given this conception, events are coming from somewhere and are going somewhere in time. Origin and destiny give meaning to human events and actions. This conception of historical time is not itself a philosophy of history but a cultural and religious worldview. Philosophical reflection begins when this conception generates problems, as it did in the age of Augustine. This philosopher struggled with problems of good and evil,

freedom and divine justice, responsibility and punishment. History entered the picture when these concepts were projected onto the stage of the large-scale social events of his own time. The conversion of the Roman Empire under Constantine CE was seen by early Christian theologians as the vindication of their religion and the harbinger of its eventual triumph throughout the world. Pagans took this as a sign that Christianity was responsible for the demise of the empire, and Christians wondered why God seemed to be punishing Rome rather than rewarding it for its conversion and crowning it with glory. Here it was historical developments, rather than just evil deeds and events, that seemed at odds with religious doctrine, and this constituted the problem Augustine felt the need to solve, addressing both pagan and Christian audiences. In response, Augustine denied that salvation and divine justice were to be sought in human secular history or its political or even religious institutions. Instead, they were to be found in the City of God, whose citizens have their real life outside secular time. As often occurs in the history of Christian thought, Greek philosophy comes to the rescue of the religious worldview. At the same time Augustine inaugurates the tradition of Christian apologetics, later called theodicy: Two things should be noted about history as Augustine conceives it: These two features of history remained more or less constant in the Christian tradition until the time of the enlightenment. He sees the world in apparent moral disorder, with the authority of the church being challenged, but assures his readers of the guidance of divine providence and the ultimate salvation of the faithful. Giambattista Vico, in the *New Science* , also appeals to the idea of providence, but his approach to history is more novel and more modern, because he thinks of providence as embodied in rational, developmental laws rather than acts of divine intervention. Vico is also known for dignifying historical knowledge, in the face of both ancient and modern disdain for it when compared to our knowledge of nature. Because human beings make history through their own acts, Vico believes, they are capable of knowing it. Because God creates nature, only he can truly know it. In this Vico challenges his contemporaries, the Cartesian defenders of the new mathematical science of nature as the paradigm for all knowledge. In the French Enlightenment, humans take center stage and their reason makes them capable of shaping their own destinies. Human events come under calculation and control. The future is no longer something to be prophesied or predicted, but something to be produced. The legitimacy of rulers can be questioned, and the people can overthrow them. History begins to look like a progress from a past of darkness and superstition into the light of reason and human self-determination. The purpose and goal of history now lies not outside and beyond it, but within it at some attainable point in the future. It is the result of human rather than divine agency, and it is now conceived not as salvation but as emancipation. Even though Voltaire introduces the term "philosophy of history" it is possible to argue that his view of history, shared by the enlightenment philosophes and the revolutionaries of the eighteenth century, was not so much a philosophical reflection on history but again, like the religion of the Jews and early Christians, an emerging political and cultural worldview. The philosophy of history begins, as before, when this worldview generates problems. The late enlightenment period produced a vast new literature of discovery and travel, which led among other things to the beginnings of history as something like an academic discipline with critical methods and justifiable assertions. A late text bears the title "An old question raised again: Kant wants to share the enlightenment point of view, just as he wants to endorse the claims of natural theology, but his critical reason forces him to limit its pretensions. As should be expected when reading Kant, of course, in no way is the idea of divine providence taken for granted. Progress in history, should it be found, would be toward "the achievement of a universal civic society which administers laws among men" p. He discusses at some lengths the difficulties of such an achievement, asserting as he does elsewhere that it would require solving "the problem of a lawful external relation among states" p. This is the greatest difficulty of all, because we can see the same antagonism among states as among individuals, which has led again and again to war. But after "devastations, revolutions, and even complete exhaustion," nature brings states to the realization that they must move "from the lawless condition of savages into a league of nations" p. He is not making claims about the actual course of history; rather, he is outlining the ideal conditions under which alone, he thinks, history could exhibit any progress. Thus he can assure practicing historians that he is making no attempt to displace their work, because he is propounding an Idea of world history based upon an a priori principle p. By using the term "Idea," a terminus technicus from the Critique of Pure Reason, which the translators signal by

means of capitalization, Kant indicates a rational concept whose empirical reality not only is not, but, according to the Critique, cannot be exhibited in experience. But, like human freedom itself, neither can its possibility be empirically denied. Thus the course of history does not provide evidence that the "civic union of the human race" will ever be achieved, but neither does it prove that it never will be. Its realization must at least be regarded as possible, and the Idea that we have of it may help bring it to pass p. Kant is telling us not where history is going but where it ought to be going. Only in this minimal sense can philosophy help "make sense" of history, namely by articulating the "cosmopolitan standpoint" from which alone it can be freed from its apparent moral chaos. And by showing that its moral realization is at least possible, it "permits us to hope" for a better future. But here he rationally justifies hope for a better future for mankind on earth. In Idea for a Universal History, the concepts of a universal civic society, or league of nations, and of history as progressing toward it, legitimize certain political choices. They are Ideas capable of guiding our action in the social sphere. Kant is anticipating the project of expanding his ethical principles, with such notions as a kingdom of ends, into a political theory. Their central concern is not with what is the case but with what we ought to do. And the same is true of his philosophy of history. In his *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* , he undertakes a universal history, and for him, as for Voltaire, this means expanding the traditional scope of history to include non-European peoples. But Herder takes this insight in a different direction. While the thinkers of the French Enlightenment sought proof of the universality of human reason, Herder by contrast is struck by the diversity and particularity of human nature, embodied in distinct peoples and cultures. The Enlightenment philosophers saw the growth of scientific rationality expanding to the political realm and imagined a future in which reason triumphed over the dark forces of superstition and emotion. Herder, with his emphasis on diversity and culture, was less convinced that history was moving in any unified direction, much less a progressive one. True, his devout Protestantism kept him from embracing the complete cultural relativism that many would later draw from his work. But in contrast to Kant, whose sympathies still lie with the Enlightenment, Herder becomes one of the first great figures of the Romantic movement that grew up in opposition to it. He begins by distinguishing a "philosophische Weltgeschichte" from history proper; philosophy, he says, has "thoughts of its own," a priori thoughts, to bring to the study of history , p. Reason not only sets the goal for history but also governs the realization of that goal. Hegel did not invent this idea, he reminds us; the idea that reason rules the world is that of Anaxagoras, and it has also been expressed in the idea of divine providence. Unwilling to settle for pious ignorance, Hegel believes that the rationality of providence can be known and explained. If we take seriously the idea of providence, the demonstration of its rationality would amount to a theodicy or "justification of God" p. The embodiment of reason is spirit Geist , both in individuals and in peoples, whose nature is to be conscious and self-conscious, and whose actualization is to be autonomous and self-sufficient, that is, to be free. But this actualization is a temporal process, and that process is history. Spirit actualizes itself and achieves freedom through history, drawing its energy from human passions and intentions; but the result of this process is often at odds with the actual intentions of the individuals and peoples involved. In history, it is only when individuals and peoples organize themselves into states that freedom can finally be truly actualized. It is here, in law, the ethical life of the community and political order, not in the mere absence of constraint, that the "positive reality and satisfaction of freedom" are to be found p. The actual course of history can be seen as the display of human perfectibility leading toward the realization of freedom. Individuals and peoples struggle against each other, and many morally good and virtuous people suffer unjustly. But history moves on a different plane, and here the acts of individuals, especially those of the great figures of history, are not to be judged by moral standards. It is the spirit of peoples, not individuals, that are the agents of history, but these, "progressing in a necessary series of stages, are themselves only phases of the one universal Spirit: The self-comprehension of world spirit is philosophy itself.

**Chapter 5 : Rome ~ Triumphs of History**

*triumphs, and tragedies, throughout history. Also contemplate the second definition, "a notable success." How would you define a notable success in history.*

The northwest portion of Mexico, called Baja California, is separated from the rest of the nation by the Gulf of California. The Sierra Madre, an extension of the Rocky Mountain chain, divides into the Oriental range to the east and the Occidental range to the west. Overall, Mexico occupies , square miles. Over time, these early peoples built highly organized civilizations, such as the Olmec, Teotihuacan, Mayan, Toltec, Zapotec, Mixtec, and Aztec societies, the majority of which were accomplished in art, architecture, mathematics, astronomy, and agriculture. For the next years, Mexico, or New Spain, would remain under colonial rule. An unequal distribution of land and wealth developed and, as the nation grew in numbers, the disproportion between the rich and poor continued to increase, as did a sense of social unrest among the most neglected of its populace. Their discontent resulted in a successful revolt against Spain in 1521. Mining was revitalized and foreign trade increased. Dynamic growth brought relative prosperity to many economic sectors of various regions of the country, complemented by increased levels of employment. Those residing in rural areas struggled to produce enough to survive from their own small parcels of land, or, much more likely, worked under a debt-peonage system, farming lands owned by someone infinitely wealthier than they were. Most residents of urban areas, if they were lucky enough to have full employment, worked long hours under poor conditions for extremely low wages and lived in housing and neighborhoods that fostered diseases. After Francisco Madero, the newly elected president, failed to define an agenda to satisfy the several disparate groups in Mexico, he likewise agreed to self-exile but was assassinated by supporters of General Victoriano de la Huerta, the man who next assumed national leadership. Violence escalated into a bloody and prolonged civil war known as the Revolution of 1910. The turmoil and bloodshed motivated some people from all levels of society to flee the country, most often northward to the United States. By the early 1920s, though relative peace had been restored, the social and economic reforms that had become associated with the revolution were still unrealized, chief among them the redistribution of land to a greater percentage of the populace. National presidents focused on promoting growth in the industrial sector, but the opening of new jobs did not keep pace with the employment needs of a rapidly expanding population. Since the 1930s, economic conditions in Mexico have improved at a gradual pace. Expanding industrialization has provided additional jobs for greater numbers of workers and increased oil production has brought in needed foreign currencies. The projected benefits from commercial accords such as the North American Free Trade Agreement have yet to materialize, but continued growth of international trade with other Latin American nations may invigorate areas of economic investment and production. Continued single-party rule by the PRI, high levels of unemployment, underemployment, low wages, and the many social problems related to a prolonged period of intense urbanization—coupled with the need for renewed efforts at land redistribution in certain areas of the country—remain as sources of concern for the government and causes of unrest for a significant segment of the population. In increasing proportions since the late 1960s, those people unable to find dependable sources of employment or subsistence wages have moved to the northern borderlands and crossed into the United States, where the economic prospects are more promising. To reverse this movement of manpower out of the country, future administrations in Mexico will have to continue to promote the expansion of economic growth to all regions in the country and the creation of new jobs in the public and private sectors. After returning to Mexico, however, he was quick to join other military leaders who rejected the accord. Relations between the United States and Mexico remained strained, at best, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The Lone Star Republic was admitted to the Union as the State of Texas in 1845; shortly thereafter the frequency of border skirmishes between the two countries increased. The capture of Mexico City was the final significant armed conflict. War between Mexico and the United States ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 in which Mexico surrendered , square miles, close to one-half of its territory. Approximately 80,000 Mexicans resided in the territory transferred to the United States at the conclusion of the Mexican-American War, the greatest numbers of whom were located in present-day New Mexico and

California. Only a small proportion of the total, slightly over 2%, decided to return to their country of origin after the signing of the treaty. Those who remained north of the border were guaranteed citizenship after two years, along with other privileges and responsibilities related to this status. The discovery of gold in the Sierra Nevada of California in 1848 was an initial stimulus for this migration, as was the expansion of copper mining in Arizona beginning in the 1850s. During this same period and on into the twentieth century, ranching and agriculture lured many inhabitants of the northern and central states of Mexico to Texas. By approximately 1900, 1 million people of Mexican ancestry lived in the United States, principally in the areas originally populated by Spaniards and Mexicans prior to 1848. Roughly 75% of these residents were born in Mexico; the remainder were second-generation inhabitants of these regions and their offspring. A combination of factors contributed to sequential pronounced rises in Mexican migration to the United States during the first three decades of the twentieth century. The Reclamation Act of 1902, which expanded acreage for farming through new irrigation projects, spurred the need for more agricultural laborers. The Mexican Revolution of 1910 and the aftermath of political instability and social violence caused many to flee northward across the border for their safety, and the growth of the U.S. economy. Though the wages received by most Mexican migrants in these decades were quite low, they were considerably higher than the salaries paid for comparable work in Mexico. Most importantly, the number of jobs for foreign laborers seemed unlimited, especially during World War I and on into the early 1920s. Only 31,000 Mexicans migrated to the United States in the first decade of the twentieth century, but the next two ten-year periods manifested markedly higher numbers, especially from 1910 to 1920, when almost 1 million people of Mexican ancestry entered the country. However, since the frontier was virtually open to anyone wishing to cross it until the creation of the Border Patrol in 1925, immigration figures for years prior to this date are of dubious legitimacy. Rural areas of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Texas attracted a vast majority of these migrants, but during the years of World War I, mounting numbers of newcomers moved to the upper midwestern states, mainly to the region around Chicago. They were attracted by jobs in industry, railroads, steelmills, and meat-packing. In these initial periods of heavy immigration, it was most common for Mexican males to cross the border for work and return to Mexico periodically with whatever profits they were able to accumulate over several months. During these same decades, men might also establish residency in the United States and return for their families, though still quite often with the ultimate objective of returning to Mexico permanently in a not-too-distant future. Hill and Wang, J., p. Mexican immigration to the United States decreased considerably in the 1930s due to the economic depression of this decade. Though approximately 300,000 Mexicans entered the United States during these years, over 100,000 left the country, most of them forced to do so because of the Repatriation Program, which sought to extradite those Mexicans without proper documentation. The Mexican government since the 1930s had attempted to encourage reverse migration to Mexico. With the exception of the decade of World War II, legal immigration from Mexico to the United States since has remained at or above the high levels of 1910 to 1920. Despite federal legislation to limit the numbers of immigrants from most countries to the United States in the 1930s and 1940s, Mexican migrants crossing the border totaled 1.5 million, and 1.2 million, for the two decades. It is estimated that approximately one million entered the United States legally between 1930 and 1940. The number of undocumented workers has increased consistently since the 1930s; approximately one million people of this category were deported annually to Mexico in the late 1930s and early 1940s, a proportion of this figure representing individuals deported more than once. Meier and Rivera, pp. The availability of jobs in the United States, coupled with high rates of unemployment and periodic slowdowns in the Mexican economy, served to encourage this continued migration northward. In the 1940s the estimated proportion had risen to 94 percent. Meier and Rivera, p. Los Angeles had among the highest number of Hispanics of major cities of the world and by far the greatest proportion of its population was Mexican in origin. According to the U.S. Census Bureau report, approximately 12 million people of Mexican ancestry lived in the United States, a figure which represented 4.5% of the total population. Over 66 percent of the people of Mexican ancestry were born in the United States, while 34% were born in Mexico. The Pacific states, led by California, held the highest populations of Mexican Americans, in descending sequence: California, 5.5 million; Texas, 2.5 million; Arizona, 1.5 million; New Mexico, 1.2 million. The procedures of these courts were biased against the original owners: Small landholders were particularly vulnerable. Land companies often successfully appropriated the holdings of isolated Mexican villagers who neglected to register their land claims in the appropriate governmental offices or failed to pay

sometimes burdensome new taxes demanded on their properties. The response of many Mexicans in the southwestern United States to the Anglo American presence was retaliatory violence. In New Mexico, Las Gorras Blancas, a vigilante group, destroyed rail lines and the properties of lumber and cattle interests in an attempt to convince these forces to move elsewhere Griswold del Castillo, p. In Texas, the decade-long Cortina War started in In defense of Mexican property rights, Cortina declared: Most Mexicans perceived Anglo Americans to be "arrogant, over-bearing, aggressive, conniving, rude, unreliable and dishonest" because of the unscrupulous actions of some McWilliams, p. Disfavor on the part of some Anglo Americans with Mexicans was evident before , but it intensified thereafter. Besides a small minority of well-to-do Mexican families with extensive landholdings, the preponderant number of residents in the territories ceded to the United States in were of humble origin and negligible financial resources. As greater numbers came north in search of work, the wages of those Mexicans already working in the United States were held down due to the abundant supply of labor, and the standard of living of most of these individuals consequently remained at the same low level for decade upon decade. Though not all Anglo Americans living in the same areas inhabited by Mexicans were appreciably better off, a definite economic disparity existed and was one of the reasons for a division to develop between the two cultures. Other differences made this division more pronounced, however. Whereas the immigrants from Mexico were predominantly Catholic, most of the people who settled in Texas, California, and the other territories were of Protestant sects. The religious wars on the European continent between these creeds were not too distant in the past to be forgotten. Perhaps most importantly for some, however, the new majority society was decidedly of North European origin and of light skin color. In contrast, most Mexicans living in or moving to these newly acquired lands of the United States were mestizos people of mixed Spanish and Indian ancestry , and a significant percentage of those who immigrated from the northern states of Mexico were primarily of Indian ancestry. The sentiments of a sizable portion of western settlers in the United States in the mids about the indigenous civilizations whose lands they were slowly appropriating were quite negative. In the words of McWilliams, "Indians were a conquered race despised by Anglo Americans" and "Mexicans were constantly equated with Indians" by the most race-conscious of the early Anglo American westerners McWilliams, p. The number of immigrants increased considerably in the first decades of the twentieth century. Though employers in mining, agriculture, and various industries were more than pleased to see ever larger numbers of migrant workers cross the border each year, Anglo American laborers in the same occupations as these immigrants blamed the newcomers for holding their wages down and viewed them as strike busters. Moreover, when urbanization became more pronounced in the s and Mexicans in the Southwest began moving to the major cities, many people in these urban centers perceived these Hispanics as part of the cause of higher crime rates, increased vagrancy, and violence. City chambers of commerce, local welfare agencies, nativist organizations, and various labor unions all began to call for controls on Mexican migration. Massive unemployment in the s prompted the initiation of the Repatriation Program. Many of the Mexicans who left the country had lived in the United States for over ten years and had started American-born families. Their mandated eviction was a tragic experience that led to a bitter realization: This would not be the last time this fact would be dramatized to Mexicans and Mexican Americans in such humiliating fashion. Approximately , children born in the United States of Mexican immigrants or Mexican American parents fought in World War II, and a proportionately high number won medals of honor, but relations between Mexican American and Anglo American citizens remained tense in the s. In in Los Angeles, the purported beating of eleven sailors by a group of Mexican American youths sparked a prolonged retaliation by servicemen and civilians against Hispanics wearing "zoot suits," distinctive clothing interpreted by some Anglo Americans in the city to symbolize a rebellious attitude by the younger Mexican Americans. Many injuries occurred on both sides and the riots in Los Angeles spread to several other metropolitan centers nationwide Meier and Rivera, p. After the war, despite the fact that thousands of Mexican Americans lost their lives in battle, many Hispanics remained segregated in neighborhoods out of sight to Anglo American society. Though in the s several southwestern states attempted to rebuild old sections of certain towns of Spanish heritage to romanticize the local Hispanic traditions, the apparent respect for the Hispanic past in this region of the country contrasted "harshly with the actual behavior of the community

toward persons of Mexican descent" McWilliams, p. Increased tourism, rather than pride in the multicultural heritage of these areas, might have been the primary factor for most reconstruction programs. Only in the s, when the civil rights of most minorities in the United States were brought under scrutiny, did the negative attitudes of many citizens toward Mexican Americans begin to be called into question. In the U. The Teatro Campesino of Luis Valdez dramatized visually for audiences the barriers of prejudice faced by most Mexican Americans in the land once possessed by their ancestors. A significant majority of U. Upward mobility has brought a better life to a minority of Mexican Americans and increased acceptance by some who might previously have repudiated them.

### Chapter 6 : blog.quintoapp.com server and hosting history

*Before the St. Petersburg Open final, Dominic Thiem had lost all three of his FedEx ATP Head2Head meetings against Slovakian Martin Klizan. But he made up for that deficit in a big way on Sunday.*

Are you sure you want to delete this answer? Yes Sorry, something has gone wrong. On June 18, Britain stood alone -- Hitler had over run Europe, crushing every nation that had picked up arms against the Nazis. The German air force the Luftwaffe had destroyed everyone that dared take to the air against them. The Poles, Holland, France, Norway Yet the German Luftwaffe far out paced the RAF in fighter planes and bombers; in fuel and ammunition; in pilots and training; and possibly most importantly -- their aircrews were battle trained, tested and hardened. Daily they flew their fighter missions doing what damage they could to the far larger Luftwaffe. As July turned into August the situation grew more desperate. The Germans began throwing more bombers and fighters at England. Hitting the airfields, the radar stations, the ports and cities. It came to a head on August 13, , what would later become know as Eagle Day. Everything the Luftwaffe had that day they put into the air. Wave-after-wave of bombers and fighters head out over the English Channel towards Britain. With these the far out number RAF pilots tore into the formations of Nazi aircraft. He asked what the RAF had in reserve. Luftwaffe bomber formations were pounced upon and decimated. One Spitfire pilot recalls that day "as the most vicious aerial combat ever to occur. Never again would the Nazis launch an air strike of this size again. Slowly, almost imperceptibly, the RAF gained the upper hand. Of the handful of exhausted and hard pressed RAF pilots that stood alone against the entire might of the Nazi Luftwaffe, Churchill would later say, in front of the House of Commons, "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.

### Chapter 7 : Triumphs of History ~ Stand in the Victorious Past

*Explore CTV News's board "Tragedy and triumph" on Pinterest. | See more ideas about Photo galleries, 30 years and American History.*

### Chapter 8 : 'Hamilton' Triumphs In Boston â€” The Opera House Is The Room Where It Happens (Finally)

*The history of epistemology Ancient philosophy The pre-Socratics. The central focus of ancient Greek philosophy was the problem of blog.quintoapp.com pre-Socratic philosophers thought that no logically coherent account of motion and change could be given.*

### Chapter 9 : The Paul Johnson Phenomenon - blog.quintoapp.com

*A Correlation of World History: The Modern Era, Mississippi Edition Â© to the Mississippi Social Studies Framework World History from The Age of Enlightenment to the Present.*