Example 1

To a high extent, religion refuses the idea of wealth accumulation because it goes against their morals(documents 4, 5, 6) however, the state wants more accumulative wealth because it helps their state and economy(documents 1, 2, 7). In religion, the large amount of income is seen as a sin, that if one has enough money to suffice while another suffers than they need to give up their income. The idea of giving back can be seen as a holy act. Yet, in the state, the amount of money coming in and going out allows for the area to sufficiently buy goods and have enough money to produce and sell their own goods, which means that accumulation is good for the economic factor. **The caring of how much they got in states was due to the silk trade which made China a top figure in trading because of their goods. While this was going on, religion was being spread and became more fluent and powerful in people's lives making them refuse the idea of their own accumulated wealth.** Religion is a factor that people in this time cling on to as their way of life which gives people the idea that self-sufficiency is good but the accumulation of wealth whilst another suffers is sinful. **During this time of the philosophy of Confucianism and the religion of Buddhism, people were raised to think of ways of enlightenment and good virtue. These are what many then began placing their morals off of.** Like in document 4, the Christain Monk told of a person who gave up their luxury because it was the devil compelling sins onto them. The monk told this biography to gain more followers and to show how their way of life works. It was to show that he was doing his job right and respectfully and to show off the religion in a way that reflects justice. Also in document 6, the painting is to show, again, how giving goods was more holy than being sinful and keeping it all to themselves. It shows this by the "Halos" shown around the higher figures heads. If people gave back to their higher figure or god, that they too would be holy in a way. The state had a system in place to run all aspects of life, which included the accumulation of money. **In China before the Zhou dynasty, there were slaves and landlords. Many upperclassmen had lots of lands and more food than they needed which showed how little they cared more about the amount of accumulated wealth than religious groups did**. In document 1, The Chronicles of Zou were to show that as long as wealth and goods were coming in, peace was kept. The chronicle was to show how wise and kind the rulers were to not take goods from the merchants, however, they were still gaining lots of products from the merchants and were swimming in goods. That was still accumulation no matter what way they wanted to be viewed, good or bad. Also in document 2, Chanakya did his job of sustaining all economic matters. He would report back everything that was sold, taken, are the amount of money made. He wanted to show how good of a commanding officer he was by showing all of the order he kept with the organization of merchant produce. In conclusion, religion did not take wealth for granted, they wanted to spread it around unlike the state during this time period. **Especially in China, where lots of their goods were traded like silk to other areas**, the state only cared about how much was made from the trade and how it made them higher and more successful powers.

Example 2

Religious responses to the accumulation of wealth differed slightly from state responses. Religious responses varied, but included the disapproval of wealth accumulation (Doc 4) as well as the allowance of wealth as long as you donate to others (Doc 5 and 6), including the church or temple responding to the wealth. Meanwhile, state responses overall varied from allowing commerce as long as they promise the state wealth or loyalty in return (Doc 1 and 7), to disapproving of commerce in general (Doc 3). At this time, trade was beginning to grow and expand, connecting many different areas throughout Eurasia, and spreading ideas, goods, and wealth throughout sea routes such as the Indian Ocean or land routes such as the Silk Road. Merchants were beginning to gain a lot of wealth from this increase in trade, and were starting to gain a decent amount of power towards the 14th century, so it is reasonable for the state and religious centers to worry of merchants becoming too powerful.

Religious responses did not vary that much from state responses, as both desired a bit of wealth themselves in return for allowing merchants to gain wealth. The image in Doc 6 depicts Bodhisattvas blessing traders who bring them gifts. The monk painting this was most likely patroned by a Buddhist temple who wanted to spread religious messages throughout Central Asian. They most likely wanted this scene painted in a cave because they wanted to encourage traders to leave gifts and wealth for their temples and religious images. Rather than punishing them, they bless the traders, demonstrating their approval of the trader's wealth accumulation. **In addition, during this time period, especially towards the 14th century, Catholic churches were allowing rich people to buy their way out of hell. If you were a rich person who wasn't very pious and sinned frequently, you could buy an indulgence that would shorten your time in purgatory or prevent you from going to hell.** This led to the Protestant Reformation in the beginning of the 14th century, but it nevertheless shows how religious institutions were fine with wealth accumulation as long as they attained a bit in return. A different example of a religious response can be found in Doc 4, which tells the story of a devout couple who gave up their wealth to follow their faith. The monk writing this story wanted to educating other devout Christians reading this story on how they should handle their wealth accumulation; by getting rid of it and following their faith. The monk does not want to lose followers to his religion, so he wants to convince his audience that God is above all material wealth, and provides an example of a couple doing so.

State responses, as mentioned above, also allowed wealth accumulation overall so long as they were promised something in return. In Doc 1, text's main message is that the ruler allows wealth accumulation as long as they promise not to revolt. This text was written during the warring states period in China, which was marked by political instability and turmoil. The person who composed this text most likely wanted to remind his or her audience of politically sound times, in which wealth accumulation was allowed in returned for loyalty and political stability. He or she does not want these warring periods to continue for fear that he or she may lose their high status job as a historian for the ruler, so he or she is reminding the audience of literate Chinese how to keep peace on it is achieved after the Warring States period. In addition to this, document 7 describes a similar situation in which a ruler declares that seizing of cargo will not occur, and that sea trade will be safely protected as long as they pay a fine to the state. The ruler wants to make sure he maintains wealth, power and authority over the growing merchant class, and he achieves this by fining them once they arrive at his kingdom. A different example of a state response is seen in Doc 3, in which a Roman statesman and philosopher states his disapproval as wealth accumulation. **Another example of states disapproving the accumulation of wealth is in the creation of the scholar gentry towards the end of the 13th century. During the time that they existed, they disapproved of the wealth accumulation of traders and merchants, mostly because they prefered to attain wealth the**

In conclusion, state responses did not vary greatly from religious responses, but rather varies more among other state responses.