Abstract
Using a modified version of the currently used Economist Intelligence Unit Global Livability Report, I will measure the livability of London during the lifetime of William Shakespeare (1564-1616), using both qualitative and quantitative historical data, and reaching a final quantitative measure of livability. I will measure five broad criteria categories: stability, healthcare, culture/environment, education, and infrastructure. I will eliminate criteria based on their anachronisms with the period; thus, criteria such as public healthcare, level of corruption, public education indicators, telecommunications, international links, and energy provisions must be eliminated or reconfigured, as they did not exist in early modern London as they do now. In keeping with the view that this report should be measured by the standards of the time, not by modern ones, views on the value of child labor and other such contemporarily illegal acts will be judged based on the historical context. Reflecting the number of sub-criteria, stability will constitute 25% of London’s livability, healthcare 15%, culture/environment 35%, education 10%, and infrastructure 15% of the overall livability score. Scores will be broken down into 20 point increments, with scores of 80-100 points reflecting ideal livability, and scores of 50 or less will reflect severely restricted living.

Method
Stability (25%): 15
- Petty Crime: 2
- Violent Crime: 3
- Uncomfortable
- Military Conflict: 4
- Acceptable
- Civil Unrest: 3
- Uncomfortable
- Threat of Tensions: 2
- Uncomfortable

Healthcare (25%): 14
- Availability of Private Healthcare: 5
- Acceptable
- Quality of Private Healthcare: 4
- Tolerable
- Availability of Over The Counter Drugs: 5
- Acceptable
- Culture/Environment (22%): 3
- Temperature/Humidity: 3
- Uncomfortable
- Job Quality and Availability: 3
- Uncomfortable
- Religious Restrictions: 2
- Uncomfortable
- Censorship: 4
- Tolerable
- Sanitation: 2
- Uncomfortable
- Culture: 5
- Acceptable
- Food: 4
- Tolerable

Education (10%): 3
- Availability of Education: 1
- Tolerable
- Quality of Education: 2
- Uncomfortable

Infrastructure (5%): 10
- Quality of Road Network: 2
- Uncomfortable
- Housing Quality: 3
- Uncomfortable
- Water Provision: 5
- Acceptable

Results
Total: 65 of 100 possible points
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Conclusion
With a score of 65, Shakespeare’s London, as the Economist Intelligence Unit Global Livability Report assigns, presents factors that “negative factors have an impact on day-to-day living”, and suggests an allowance of 10% to move a worker to a city with this rating (Economist Intelligence Unit Global Livability Report). While this supports that London would be livable for Shakespeare’s contemporaries, but not necessarily ideal, data for the conditions of smaller villages in England were unavailable, so the relative livability of London compared to surrounding areas, and the potential impact such data would have on this research, remains unmeasured.

Measuring the Livability of Shakespeare’s London

Category 1: Stability (weight: 25% of total)
Indicator Source
- Prevalence of petty crime EIU rating
- Prevalence of violent crime EIU rating
- Threat of terror EIU rating
- Threat of military conflict EIU rating
- Threat of civil unrest/conflict EIU rating

Category 2: Healthcare (weight: 20% of total)
Indicator Source
- Availability of private healthcare EIU rating
- Availability of public healthcare EIU rating
- Quality of public healthcare EIU rating
- Availability of over-the-counter drugs EIU rating
- General healthcare indicators Adapted from World Bank

Category 3: Culture & Environment (weight: 25% of total)
Indicator Source
- Humidity/temperature rating Adapted from average weather conditions
- Discomfort of climate to travelers EIU rating
- Level of corruption Adapted from Transparency International
- Social or religious restrictions EIU rating
- Level of censorship EIU rating
- Sporting availability EIU field rating of 3 sport indicators
- Cultural availability EIU field rating of 4 cultural indicators
- Food and drink EIU field rating of 4 cultural indicators
- Consumer goods and services EIU rating of product availability

Category 4: Education (weight: 10% of total)
Indicator Source
- Availability of private education EIU rating
- Quality of public education EIU rating
- Public education indicators Adapted from World Bank

Category 5: Infrastructure (weight: 20% of total)
Indicator Source
- Quality of road network EIU rating
- Quality of public transport EIU rating
- Quality of international links EIU rating
- Availability of good quality housing EIU rating
- Quality of energy provision EIU rating
- Quality of water provision EIU rating
- Quality of telecommunications EIU rating
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