

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Paper

From ThePlaz.com

World Cultures World Cultures Comparison Project Paper - see Cut sections

## Contents

- 1 Opening
- 2 Pro: Economics (Plaz)
  - 2.1 Introduction
  - 2.2 Specialization
  - 2.3 Currency
  - 2.4 Trade Barriers
  - 2.5 Innovation
  - 2.6 Exports
  - 2.7 Conclusion
- 3 Con: Pollution (David)
- 4 Con: Outsourcing (David)
- 5 Con: McDonalds in China (Greg)
- 6 Con: Changes in Latin America (Greg)
- 7 Pro: Spread Positive Culture (Plaz)
  - 7.1 McDonald's in Hong Kong
  - 7.2 Sati
  - 7.3 Women and Discrimination
- 8 Pro: Democracy and Freedom (Jeff)
- 9 Conclusion
- 10 Sources
- 11 Further Reading

## Opening

Globalization, a massive force that drives international markets in the current day, has affected thousands of years in history. This controversial force, whether good or bad, has and continues to change the rules of the world. Increasing connections, the spreading of culture, and rising international trade represent only some of what globalization can accomplish. However, from job loss to pollution to cracking culture, globalization does not always affect humans positively. From the thousands of protesters at the World Trade Organization to the leagues of economists rallying the president, globalization and free trade represent to some a promise of growth and a better life. To others, it means a harsher, poorer life. Including rich, poor, developing, and developed, globalization touches all people. But does it help us or hurt those it serves? It definitely does both. But which effect eclipses the other and comes out stronger? In the long run, which has a better effect, a global world, or one closed off from changing forces? That remains a hotly contested question. Various viewpoints include its positive economic outcomes for both developed and developing nations rebutted by arguments of increased pollution and domestic job loss. Two case studies, one of McDonalds in Hong Kong and the other of Latin American corruption, explain the negative effects of cultural globalization. An



advantageous argument returns to discuss the positive social effects of globalization. The final consists of an argument for the spreading of democracy and freedom.

## **Pro: Economics (Plaz)**

### **Introduction**

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations. Increasing trade between nations helps both parties advance by allowing them each to produce what they can and sell excise products around the world. In addition, globalization increases competition which prevents lazy monopolies and inefficient means of production. It drives innovation and world peace with a spirit of interdependence. Trade barriers only prevent these benefits from realization and hurt society as a whole. Globalization represents a positive trend which must continue to drive growth to make the world a better place.

### **Specialization**

No one person can do everything, and the same holds true for nations as well. For starters, not every nation has enough of every natural resource. The United States does not have enough oil to survive efficiently. Sure, if necessary its officials could end the dependency on oil, but this represents an enormous cost to the current industries. Alternative fuels cost too much but the same holds true for manufacturing.

The United States only has a certain amount of workers and a certain amount of land. Distributing that land to make the most goods as possible for society provides the best economic action. Of course they cannot make everything equally well. The United States needs to make trade-offs and produce more of some things than others. This decreases total output. Consider, for a minute, a smaller scale. What if each state could not trade with one another? Where would cotton or computers come from? In every state a computer factory would rise. Currently, a few, well-equipped, very efficient factories make most computer parts. If every state required a factory, many more resources would get consumed to produce the same amount of products. Sure the factory owners would grow wealthier, but at the expense of everyone else. In addition, the cotton plants would have lower yields in countries to the north because of the colder weather. In total, production goes down. In fact, since the Constitution banned trade barriers between states, one of the largest free-trade areas has emerged (McConnell and Brue 780). Economists cite this as a leading factor in the United State's development (McConnell and Brue 780). This represents an example of how free trade plays out.

Specialization solves the problem of inefficiencies. For example, Pennsylvania can produce large amounts of coal and agricultural goods. They trade those items for cotton and computers, which other states produce well. In total, with the same about of input, more cotton, coal, computers, and agricultural goods get produced each year.

This same pattern holds true between nations as well. The Japanese can produce televisions more efficiently than the United States can. However, America does not come out worse off because its citizens can produce medicines extremely well, comparatively, due to their highly trained workforce. Thus America can trade medicine for televisions. This represents the most efficient use of the scarce resources which exist in the world.

Wal-Mart represents another example of the power of maximum efficiency. Wal-Mart, the world's largest retailer and domestic private employer, achieves the lowest price possible through massive operations around the world (Wal-Mart Facts). They show success because of the principle of economies of scale. They use technology and specialization to remove as much waste from their operation as possible. Consumers must like this efficient, low-cost process because more than one-third of the United State's population visits a Wal-Mart every week (Zimmerman and Hudson). Most do not concern themselves that most production comes from China and other foreign factories. Yes, some people do raise concerns about Wal-Mart's effect on local communities and global industries; however, low prices usually draw people in, and in fact, represent a positive net effect.



## Currency

And indeed, global trade helps everyone. By buying goods from China, the United States puts its currency into the hands of foreigners. What do these foreigners do with these American dollars? They can either buy exports, thus bringing the money back to the domestic industries, or invest it, again bringing dollars back. They also can trade the dollars in the foreign exchange market, but someone must buy them. They too must invest and purchase American goods. Money loses value during inflation making it foolish to lock money in a vault. Therefore it must go elsewhere to investment and eventually brought back to America.

## Trade Barriers

Many who fear Wal-Mart and global competition try to lobby governments to pass trade barriers. In addition, workers about to lose their jobs try to install trade barriers very vocally. The rest of America usually supports the politicians unaware of the benefits trade can have. Trade barriers include both quotas and tariffs. Both harm consumers, foreign markets, and even domestic production. They artificially increase prices by reducing the number of producers able to sell a product in a certain region (McConnell and Brue 85). This shows very similar tendencies to installing monopolies, at least among domestic producers.

Throughout history, evidence has shown that monopolies represent a detriment to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (McConnell and Brue 85). Monopolies do not find themselves governed by market principles, and therefore do not operate for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole (McConnell and Brue 85). Throughout history, starting with the Sherman Act of 1890, the United States has tried to regulate or break monopolies (McConnell and Brue 85). Thus, regulations actually trying to create monopolies or monopoly-like situations with domestic producers represent poor ideas for the macro society.

Thus, globalization serves to increase competition, granting the most efficient operation of business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices, which as shown above with Wal-Mart, get demanded by consumers.

## Innovation

In addition, protective tariffs reduce innovation. Once a producer has a monopoly they no longer need to innovate to stay competitive. Their products will continue to sell regardless of their quality and features. Without the drive for innovation, little advancement will get funding.

This dearth of innovation hurts future industries. Over time some jobs get replaced by other jobs. Farming once employed many people in America. In the present day, very few people have careers as farmers. Does this mean suffering? Of course not! Americans have a higher standard of living than ever. Increasingly, Americans perform less manual labor in their jobs. What happened? New technologies brought around new industries which brought new, higher skilled jobs. Twenty years ago, very few people dreamed of working as computer programmers. Today, many find employment in computer-related fields.

The same patterns occur during globalization. Yes some will lose their jobs, but the increased competition creates more new technologies which have the potential to employ the workers that lost their jobs. Thus the benefit of new, higher skilled jobs reduces the pain of losing lower-skilled jobs to foreign nations in the long-run.

## Exports

Many countries depend on global trade for both imports and exports, including the United States. The United States has and continues to benefit from exporting their goods (McConnell and Brue 102). Many agricultural goods get sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land. America also sells automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42 percent of their exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products not essential and luxury (McConnell and Brue 103).



Thus America relies, both consumers and exporters, on free global trade. This trade will come along with globalization and must receive wide encouragement.

Nevertheless, enacting regulations and protectionist policies to protect domestic markets only encourages protectionist policies against exports. Enacting these policies will only start a downward spiral, plunging the world into the past by restricting globalization. This hurts the many United States businesses which export goods from the United States.

In addition, America exports services. In 1996, service exports exceeded service imports by 80 billion dollars (McConnell and Brue 765).

When tourists and foreign students come to the United States, America actually exports services to them whenever they spend money. When a tourist comes from another nation, they bring foreign currency and trading it for things from the United States like meals and hotel rooms (Roberts 82). In addition students coming for education in the United States bring a lot of money with them to spend both on tuition and living expenses (Roberts 82). Without global trade countries do not need dollars to spend on "exports".

## Conclusion

Thus, global trade, in the long run, has a positive impact on the United States. But lets not forget about developing nations which we provide jobs to. These jobs help make them richer, and in turn, increasingly able to purchase US exports. The global economy helps all of us make our lives better and increases worldwide standards of living. Globalization has and continues to have a positive impact on our lives.

## Con: Pollution (David)

The Earth has suffered plenty from the industrialization of the world. A breaking ozone layer, a lack of clean air and water, contaminated food and rain just names a few. Modernized countries like the United States and Britain, along with oncoming China, cause the planet to evolve into stages of decay and filth. Globalization can bring this issue to every country in the world. The ideal solution provides equal countries but how could America, Britain, and other advanced countries ever accept lower standards of living simply for the benefit of the environment or other countries globally?

Bringing economies to the global scale means increasing the power of the lower countries to have the ability to do so and compete accordingly. Though specialization gives poorer economies an advantage, it fails to mention the amount of consumption they gain from it, and what they have to do in order to compete. No living human can reject marginal amounts of wealth, so at the prospect of greater wealth people do almost anything. For example, CBS News talks about how some of Bangladesh's citizens must break their backs to tear apart ships so industrialized countries can use the steel and excess parts (Gavshon). They have to expand their production to a product the advanced countries do not want to produce but still demand. They must accept socially unacceptable jobs without any ecological law in order to reap anything close to a profit (Gavshon). Thus, globalization creates a harsher life for them and poor environmental health.

Not only that, but increased globalization means countries of the world consume more. As previously stated, humans cannot reject a greater abundance of goods and will thus consume as much as possible. If every country consumes as much as the highest classes of the world, the world will undoubtedly not live to see the next Y2K. The Living Planet Report makes an interesting prediction: "even optimistic United Nations projections with moderate increases in population, food and fiber consumption, and CO2 emissions suggest that by 2050 humanity will demand resources at double the rate at which the Earth can generate them." That sort of availability does not exist. Globalization brings economies to a level of consumption that cannot meet the demands of society. Therefore, globalization hurts the welfare of the world.



## Con: Outsourcing (David)

Job outsourcing seems unquestionably favorable to those who consume goods and hold a steady domestic, high-skilled job. However, a former Microsoft phone operator may disagree. They must have known that their American job would leave them soon because Microsoft could gain cheaper labor overseas. They knew that soon they would have to retrain for years and years to get a job that they had prepared themselves for. Their past skills remain unused in the labor pool; they can not find another job without retraining. But during the period of retraining, one undergoes difficulty. Without a job, one can not pay for one's retraining. Economic efficiency does not even relate to the social hardships placed upon its society. Isn't employment for all a better goal than affording luxuries for a few? One does not care about the benefits to society when one faces unemployment.

In addition, the job done by outsourced workers does not represent the same quality. Has one ever tried to talk to someone with a thick accent outside the United States? One can hardly understand them, especially when one gets mad about the companies' service. One does not want to deal with that when they have a problem. Many Americans much prefer talking to someone in the United States. Companies should realize that the support quality causes them to lose customers. Thus, some have even brought jobs back to the United States, slowing globalization.

Globalization does not always represent the best choice, even if it means angering your customers, or causing domestic unemployment.

## Con: McDonalds in China (Greg)

Over many years of globalization and influences from the outside world, China has modernized from the days of Daoism and Confucianism into a bustling, highly populated, and overly crowded nation... for the worse. Nowadays, American franchises such as Starbucks, Kentucky Fried Chicken, McDonald's, and Xerox crawl all over China, tainting traditional customs and cultural values (Watson 1). These franchises and companies expose only American culture to youthful minds, blocking away their own traditional culture. Some parents view McDonald's as a way to "connect" their children with the outside world (Watson 2). However, this could lead to children attending American universities, thus abandoning Chinese universities and education. Also, with globalization in the economy come changes in society. In China's larger cities for example, the male no longer rules the household (Watson 3). The conjugal unit, a new family system that attends to the whims of the married couple has also emerged (Watson 3). This type of family system undermines traditional ways of filial piety and Confucianism (Watson 3). McDonald's has popularized too quickly with China's younger generations, teaching American culture before Chinese culture at such an early age (Watson 3). All these recent and rapid changes could send society abuzz, causing chaos to break loose. A clash between traditional Chinese and modernized Chinese could spark. This could eventually divide China's cities and society into a war zone.

Since McDonald's draws anti-American protestors, some of which who have even bombed and attacked restaurants, the influence of this fast food establishment has only negatively affected Chinese society (Watson 4). Hong Kong special foods and delicacies have already succumbed to "industrialized food" (Watson 4). New, exotic cuisines from Europe have poured into China furthering the food competition (Watson 4). Fast food eateries cause children to often eat outside their homes, without consumer protection (Watson 6). Although dining outside the home may seem pleasant, many have suffered from food poisoning, and some have even died (Watson 6). Rather than eating in the safety of one's home traditionally, some choose to eat out, risking their lives. One who does eat out at a Chinese restaurant, may find a decrease in originality and style; many Chinese restaurants now base their styles, such as uniforms, off of American establishments (Watson 6). All over the world, global franchises and other organizations compete against one another, spilling their cultural values, which could end in a catastrophic event, perhaps even war.

Next, modernization has led to China's excessive population growth, especially the elderly class. Researchers expect that by 2025, 274 million people over 60 years of age will exist in China- more than the entire 1998 U.S. population (Watson 6)! Unfortunately however, civil society currently ignores the vast elderly population (Watson 7). Leaving



such an enormous majority of the population unchecked could result in severe shortages.

New cultures and their ideas may prompt China's communist government to begin another plan or economic movement towards further modernization, like the Cultural Revolution, an successful attempt by the Chinese. Once the Chinese had seen the competition in modernization, the communists immediately began reforms to "catch up," such as the Great Leap Forward, and the Five Year Plan China adopted from the Soviet Union. During this time years ago, peasants lost their farms and had to combine with others. Also, attempting to "re-educate" such a vast population would take years. In the eyes of some citizens, "re-education" would seem pointless since China currently produces the most steel and coal in the world. Such efforts to change the culture, in the past, did not help China.

## **Con: Changes in Latin America (Greg)**

Argentina, Peru, Brazil, and Colombia all appeared to blossom at a time, but globalization caused all these countries to wilt (Hilton 1). Thanks to globalization, many Latin American countries have developed into a total mess. Now, Argentina's former president, Menem faces criminal charges, unemployment has reached 18 percent, the country has plunged into bankruptcy, and owes 90 billion pounds externally (Hilton 1). Brazil has reached 20 percent inflation, Peru's president Alberto Fujimori's government collapsed in a corruption scandal, and Colombia now houses the latest arena for America's military (Hilton 1). Most countries in Latin America have pursued economic liberalism for the past 15 years, but with little progress (Hilton 1). Cancun, Mexico holds the most unequal distribution of wealth and income in the world (Hilton 1). Due to this, Cancun has suffered with an increase of daily criminal violence, continuing drug-related problems, and official corruption (Hilton 1). Throughout Latin America, the poor and impoverished middle-classes (teachers and health workers) have lost their jobs, and articulate the opposition to economic liberalism (Hilton 1). Venezuela seems fine now, but President Hugo Chavez aspires to introduce a Cuban-style society to the country (Hilton 1). Globalization has guided Latin America into chaos, without any seemingly hopes of helping Latin America out of its current state.

According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), globalization has changed the social structures of society in Latin America, but has not contributed in correcting the social inequalities (Gonzalez 1). Neoliberal-inspired structural reforms have developed into a widespread movement (Gonzalez 1). Although globalization did produce benefits in Latin America, these benefits resulted in serious social repercussions (Gonzalez 1). The ILO also states that the benefits reflected and reproduced the inequalities existing in the region (Gonzalez 1). Even though globalization may have somewhat helped Latin America as a whole, the original social inequality issue still remains, new problems emerge, and globalization has yet to solve the Neoliberal movement.

Also, existing differences between countries such as wages and labor regulations, could start the expansion of unfair practices towards workers (Gonzalez 1). Globalization may increase Latin America's per capita or human development index, but since the original problems still remain the same, the country's progression will not increase as much as it can. "Situations are thus created in which there are further limits to pay raises as developing economies pursue ways to compete internationally and succumb to internal pressures for greater flexibility in the workforce" (Gonzalez 1). The effects of globalization have failed to create enough jobs to match the expanding workforce in Latin America (Gonzalez 1). This limited workforce causes companies attempting to expand their organization and franchise internationally to crumble internally because the company lacks workers at the heart of the company. While globalization tries to benefit Latin America, social inequalities and other original problems create a great imbalance, erasing globalization's benefits.

## **Pro: Spread Positive Culture (Plaz)**

Globalization does not kill culture, but it spreads it. All across America, ethnic restaurants serve food from and inspired by the rest of the world. Walking into any American city, one would see restaurants serving food from almost every country in the world. A partial list includes Mexican, French, Chinese, Thai restaurants, but the list goes on and on. These restaurants source some of their food from other nations, supporting global trade. But also, perhaps more importantly, American consumers find themselves exposed to different cultures.



Cultures never stand still. Things change, and true, change can get accelerated through foreign influence, but this represents a positive force. America exemplifies a prime example of mixed culture. Almost all of its citizens either immigrated to the United States, or have ancestors who did. The ancestors brought with them many traditions and beliefs that continue on. And, as the culture evolved over time, so has others.

## **McDonald's in Hong Kong**

People must wish for the culture to evolve. People can, and do, resist change, but they often represent the minority. Most do in fact embrace change, making it a viable occurrence. Take for instance the McDonald's in Hong Kong. No one finds themselves forced to eat there. But people do. And they do so in large numbers. The restaurants attract thousands of people and evolve into "hang-out" places for retirees and teens, similar to Wawa in the United States (Watson 5). In addition, rewards for good behavior often include a meal at McDonald's (Watson 4). In addition, the threat of withholding visits deters children from disobeying their parents (Watson 4). In fact, Chinese often regard McDonald's as comfort and local food (Watson 6). One eight-year-old Korean arrived in America and exclaimed, "Look! They have our kind of food here" after seeing a McDonald's (Watson 3). Lastly, a simple fact remains; these restaurants must make money in order for them to continue operating. If people do not like McDonald's, the stores would fold from lack of business.

And, in fact, McDonald's has changed local culture. But they have changed it for the better. Many local restaurants have adopted McDonald's ways (Watson 6). Some local Chinese chains feature employees wearing bright colored uniforms, and clean toilets (Watson 6). Customers now line up orderly instead of attempting to shove their money into the face of the person running the cash register (Watson 5). McDonald's keeps children away from bad influences like drugs and alcohol (Watson 5).

## **Sati**

But also, globalization has ended negative cultural practices. After the British arrived, sati, the practice of ritual suicide by widows onto their husband's funeral pyre, declined ("Woman commits 'sati' in UP village" 2). The process rarely ever occurs today after Lord William Bentinck outlawed it in the 1800s ("Woman commits 'sati' in UP village" 2). Foreign imperialism made the first attempt to try and reduce this horrific culture. As the global world gains popularity, human rights violations go down (Uy). Industrialization nations usually follow democratic policies with clean records. Stable economies, into one which investors want to invest, without a government committed to ending such violent practices rarely occurs.

## **Women and Discrimination**

In addition, women have increased equality with globalization. They represent a large potential workforce which increases production at a necessary degree to increase the standard of living. In the United States, increases in the amount of people willing to work have amounted to a third of growth (McConnell and Brue 374). Not only do immigrants help grow the workforce, but in the 50s, 60s, and 70s, women joining the regular workforce contributed to the economic growth (McConnell and Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color, hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (McConnell and Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. That explains why many nations find themselves forced to reduce discrimination against women. Societies which discriminate against women include many Muslim-ruled nations. Afghanistan, under the Taliban, had a horrible record against the treatment of women.

All of this made Afghanistan one of the world's least developed countries according to a United Nations study conducted in February 2005 (CBC). Only five sub-Saharan Africa nations manage to surpass it for dishonor of the lowest position in the development index (CBC). In Afghanistan, one hundred forty-two out of every one thousand



babies died before age one and every thirty minutes another woman dies in pregnancy (CBC). All of this contributes to the very low life-expectancy of forty-two and one half years (CBC).

Discrimination will never help a nation advance. Hopefully, globalization can pressure strict Muslim and other religious societies to ease and remove discrimination against women. This pressure to change culture could positively affect the lives of many women, along with the entire population of the Earth.

## **Pro: Democracy and Freedom (Jeff)**

Globalization has good effects on countries around the world by promoting freedom and democracy between nations and the world. Introducing countries into trade and communication with others inevitably boosts the economy and friendliness between each of them. Though there remain many who say that globalization hurts poor people around the world, it in fact helps the poor in some nations. Bangladesh has a booming textile industry and India has its information technology. The people in these two poor countries now have to live a better life and have more freedoms than they previously had due to the new income of money.

Spreading new trade and commerce to poorer nations will help with their situations and promote peace between them and other more prosperous nations around the world. Since open trade came about in the eastern European nations after the fall of the Soviet Union, this shows that globalization can promote democracy and peace between nations around the world. China, for example, greatly enlarges its power in the world. The trade and communication brought about by globalization contributes as one factor in its growth. The American superstore, Wal-Mart has countless suppliers in China, and many products say "Made in China." Each of these products requires the employment of a Chinese person. Yes, these workers do work for lower wages than a worker would in the United States. However, comparative to other jobs, they make more money than ever before, or else they would not take the job.

The United States would find extreme difficulty going to war against China. Disrupting trade would have an immense impact on them and their allies' economies. America would lose a lot in a war against any of their major trading partners. In addition, this war could have a domino effect and break up peaceful relations with the rest of the world, possibly starting another world war. Since World War 2, economies have recovered and surpassed the pre-war levels.

In the past 30 years, and for the foreseeable future, major economic powers will not go to war against each other. They have realized the devastation it would cause all over the world. Most of the ongoing armed conflicts involve either tribes or gangs ravaging war-torn counties, or religious extremists bent on ideological supremacy. The superpowers of the world have learned to grow tolerant of different religions, genders, and backgrounds in order to increase domestic production. Only areas torn with corruption or obsessed about religious principles continue to actively, aggressively fight. Economically advanced nations try to cool the fighting, but do not try to aggressively expand.

## **Conclusion**

Society tends to favor economic progress because the idea portrays that it will make everyone happier. The term "globalization" gets frequently tossed around when discussing this desire for increased wealth. Does it hurt us? Can it help us? Will it make me richer? People ask these questions when dealing with this economic force in hopes to find another way to achieve economic prosperity. Theodore Levitt discovered this force as a trade and industry power that increases economic interdependence of countries worldwide to increase the amount of goods available to the consumer (McConnell and Brue 90). Prices get lowered, people get happy. Such transactions include the expansion of industrial, financial, political, informational/technological, and cultural commerce. However, much conflict arouses from the topic. The greatest advantage to globalization consists of the economic argument. Prices are lowered through the efforts of specialization, and competition prevails, perhaps taking business away from less efficient domestic producers. The economic argument gets countered by the argument of increased pollution resulting from laxer safety and pollution safeguards. Cultural globalization has an aura of welcoming because



positive culture spreads (i.e. democracy and freedom) but so does the negative culture along with that. In addition, some customs end, ones which society now sees as cruel. Many issues and arguments spawn from this one topic and arguments frequent politics and newspapers enough to make the topic one of the most controversial of the modern day.

But that stems from the fact that no one can answer the question. Each argument has its own pros and cons. "If the benefits exceed the cost?" remains a question which must hold consideration with one's personal beliefs and views on the world. From a macroeconomic outlook, globalization squarely exists as a positive force. But, culturally, the question does not resolve itself as clearly. However, the question will remain controversial for a long time with the answers possibly never emerging.

## Sources

- "CBC News In Depth: Afghanistan." CBC News. 6 March 2006. CBC/Radio-Canada. 26 Oct 2006 <<http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/afghanistan/>>.
- Eichengreen, Barry, and David Leblang. Democracy and Globalization. June 2006. Bank for International Settlements. 9 Jan 2007 <<http://www.bis.org/events/conf060619eichengreen.pdf>>.
- Gavshon, Michael. "The Ship Breakers of Bangladesh." CBS News. 5 November 2006. CBS Corporation. 12 January 2007 <<http://www.cbs.com/>>.
- Gonzalez, Gustavo. "Latin America: Globalization Doesn't Correct Inequalities." Global Policy Forum. 2000. Global Policy Forum. 29 December 2006 <<http://www.globalpolicy.org/soecon/develop/devthry/poverty/2001/0118gonz.htm>>.
- Hails, Chris. Living Planet Report 2006. Switzerland: WWF International, 2006.
- Hilton, Isabela. "Forget Cancun, Globalization Has Destroyed the Real Latin America." NewsCenter. 2001-2006. Guardian Newspapers Limited. 29 December 2006 <<http://www.commondreams.org/views01/0808-02.htm>>.
- McConnell, Campbell, and Stanley Brue. Economics. 14th edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1999.
- "Monopoly." Encarta. Microsoft. 28 Dec 2006 <[http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia\\_761567422/Monopoly.html](http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761567422/Monopoly.html)>.
- Roberts, Russell. The Choice. Prentice Hall, 1996.
- Uy, Dennis. "Why Globalization helps the poor?" Liberal Economy. 15 Nov 2006. 9 Jan 2007 <<http://liberaleconomy.wordpress.com/2006/11/15/why-globalization-helps-the-poor/>>.
- Wal-Mart Facts. Corporate Facts: Wal-Mart By the Numbers. 26 July 2006. Wall-Mart. 16 January 2007 <[http://www.walmartfacts.com/FactSheets/7262006\\_Corporate\\_Facts.pdf](http://www.walmartfacts.com/FactSheets/7262006_Corporate_Facts.pdf)>.
- Watson, James L. "China's Big Mac Attack." Foreign Affairs. May/June 2000. Council Foreign Relations, Inc. 29 December 2006
- "Woman commits 'sati' in UP village." Times of India. 19 May 2006. Times Internet Limited. 5 Jan 2007 <[http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS/India/Woman\\_commits\\_sati\\_in\\_UP\\_village/articleshow/msid-1538](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS/India/Woman_commits_sati_in_UP_village/articleshow/msid-1538)>.
- Zimmerman, Ann and Kris Hudson. "Managing Wal-Mart." Wall Street Journal. 17 April 2006. Dow Jones & Company, Inc. 16 Jan 2007 <[http://wsjclassroom.com/monday/mx\\_06apr17.pdf](http://wsjclassroom.com/monday/mx_06apr17.pdf)>.

## Further Reading

- Roberts, Russell. The Choice. Prentice Hall, 1996.
- <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/11/03/60minutes/main2149023.shtml?CMP=ILC-SearchStories>
- <http://www.guardian.co.uk/waste/story/0,12188,1308278,00.html>
- <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/4810>

Retrieved from "http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\_Cultures\_Comparison\_Project/Paper"

Category: World Cultures Comparison Project




Tecker Tecker 8911 Conflicter Minisites

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Paper

From ThePlaz.com

World Cultures World Cultures Comparison Project Paper Template: World Cultures Comparison Project

 **Only a DRAFT!**

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

## Contents

- 1 Opening
- 2 Pro: Economics (Plaz)
  - 2.1 Introduction
  - 2.2 Specialization
  - 2.3 Currency
  - 2.4 Trade Barriers
  - 2.5 Innovation
  - 2.6 Exports
  - 2.7 Conclusion
- 3 Con: Pollution (David)
- 4 Con: Outsourcing (David)
- 5 Con: McDonalds in China (Greg)
- 6 Con: Changes in Latin America (Greg)
- 7 Pro: Spread Positive Culture (Plaz)
  - 7.1 McDonald's in Hong Kong
  - 7.2 Sati
  - 7.3 Women and Discrimination
- 8 Pro: Democracy and Freedom (Jeff)
- 9 Stat Support (Plaz)
- 10 Conclusion
- 11 Cut
  - 11.1 Support
  - 11.2 Growth
  - 11.3 Sharia
  - 11.4 Rebuttal to cultural revolution by plaz
  - 11.5 Pollution
  - 11.6 Plaz's Old Opening
- 12 Sources
- 13 Further Reading
- 14 Comments



## Opening

Globalization, a massive force that drives international markets in the current day, has affected thousands of years in history. This controversial force, whether good or bad, has and continues to change the rules of the world. Increasing connections, the spreading of culture, and increasing international trade represent only some of what globalization can accomplish. However, from job loss to pollution to cracking culture, globalization does not always affect humans positively. From the thousands of protesters at the World Trade Organization to the leagues of economists rallying the president, globalization and free trade represent to some a promise of growth and a better life, but to others, a harsher, poorer life. From the lobby organizations of some of the biggest unions to simple farmlands in the world's poorest countries, globalization touches all people. But does it help us or hurt those it serves? It definitely does both. But which effect eclipses the other and comes out stronger? In the long run, which is better, a global world, or one closed off from changing forces. That remains a hotly contested question. Various viewpoints include its positive economic outcomes for both developed and developing nations rebutted by arguments of increased pollution and domestic job loss. Two case studies, one of McDonalds in Hong Kong and the other of Latin American corruption, explain the negative effects of cultural globalization. An advantageous argument returns to discuss the positive social effects of globalization. The final consists of an argument for the spreading of democracy and freedom.

## Pro: Economics (Plaz)

### Introduction

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations. Increasing trade between nations helps both parties advance by allowing them each to produce what they can do be and able to sell those products around the world. In addition, globalization increases competition which prevents lazy monopolies and inefficient means of production. It drives innovation and world peace with a spirit of interdependence. Trade barriers only prevent these benefits from realization and hurt society as a whole. Globalization represents a positive trend which must continue to drive growth to make the world a better place.

### Specialization

No one person can do everything, and the same holds true for nations as well. For starters, not every nation has enough of every natural resources. The United States does not have enough oil to survive efficiently. Sure, if necessary we could end our dependency on oil, but this represents an enormous cost to our current industries. Alternative fuels currently cost too much, or we would have adopted them already. But the same also holds true for manufacturing.

The United States only has a certain amount of workers and a certain amount of land. It's best to distribute that land to make the most goods as possible for our society. Of course we can't make everything equally well. We would need to make trade-offs and produce more of some things then others. This would decrease total output. Consider, for a minute, a smaller scale. What if each state could not trade with one another? Where would we get cotton or computers? In every state a computer factory would rise. Currently, a few, well-equipped, very efficient factories make most computer parts. If a factory was needed in every state, many more resources would get consumed to produce the same amount of products. Sure the factory owners would grow wealthier, but at the expense of everyone else. In addition, the cotton plants would have lower yields here because of the colder weather. In total, production goes down. In fact, since the Constitution banned trade barriers between states, one of the largest free-trade areas has emerged (Brue 780). Economists cite this as a leading factor in the United State's development (Brue 780). This represents an example of how free trade has played out.

Specialization solves the problem of inefficiencies. For example, Pennsylvania can produce large amounts of coal and agricultural goods. We trade these items for cotton and computers, which other states produce well. In total, with the same about of input, more cotton, coal, computers, and agricultural goods get produced each year.



This same pattern holds true between nations as well. Asians can produce televisions more efficiently than we can. However, we do not come out worse off because Americans can produce medicines extremely well, comparatively, due to our highly trained workforce. Thus we can trade medicine for televisions. This represents the most efficient use of the scarce resources which exist in the world.

Wal-Mart represents another example of the power of maximum efficiency. Wal-Mart, the world's largest retailer and domestic private employer, achieves the lowest price possible through massive operations around the world (via Wikipedia). They show success because of the principle of economies of scale. They use technology and specialization to remove as much waste from their operation as possible. Consumers must like this efficient, low-cost process because more than one-third of the United States' population visits a Wal-Mart every week (via Wikipedia). Most do not concern themselves that most production comes from China and other foreign factories. Yes, some people do raise concerns about Wal-Mart's effect on local communities and global industries, however, low prices usually draw people in, and in fact, represents a positive net effect.

## Currency

And indeed, global trade helps everyone. By buying goods from China, we as the United States, put our currency into the hands of foreigners. What do these foreigners do with these American dollars? They can either buy our exports, thus bringing the money back to our domestic industries, or invest it, again bringing our dollars back. They also can trade the dollars in the foreign exchange market, but someone must buy them. They too much invest and purchase American goods. It's foolish to lock the money up in a vault because it loses value during inflation. Therefore it must go elsewhere to investment and eventually brought back to America.

## Trade Barriers

Many who become scared of Wal-Mart and global competition try to lobby governments to pass trade barriers. In addition, workers about to lose their jobs become very vocal about installing trade barriers. The rest of America usually supports the politicians, not know the benefits trade can have. Trade barriers include both quotas and tariffs. Both harm consumers, foreign markets, and even domestic production. They artificially increase prices by reducing the number of producers able to sell a product in a certain region. This shows very similar tendencies to installing monopolies, at least among domestic producers.

Throughout history evidence has amassed that monopolies represent a detriment to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies do not find themselves governed by market principles, and therefore do not operate for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole (Brue 85). Throughout history, starting with the Sherman Act of 1890, the United States has tried to regulate or break monopolies (Brue 85). Thus, regulations actually trying to create monopolies or monopoly-like situations with domestic producers represent poor ideas for the macro society.

Thus, globalization serves to increase competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices, which as shown above with Wal-Mart, get demanded by consumers.

## Innovation

In addition, protective tariffs reduce innovation. Once a producer has a monopoly they no longer need to innovate to stay competitive. Their products will continue to sell regardless of their quality and features. Without the drive for innovation, few advancements will get funding.

This dearth of innovation hurts future industries. Over time some jobs get replaced by other jobs. Farming once employed many people in America. Today very few people have careers as farmers. Does this mean we suffer? Of course not! Americans have a higher standard of living than ever. Increasingly, Americans do less manual labor in their jobs. What happened? New technologies brought around new industries which brought new, higher skilled jobs.



Twenty years ago, very few people dreamed of becoming computer programmers. Today, many find employment in computer-related fields.

The same patterns will occur during globalization. Yes some will lose their jobs, but the increased competition creates more new technologies which have the potential to employ large numbers of workers. Thus the benefit of new, higher skilled jobs reduces the pain of losing lower-skilled jobs to foreign nations in the long-run.

## **Exports**

Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods get sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land as we have. We also sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products both essential and luxury (Brue 103).

Thus we rely, both our consumers and exporters, on free global trade. This trade will come along with globalization and must get encouragement.

Nevertheless, enacting regulations and protectionist policies to protect our domestic markets will only encourage protectionist policies against our exports. Enacting these policies will only start a downward spiral, plunging the world into the past by restricting globalization. This hurts the many US businesses which export goods from the United States.

In addition, we export services. In 1996, service exports exceeded service imports by \$80 billion (Brue 765).  
?normal service exports -

When tourists and foreign students come to the United States, we actually export services to them whenever they spend money here. When a tourist comes from another nation they bring foreign currency and trading it for things from the US like meals and hotel rooms (Choice 82). In addition students coming for education in the United States bring a lot of money with them to spend both on tuition and living expenses (Choice 82). Without global trade no dollars can be found to spend on these "exports."

## **Conclusion**

Thus, global trade, in the long run, has a positive impact on the United States. But let's not forget about developing nations which we provide jobs to. These jobs help make them richer, and in turn, increasingly able to purchase US exports. The global economy helps all of us make our lives better and increases worldwide standards of living. Globalization has and continues to have a positive impact on our lives.

## **Con: Pollution (David)**

I'll put it in the first edit once you guys get back to me.

## **Con: Outsourcing (David)**

Job outsourcing seems unquestionably favorable to those who consume goods and hold a steady domestic, high-skilled job. However, a former Microsoft phone operator may disagree. They must have known that their American job would leave them soon because Microsoft could gain cheaper labor overseas. They knew that soon they would have to retrain for years and years to get a job that they had prepared themselves for. Their past skills remain unused in the labor pool; they can not find another job without retraining. But during the period of retraining, one undergoes difficulty. Without a job, one can not pay for one's retraining. Economic efficiency does not even relate to the social hardships placed upon its society. Isn't employment for all a better goal, the affording luxuries for



a few? One does not care about the benefits to society when one becomes unemployed.

In addition, the job done by outsourced workers does not represent the same quality. Has one ever tried to talk to someone with a thick accent outside the United States? One can hardly understand them, especially when one becomes mad about the companies' service. One does not want to deal with that when they have a problem. Many Americans much prefer talking to someone in the United States. Companies should realize that the support quality causes them to lose customers. Thus, some have even brought jobs back to the United States, slowing globalization.

Globalization does not always represent the best choice, even if it means angering your customers, or causing domestic unemployment.

## **Con: McDonalds in China (Greg)**

Over many years of globalization and influences from the outside world, China has modernized from the days of Daoism and Confucianism into a bustling, highly populated, and overly crowded nation... for the worse. Nowadays, American franchises such as Starbucks, Kentucky Fried Chicken, McDonald's, and Xerox crawl all over China, tainting traditional customs and cultural values (Watson 1). These franchises and companies expose only American culture to youthful minds, blocking away their own traditional culture. Some parents view McDonald's as a way to "connect" their children with the outside world (Watson 2). However, this could lead to children attending American universities, thus abandoning Chinese universities and education. Also, with globalization in the economy come changes in society. In China's larger cities for example, the male no longer rules the household (Watson 3). The conjugal unit, a new family system that attends to the whims of the married couple has also emerged (Watson 3). This type of family system undermines traditional ways of filial piety and Confucianism (Watson 3). McDonald's has become too popular with China's younger generations, teaching American culture before Chinese culture at such an early age (Watson 3). All these recent and rapid changes could send society abuzz, causing chaos to break loose. A clash between traditional Chinese and modernized Chinese could spark. This could eventually divide China's cities and society into a war zone.

Since McDonald's draws anti-American protestors, some of which who have even bombed and attacked restaurants, the influence of this fast food establishment has only negatively affected Chinese society (Watson 4). Hong Kong special foods and delicacies have already succumbed to "industrialized food" (Watson 4). New, exotic cuisines from Europe have poured into China furthering the food competition (Watson 4). Fast food eateries cause children to often eat outside their homes, without consumer protection (Watson 6). Although dining outside the home may seem pleasant, many have suffered from food poisoning, and some have even died (Watson 6). Rather than eating in the safety of one's home traditionally, some choose to eat out, risking their lives. One who does eat out at a Chinese restaurant, may find a decrease in originality and style; many Chinese restaurants now base their styles, such as uniforms, off of American establishments (Watson 6). All over the world, global franchises and other organizations compete against one another, spilling their cultural values, which could end in a catastrophic event, perhaps even war.

Next, modernization has led to China's excessive population growth, especially the elderly class. Researchers expect that by 2025, 274 million people over 60 years of age will exist in China- more than the entire 1998 U.S. population (Watson 6)! Unfortunately however, civil society currently ignores the vast elderly population (Watson 7). Leaving such an enormous majority of the population unchecked could result in severe shortages.

New cultures and their ideas may prompt China's communist government to begin another plan or economic movement towards further modernization, like the Cultural Revolution, which was not successful. Once the Chinese had seen the competition in modernization, the communists immediately began reforms to "catch up," such as the Great Leap Forward, and the Five Year Plan China adopted from the Soviet Union. During this time years ago, peasants lost their farms and had to combine with others. Also, attempting to "re-educate" such a vast population would take years. In the eyes of some citizens, "re-education" would seem pointless since China currently produces the most steel and coal in the world. Such efforts to change the culture, in the past, did not help China.



## Con: Changes in Latin America (Greg)

Argentina, Peru, Brazil, and Colombia all appeared to blossom at a time, but globalization caused all these countries to wilt (Hilton 1). Thanks to globalization, many Latin American countries have developed into a total mess. Now, Argentina's former president, Menem faces criminal charges, unemployment has reached 18%, the country has plunged into bankruptcy, and owes 90 billion pounds externally (Hilton 1). Brazil has reached 20% inflation, Peru's president Alberto Fujimori's government collapsed in a corruption scandal, and Colombia now houses the latest arena for America's military (Hilton 1). Most countries in Latin America have pursued economic liberalism for the past 15 years, but with little progress (Hilton 1). Cancun, Mexico holds the most unequal distribution of wealth and income in the world (Hilton 1). Due to this, Cancun has suffered with an increase of daily criminal violence, continuing drug-related problems, and official corruption (Hilton 1). Throughout Latin America, the poor and impoverished middle-classes (teachers and health workers) have lost their jobs, and articulate the opposition to economic liberalism (Hilton 1). Venezuela seems fine now, but President Hugo Chavez aspires to introduce a Cuban-style society to the country (Hilton 1). Globalization has guided Latin America into chaos, without any seemingly hopes of helping Latin America out of its current state.

According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), globalization has changed the social structures of society in Latin America, but has not contributed in correcting the social inequalities (Gonzalez 1). Neoliberal-inspired structural reforms have developed into a widespread movement (Gonzalez 1). Although globalization did produce benefits in Latin America, these benefits resulted in serious social repercussions (Gonzalez 1). ILO also states that the benefits also reflected and reproduced the inequalities existing in the region (Gonzalez 1). Even though globalization may have somewhat helped Latin America as a whole, the original social inequality issue still remains, new problems emerge, and globalization has yet to solve the neoliberal movement.

Also, existing differences between countries such as wages and labor regulations, could start the expansion of unfair practices towards workers (Gonzalez 1). Globalization may increase Latin America's per capita or human development index, but since the original problems still remain the same, the country's progression will not increase as much as it can. "Situations are thus created in which there are further limits to pay raises as developing economies pursue ways to be more competitive internationally and succumb to internal pressures for greater flexibility in the workforce" (Gonzalez 1). The effects of globalization have failed to create enough jobs to match the expanding workforce in Latin America (Gonzalez 1). This limited workforce causes companies attempting to expand their organization and franchise internationally to crumble internally, because the company lacks workers at the heart of the company. While globalization tries to benefit Latin America, social inequalities and other original problems create a great imbalance, erasing globalization's benefits.

## Pro: Spread Positive Culture (Plaz)

Globalization does not kill culture, but it spreads it. All across America, ethnic restaurants serve food from and inspired by the rest of the world. Walk into any American city and you will see restaurants serving food from almost every country in the world. A partial list included Mexican, French, Chinese, Thai restaurants, but the list goes on and on. These restaurants source some of their food from other nations, supporting global trade. But also, perhaps more importantly, American consumers find themselves exposed to different cultures.

Cultures never stand still. Things change, and true, change can get accelerated through foreign influence, but this represents a positive force. America exemplifies a prime example of mixed culture. Almost all of us either immigrated to the United States, or have ancestors who did. We brought with us many traditions and beliefs which we still share. And, as our culture evolved over time, so has others.

## McDonald's in Hong Kong

People must wish for the the culture to evolve. People can, and do, resist change, but they often represent the minority. Most do in fact embrace change, and that is why it happens. Take for instance the McDonald's in Hong



Kong. No one finds themselves forced to eat there. But people do. And they do so in large numbers. The restaurants attract thousands of people and become "hang-out" places for retirees and teens, similar to Wawa in the United States (Watson 5). In addition, rewards for good behavior often include a meal at McDonald's (Watson 4). In addition, the threat of withholding visits deters children from disobeying their parents (Watson 4). In fact, Chinese often regard McDonald's as comfort and local food (Watson 6). One eight-year-old Korean arrived in America and exclaimed, "Look! They have our kind of food here" after seeing a McDonald's (qtd. in Watson 3). Lastly, a simple fact remains, these restaurants must make money in order for them to continue operating. If people do not like McDonald's the stores would fold from lack of business.

And, in fact, McDonald's has changed local culture. But they have changed it for the better. Many local restaurants have adopted McDonald's ways (Watson 6). Some local Chinese chains feature employees wearing bright colored uniforms, and clean toilets (Watson 6). Customers now line up orderly instead of attempting to shove their money into the face of the person running the cash register (Watson 5). McDonald's keeps children away from bad influences like drugs and alcohol (Watson 5).

## Sati

But also, globalization has ended negative cultural practices. After the British arrived, sati, the practice of ritual suicide by widows onto their husband's funeral pyre, declined ("Woman commits 'sati' in UP village" 2). The process is rare today after being outlawed by Lord William Bentinck in the 1800s ("Woman commits 'sati' in UP village" 2). Foreign imperialism was the first to try and reduce this horrific culture. As the world increasing becomes more global, human rights violations goes down (stats). Industrialization nations usually happen to be democracies with clean records. It is hard to have a stable economy, into one which investors want to invest, without a government committed to ending such violent practices.

## Women and Discrimination

In addition, women become increasingly equal with globalization. They represent a large potential workforce which becomes necessary to increase production. In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). Not only do immigrants help grow the workforce, but in the 50s, 60s, and 70s, our growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. That is why many nations find themselves forced to reduce discrimination against women. Societies which discriminate against women include many Muslim-ruled nation. Afghanistan, under the Taliban, had a horrible record against the treatment of women.

All of this made Afghanistan one of the world's least developed countries according to a UN study conducted in February 2005 (CBC). Only five sub-Saharan Africa nations manage to surpass it for dishonor of the lowest position in the development index (CBC). In Afghanistan, one hundred forty-two out of every one thousand babies died before age one and every thirty minutes another woman dies in pregnancy (CBC). All of this contributes to the very low life-expectancy of forty-two and one half years (CBC).

Discrimination will never help a nation advance. Hopefully, globalization can pressure strict Muslim and other religious societies to ease and remove discrimination against women. This pressure to change culture could positively affect the lives of many women, along with the entire population of the Earth.

## Pro: Democracy and Freedom (Jeff)



Globalization has its good effects on countries around the world by promoting freedom and democracy between nations and the world. Introducing countries into trade and communication with others will inevitably boost the economy and friendliness between each of them. Though there are many who say that globalization is hurting poor people around the world it is in fact helping the poor in some nations. Bangladesh has a booming textile industry and India has its information technology. The people in these two poor countries are now able to live a better life and have more freedoms than they previously had due to the new income of money.

Spreading new trade and commerce to poorer nations will help with their situations and promote peace between them and other more prosperous nations around the world. Since open trade came about in the eastern European nations after the fall of the Soviet Union, this shows that globalization is able to help promote democracy and peace between nations around the world. China for example is a greatly enlarging power in the world and the trade and communication brought about by globalization is one factor in its growth. The American superstore, Wal-Mart has countless suppliers in China and if you look around everywhere you can see how many products are "Made in China." Each of these products requires the employment of a Chinese person. Yes, these workers do work for less wages than a worker would in the United States. However, comparative to other jobs, they're making more money than ever before, or else they would not take the job.

The United States would find extreme difficulty going to war against China. Disrupting trade would have an immense impact on our and our allies' economies. We would lose a lot in a war against any of our major trading partners. In addition, this war could have a domino effect and break up peaceful relations with the rest of the world, possibly starting another world war. Since World War 2, our economies have recovered and way surpassed the pre-war levels.

In the past 30 years, and for the foreseeable future, major economic powers will not go to war against each other. They have realized the devastation it would cause all over the world. Most of the ongoing armed conflicts involve either tribes and gangs ravaging war-torn countries, or religious extremists bent on ideological supremacy. The superpowers of the world have learned to grow tolerant of different religions, genders, and backgrounds in order to increase domestic production. Only areas torn with corruption or obsessed about religious principles continue to actively, aggressively fight. Economically advanced nations try to cool the fighting, but do not try to aggressively expand.

Sources:

- <http://www.bis.org/events/conf060619eichengreen.pdf>
- [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)
- <http://liberaleconomy.wordpress.com/2006/11/15/why-globalization-helps-the-poor/>

World Cultures Notes

I know it **sucks**, so shutup!!

Which article of Wikipedia? And please cite your sources in your sections ex: (Plasmeier 1). I thought it was pretty good. I left the 1st para. alone, added to the 2nd, rewrote the 3rd and added on of the sections I told you about. Maybe add some facts (below) from wikipedia or I will later.--Plaz 20:10, 9 January 2007 (EST)

## Stat Support (Plaz)

(still to come --Plaz 20:10, 9 January 2007 (EST))

## Conclusion

Society tends to favor economic progress because the idea is that it will make everyone happier. The term



"globalization" gets frequently tossed around when discussing this desire for increased wealth. Does it hurt us? Can it help us? Will it make me richer? People ask these questions when dealing with this economic force in hopes to find another way to achieve economic prosperity. Theodore Levitt discovered this force as a trade and industry power that increases economic interdependence of countries worldwide to increase the amount of goods available to the consumer. Prices get lowered, people get happy. Such transactions include the expansion of industrial, financial, political, informational/technological, and cultural commerce. However, much conflict arouses from the topic. The greatest advantage to globalization consists of the economic argument. Prices are lowered through the efforts of specialization and competition prevails, perhaps taking business away from less efficient domestic producers. The economic argument is often countered by the argument of increased pollution resulting from laxer safety and pollution safeguards. Cultural globalization can often be considered good because positive culture spreads (i.e. democracy and freedom) but so does the negative culture along with that. In addition, some customs are ended, ones which society now sees as cruel. Many issues and arguments spawn from this one topic and arguments frequent politics and newspapers enough to make the topic one of the most controversial of the modern day.

But that stems from the fact that the question can not be answered. Each argument has its own pros and cons. "If the benefits exceed the cost?" remains a question which must be weighed with one's personal beliefs and views on the world. From an macroeconomic outlook, globalization squarely exists as a positive force. But, culturally, the question does not resolve itself as clearly. However, the question will remain controversial for a long time, with the answers, possibly never emerging.

## Cut

(leave for archiving --Plaz 22:18, 3 January 2007 (EST))

## Support

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession. Thus artificial or protectionist trade barriers are harmful to a nation's aggregate economy, as well as the global climate.

(more Jeff's section)

## Growth

(?cut) Growth is the means which reduces the burden of scarcity (Brue 369). "An economy experiencing growth is better able to meet people's wants and resolve socioeconomic problems" (Brue 369). Growth allows more finished goods to be produced either by increasing imports or making production more efficient (Brue 369). This means we are able to do more with less or the same amount of resources.

Looking back a hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. Technological advancement has been the largest source of growth in the United States making up 28% of the increase in productivity according to Edward Denison and projected to 1998 by McConnell and Brue (374). New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!). Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and technological advancements are what power it.

In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). This has been in part because of our open arms towards immigrants. In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, growth was



largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. Ending or reducing global trade will only have the same effect.

## Sharia

?cut in paper?

## Rebuttal to cultural revolution by plaz

(oh i see, i was thinking about the pro view, but I too thought forced change was bad) Forcing culture to be protected might incite another backlash similar to the Cultural Revolution. The Cultural Revolution showed what can happen when rapid cultural change gets attempted. Culture seems to change at its own pace, the pace accepted by the people in China. Attempting to artificially alter that change only seems to incite corruption, and greed.

## Pollution

The Earth has suffered plenty from the industrialization of the world. A breaking ozone, a lack of clean air and water, contaminated food and rain just names a few. Modernized countries like the United States and Britain, along with oncoming China, causes the planet to evolve into stages of decay and filth. Globalization can bring this issue to every country in the world. The ideal solution provides equal countries but how could America, Britain, and other advance countries ever accept lower standards of living for the environment or for other countries globally? Brining economies to the global scale means increasing the power of the lower countries to have the ability to do so and compete properly. Though specialization gives poorer economies an advantage, it fails to mention the amount of consumption they gain from it. Limited resources can not provide the great life for all countries. Increased globalization means countries of the world consume more. No human can reject a greater abundance of goods and will thus consume as much as possible. If every country consumes as much as the highest classes of the world, the world will undoubtedly exist to see the next Y2K. For China alone, experts predict that in order to fulfill the demand for goods by the Chinese and at its current growth, they require a whole new Earth by 2035 (Discovery Atlas). That sort of availability does not exist. The world may pull off one or two of that consumption but never the entirety. Globalization brings economies to a level of consumption unacceptable to society's resources. Intervention must occur.

In addition, in developing nations laws regarding the environment do not exist at the same level as in developed nations.

David, what you have here is not really what I was thinking of. Sure increased consumption is bad, but that is more subjective (is materialism bad?) I think it would be stronger if you focused on the difference between environmental laws and practices in developed and developing nations. (this should help:

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/11/03/60minutes/main2149023.shtml?CMP=ILC-SearchStories>)

In addition, the outsourcing of trash is what many consider unfair. Here are two articles to help:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/waste/story/0,12188,1308278,00.html> <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/4810> Lastly, please cite your sources in your section like Gerg and I ahve done. Make sure to add the mla at the bottom. Thank you for your contribution--Plaz 16:39, 8 January 2007 (EST)

## Plaz's Old Opening

Globalization, a massive force which currently affects the world today, and has affected thousands of years of



history, remains a controversial force. Globalization, wither good or bad, has and continues to change the rules of the world we live in. Increasing connections, spreading culture, and increasing international trade represent only some of what globalization has accomplished. However, from job loss to pollution, to cracking culture, globalization does not affect us positively. From the thousands of protesters at the WTO the to the leagues of economists rallying the president, globalization and free trade represent to some a promise of growth and a better life, but to others, it represents a harsher, poorer life. From the lobby organizations of some of the biggest unions to simple farmlands in the world's poorest countries, globalization touches us all. But does it help us or hurt us? It definitely does both. But which effect eclipses the other and comes out stronger? In the long run, which is better, a global world, or one closed off from changing forces. That remains a hotly contested question.

Below lie some viewpoints and arguments complied by members of our group. Plaz argues for globalization due to its positive economic outcomes for both developed and developing nations. David rebuts him with arguments of increased pollution, and domestic job loss. Following, Greg leads us in two case studies, one of McDonald's in Hong Kong, and the other of Latin American corruption. Plaz returns to talk about the positive cultural and social affects of globalization. Finally, Jeff offers his viewpoint on globalization and the increase in worldwide peace and prosperity.

## Sources

(will format later --Plaz 23:54, 31 December 2006 (EST)) (need to do mla for some)

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia
- ?Riley interview
- The Choice
- encarta: monopoly
- Gonzalez, Gustavo. "Latin America: Globalization Doesn't Correct Inequalities." Global Policy Forum. 2000. Global Policy Forum. 29 December 2006  
<<http://www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/develop/devthry/poverty/2001/0118gonz.htm>>.
- Hilton, Isabela. "Forget Cancun, Globalization Has Destroyed the Real Latin America." NewsCenter. 2001-2006. Guardian Newspapers Limited. 29 December 2006  
<<http://www.commondreams.org/views01/0808-02.htm>>.
- Watson, James L. "China's Big Mac Attack." Foreign Affairs. May/June 2000. Council Foreign Relations, Inc. 29 December 2006
- 1/5/07  
[http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS/India/Woman\\_commits\\_sati\\_in\\_UP\\_village/articleshow/msid-15383](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS/India/Woman_commits_sati_in_UP_village/articleshow/msid-15383)
- "CBC News In Depth: Afghanistan." CBC News. 6 March 2006. CBC/Radio-Canada. 26 Oct 2006  
<<http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/afghanistan/>>.

## Further Reading

- The Choice

## Comments

When I edit this to compile this into the paper, I'm going to tend to make most of the corrections in structural changes including MLA and such. I talked to Plaz about condensing and I saw the note on the original comparisons project page but wasn't sure whether or not you wanted me to condense items or edit them for content. I know I can (and will) edit my sections for content but let me know and preferably before you go to bed tonight. The other thing is how should I structure the paragraphs. Plaz and Greg split up their sections into multiple paragraphs but Jeff and I kept it in one. Do you want me to keep the paragraphs you guys made with all its content in that order, or do you want me to condense, use your research and writing to form the essay, and edit for content? -Groff P.S. You can



email me at [Cooldaveg73@aol.com](mailto:Cooldaveg73@aol.com) or write to this page, I will check it before I go to bed. If nothing is written I will do the latter because it makes more sense. -Groff

David, are you getting rid of the pollution section? I liked what you had, keep it and expand. As I wrote on the main project page, Cobb doesn't care how long it is. I would feel better if you addressed most of the points. I would also separate them into sub-headings. That makes it easier to organize. (I should ask him if we should keep it in this format, or turn it into MLA-styled). Also, I think we should leave the paper as separate sections. He didn't say anything about that, so I don't think we need "glue" text between sections. Just keep the headings. I like your opening, so I am removing mine and inserting yours. For the conclusion, I go as far as to say that it's a balance. We need to sum up globalization more, rather than restate points. Thanks. We're almost done the paper!!!! I say don't do anything tonight. Goodnight!--Plaz 21:59, 9 January 2007 (EST)

Retrieved from "[http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\\_Cultures\\_Comparison\\_Project/Paper](http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World_Cultures_Comparison_Project/Paper)"

---

- This page was last modified 23:09, January 9, 2007.
- Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 license



74h + David  
 Tecker Tecker 811 Conflicter Minisites

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Paper

From ThePlaz.com

World Cultures World Cultures Comparison Project Paper Template: World Cultures Comparison Project

 **Only a DRAFT!**

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

## Contents

- 1 Opening
- 2 Pro: Economics (Plaz)
  - 2.1 Introduction
  - 2.2 Specialization
  - 2.3 Currency
  - 2.4 Trade Barriers
  - 2.5 Innovation
  - 2.6 Exports
  - 2.7 Conclusion
- 3 Con: Pollution (David)
- 4 Con: Outsourcing (David)
- 5 Con: McDonalds in China (Greg)
- 6 Con: Changes in Latin America (Greg)
- 7 Pro: Spread Positive Culture (Plaz)
  - 7.1 McDonald's in Hong Kong
  - 7.2 Sati
  - 7.3 Women and Discrimination
- 8 Pro: Democracy and Freedom (Jeff)
- 9 Conclusion
- 10 Cut
  - 10.1 Support
  - 10.2 Growth
  - 10.3 Sharia
  - 10.4 Rebuttal to cultural revolution by plaz
- 11 Sources
- 12 Further Reading

## Opening

Globalization, a massive force which currently affects the world today, and has affected thousands of years of history, remains a controversial force. Globalization, wither good or bad, has and continues to change the rules of the



world we live in. Increasing connections, spreading culture, and increasing international trade represent only some of what globalization has accomplished. However, from job loss to pollution, to cracking culture, globalization does not affect us positively. From the thousands of protesters at the WTO to the leagues of economists rallying the president, globalization and free trade represent to some a promise of growth and a better life, but to others, it represents a harsher, poorer life. From the lobby organizations of some of the biggest unions to simple farmlands in the world's poorest countries, globalization touches us all. But does it help us or hurt us? It definitely does both. But which effect eclipses the other and comes out stronger? In the long run, which is better, a global world, or one closed off from changing forces. That remains a hotly contested question.

Below lie some viewpoints and arguments compiled by members of our group. Plaz argues for globalization due to its positive economic outcomes for both developed and developing nations. David rebuts him with arguments of increased pollution, and domestic job loss. Following, Greg leads us in two case studies, one of McDonald's in Hong Kong, and the other of Latin American corruption. Plaz returns to talk about the positive cultural and social affects of globalization. Finally, Jeff offers his viewpoint on globalization and the increase in worldwide peace and prosperity.

## **Pro: Economics (Plaz)**

### **Introduction**

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations. Increasing trade between nations helps both parties advance by allowing them each to produce what they can do best and able to sell those products around the world. In addition, globalization increases competition which prevents lazy monopolies and inefficient means of production. It drives innovation and world peace with a spirit of interdependence. Trade barriers only prevent these benefits from realization and hurt society as a whole. Globalization represents a positive trend which must continue to drive growth to make the world a better place.

### **Specialization**

No one person can do everything, and the same holds true for nations as well. For starters, not every nation has enough of every natural resources. The United States does not have enough oil to survive efficiently. Sure, if necessary we could end our dependency on oil, but this represents an enormous cost to our current industries. Alternative fuels currently cost too much, or we would have adopted them already. But the same also holds true for manufacturing.

The United States only has a certain amount of workers and a certain amount of land. It's best to distribute that land to make the most goods as possible for our society. Of course we can't make everything equally well. We would need to make trade-offs and produce more of some things than others. This would decrease total output. Consider, for a minute, a smaller scale. What if each state could not trade with one another? Where would we get cotton or computers? In every state a computer factory would rise. Currently, a few, well-equipped, very efficient factories make most computer parts. If a factory was needed in every state, many more resources would get consumed to produce the same amount of products. Sure the factory owners would grow wealthier, but at the expense of everyone else. In addition, the cotton plants would have lower yields here because of the colder weather. In total, production goes down. In fact, since the Constitution banned trade barriers between states, one of the largest free-trade areas has emerged (Brue 780). Economists cite this as a leading factor in the United States' development (Brue 780). This represents an example of how free trade has played out.

Specialization solves the problem of inefficiencies. For example, Pennsylvania can produce large amounts of coal and agricultural goods. We trade these items for cotton and computers, which other states produce well. In total, with the same amount of input, more cotton, coal, computers, and agricultural goods get produced each year.

This same pattern holds true between nations as well. Asians can produce televisions more efficiently than we can. However, we do not come out worse off because Americans can produce medicines extremely well, comparatively,



due to our highly trained workforce. Thus we can trade medicine for televisions. This represents the most efficient use of the scarce resources which exist in the world.

Wal-Mart represents another example of the power of maximum efficiency. Wal-Mart, the world's largest retailer and domestic private employer, achieves the lowest price possible through massive operations around the world (via Wikipedia). They show success because of the principle of economies of scale. They use technology and specialization to remove as much waste from their operation as possible. Consumers must like this efficient, low-cost process because more than one-third of the United States population visits a Wal-Mart every week (via Wikipedia). Most do not concern themselves that most production comes from China and other foreign factories. Yes, some people do raise concerns about Wal-Mart's effect on local communities and global industries, however, low prices usually draw people in, and in fact, represents a positive net effect.

## Currency

And indeed, global trade helps everyone. By buying goods from China, we as the United States, put our currency into the hands of foreigners. What do these foreigners do with these American dollars? They can either buy our exports, thus bringing the money back to our domestic industries, or invest it, again bringing our dollars back. They also can trade the dollars in the foreign exchange market, but someone must buy them. They too much invest and purchase American goods. It's foolish to lock the money up in a vault because it loses value during inflation. Therefore it must go elsewhere to investment and eventually brought back to America.

## Trade Barriers

Many who become scared of Wal-Mart and global competition try to lobby governments to pass trade barriers. In addition, workers about to lose their jobs become very vocal about installing trade barriers. The rest of America usually supports the politicians, not know the benefits trade can have. Trade barriers include both quotas and tariffs. Both harm consumers, foreign markets, and even domestic production. They artificially increase prices by reducing the number of producers able to sell a product in a certain region. This shows very similar tendencies to installing monopolies, at least among domestic producers.

Throughout history evidence has amassed that monopolies represent a detriment to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies do not find themselves governed by market principles, and therefore do not operate for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole (Brue 85). Throughout history, starting with the Sherman Act of 1890, the United States has tried to regulate or break monopolies (Brue 85). Thus, regulations actually trying to create monopolies or monopoly-like situations with domestic producers represent poor ideas for the macro society.

Thus, globalization serves to increase competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices, which as shown above with Wal-Mart, get demanded by consumers.

## Innovation

In addition, protective tariffs reduce innovation. Once a producer has a monopoly they no longer need to innovate to stay competitive. Their products will continue to sell regardless of their quality and features. Without the drive for innovation, few advancements will get funding.

This dearth of innovation hurts future industries. Over time some jobs get replaced by other jobs. Farming once employed many people in America. Today very few people have careers as farmers. Does this mean we suffer? Of course not! Americans have a higher standard of living than ever. Increasingly, Americans do less manual labor in their jobs. What happened? New technologies brought around new industries which brought new, higher skilled jobs. Twenty years ago, very few people dreamed of becoming computer programmers. Today, many find employment in computer-related fields.



The same patterns will occur during globalization. Yes some will lose their jobs, but the increased competition creates more new technologies which have the potential to employ large numbers of workers. Thus the benefit of new, higher skilled jobs reduces the pain of losing lower-skilled jobs to foreign nations in the long-run.

## Exports

Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods get sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land as we have. We also sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products both essential and luxury (Brue 103).

Thus we rely, both our consumers and exporters, on free global trade. This trade will come along with globalization and must get encouragement.

Nevertheless, enacting regulations and protectionist policies to protect our domestic markets will only encourage protectionist policies against our exports. Enacting these policies will only start a downward spiral, plunging the world into the past by restricting globalization. This hurts the many US businesses which export goods from the United States.

In addition, we export services. In 1996, service exports exceeded service imports by \$80 billion (Brue 765).  
?normal service exports -

When tourists and foreign students come to the United States, we actually export services to them whenever they spend money here. When a tourist comes from another nation they bring foreign currency and trading it for things from the US like meals and hotel rooms (Choice 82). In addition students coming for education in the United States bring a lot of money with them to spend both on tuition and living expenses (Choice 82). Without global trade no dollars can be found to spend on these "exports."

## Conclusion

Thus, global trade, in the long run, has a positive impact on the United States. But let's not forget about developing nations which we provide jobs to. These jobs help make them richer, and in turn, increasingly able to purchase US exports. The global economy helps all of us make our lives better and increases worldwide standards of living. Globalization has and continues to have a positive impact on our lives.

## Con: Pollution (David)

The Earth has suffered plenty from the industrialization of the world. A breaking ozone, a lack of clean air and water, contaminated food and rain just names a few. Modernized countries like the United States and Britain, along with oncoming China, causes the planet to evolve into stages of decay and filth. Globalization can bring this issue to every country in the world. The ideal solution provides equal countries but how could America, Britain, and other advanced countries ever accept lower standards of living for the environment or for other countries globally? Bringing economies to the global scale means increasing the power of the lower countries to have the ability to do so and compete properly. Though specialization gives poorer economies an advantage, it fails to mention the amount of consumption they gain from it. Limited resources can not provide the great life for all countries. Increased globalization means countries of the world consume more. No human can reject a greater abundance of goods and will thus consume as much as possible. If every country consumes as much as the highest classes of the world, the world will undoubtedly exist to see the next Y2K. For China alone, experts predict that in order to fulfill the demand for goods by the Chinese and at its current growth, they require a whole new Earth by 2035 (Discovery Atlas). That sort of availability does not exist. The world may pull off one or two of that consumption but never the entirety. Globalization brings economies to a level of consumption unacceptable to society's resources. Intervention must occur.



In addition, in developing nations laws regarding the environment do not exist at the same level as in developed nations.

David, what you have here is not really what I was thinking of. Sure increased consumption is bad, but that is more subjective (is materialism bad?) I think it would be stronger if you focused on the difference between environmental laws and practices in developed and developing nations. (this should help:  
<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/11/03/60minutes/main2149023.shtml?CMP=ILC-SearchStories>)

In addition, the outsourcing of trash is what many consider unfair. Here are two articles to help:  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/waste/story/0,12188,1308278,00.html> <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/4810> Lastly, please cite your sources in your section like Gerg and I ahve done. Make sure to add the mla at the bottom. Thank you for your contribution--Plaz 16:39, 8 January 2007 (EST)

## Con: Outsourcing (David)

Job outsourcing seems unquestionably favorable to those who consume goods and hold a steady domestic, high-skilled job. However, a former Microsoft phone operator may disagree. They must have known that their American job would leave them soon because Microsoft could gain cheaper labor overseas. They knew that soon they would have to retrain for years and years to get a job that they had prepared themselves for. Their past skills remain unused in the labor pool; they can not find another job without retraining. But during the period of retraining, one undergoes difficulty. Without a job, one can not pay for one's retraining. Economic efficiency does not even relate to the social hardships placed upon its society. Isn't employment for all a better goal, the affording luxuries for a few? One does not care about the benefits to society when one becomes unemployed.

In addition, the job done by outsourced workers does not represent the same quality. Has one ever tried to talk to someone with a thick accent outside the United States? One can hardly understand them, especially when one becomes mad about the companies' service. One does not want to deal with that when they have a problem. Many Americans much prefer talking to someone in the United States. Companies should realize that the support quality causes them to lose customers. Thus, some have even brought jobs back to the United States, slowing globalization.

Globalization does not always represent the best choice, even if it means angering your customers, or causing domestic unemployment.

## Con: McDonalds in China (Greg)

Over many years of globalization and influences from the outside world, China has modernized from the days of Daoism and Confucianism into a bustling, highly populated, and overly crowded nation... for the worse. Nowadays, American franchises such as Starbucks, Kentucky Fried Chicken, McDonald's, and Xerox crawl all over China, tainting traditional customs and cultural values (Watson 1). These franchises and companies expose only American culture to youthful minds, blocking away their own traditional culture. Some parents view McDonald's as a way to "connect" their children with the outside world (Watson 2). However, this could lead to children attending American universities, thus abandoning Chinese universities and education. Also, with globalization in the economy come changes in society. In China's larger cities for example, the male no longer rules the household (Watson 3). The conjugal unit, a new family system that attends to the whims of the married couple has also emerged (Watson 3). This type of family system undermines traditional ways of filial piety and Confucianism (Watson 3). McDonald's has become too popular with China's younger generations, teaching American culture before Chinese culture at such an early age (Watson 3). All these recent and rapid changes could send society abuzz, causing chaos to break loose. A clash between traditional Chinese and modernized Chinese could spark. This could eventually divide China's cities and society into a war zone.

Since McDonald's draws anti-American protestors, some of which who have even bombed and attacked restaurants, the influence of this fast food establishment has only negatively affected Chinese society (Watson 4). Hong Kong



special foods and delicacies have already succumbed to "industrialized food" (Watson 4). New, exotic cuisines from Europe have poured into China furthering the food competition (Watson 4). Fast food eateries cause children to often eat outside their homes, without consumer protection (Watson 6). Although dining outside the home may seem pleasant, many have suffered from food poisoning, and some have even died (Watson 6). Rather than eating in the safety of one's home traditionally, some choose to eat out, risking their lives. One who does eat out at a Chinese restaurant, may find a decrease in originality and style; many Chinese restaurants now base their styles, such as uniforms, off of American establishments (Watson 6). All over the world, global franchises and other organizations compete against one another, spilling their cultural values, which could end in a catastrophic event, perhaps even war.

Next, modernization has led to China's excessive population growth, especially the elderly class. Researchers expect that by 2025, 274 million people over 60 years of age will exist in China- more than the entire 1998 U.S. population (Watson 6)! Unfortunately however, civil society currently ignores the vast elderly population (Watson 7). Leaving such an enormous majority of the population unchecked could result in severe shortages.

New cultures and their ideas may prompt China's communist government to begin another plan or economic movement towards further modernization, like the Cultural Revolution, which was not successful. Once the Chinese had seen the competition in modernization, the communists immediately began reforms to "catch up," such as the Great Leap Forward, and the Five Year Plan China adopted from the Soviet Union. During this time years ago, peasants lost their farms and had to combine with others. Also, attempting to "re-educate" such a vast population would take years. In the eyes of some citizens, "re-education" would seem pointless since China currently produces the most steel and coal in the world. Such efforts to change the culture, in the past, did not help China.

## **Con: Changes in Latin America (Greg)**

Argentina, Peru, Brazil, and Colombia all appeared to blossom at a time, but globalization caused all these countries to wilt (Hilton 1). Thanks to globalization, many Latin American countries have developed into a total mess. Now, Argentina's former president, Menem faces criminal charges, unemployment has reached 18%, the country has plunged into bankruptcy, and owes 90 billion pounds externally (Hilton 1). Brazil has reached 20% inflation, Peru's president Alberto Fujimori's government collapsed in a corruption scandal, and Colombia now houses the latest arena for America's military (Hilton 1). Most countries in Latin America have pursued economic liberalism for the past 15 years, but with little progress (Hilton 1). Cancun, Mexico holds the most unequal distribution of wealth and income in the world (Hilton 1). Due to this, Cancun has suffered with an increase of daily criminal violence, continuing drug-related problems, and official corruption (Hilton 1). Throughout Latin America, the poor and impoverished middle-classes (teachers and health workers) have lost their jobs, and articulate the opposition to economic liberalism (Hilton 1). Venezuela seems fine now, but President Hugo Chavez aspires to introduce a Cuban-style society to the country (Hilton 1). Globalization has guided Latin America into chaos, without any seemingly hopes of helping Latin America out of its current state.

According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), globalization has changed the social structures of society in Latin America, but has not contributed in correcting the social inequalities (Gonzalez 1). Neoliberal-inspired structural reforms have developed into a widespread movement (Gonzalez 1). Although globalization did produce benefits in Latin America, these benefits resulted in serious social repercussions (Gonzalez 1). ILO also states that the benefits also reflected and reproduced the inequalities existing in the region (Gonzalez 1). Even though globalization may have somewhat helped Latin America as a whole, the original social inequality issue still remains, new problems emerge, and globalization has yet to solve the neoliberal movement.

Also, existing differences between countries such as wages and labor regulations, could start the expansion of unfair practices towards workers (Gonzalez 1). Globalization may increase Latin America's per capita or human development index, but since the original problems still remain the same, the country's progression will not increase as much as it can. "Situations are thus created in which there are further limits to pay raises as developing economies pursue ways to be more competitive internationally and succumb to internal pressures for greater flexibility in the workforce" (Gonzalez 1). The effects of globalization have failed to create enough jobs to match the expanding



workforce in Latin America (Gonzalez 1). This limited workforce causes companies attempting to expand their organization and franchise internationally to crumble internally, because the company lacks workers at the heart of the company. While globalization tries to benefit Latin America, social inequalities and other original problems create a great imbalance, erasing globalization's benefits.

## **Pro: Spread Positive Culture (Plaz)**

Globalization does not kill culture, but it spreads it. All across America, ethnic restaurants serve food from and inspired by the rest of the world. Walk into any American city and you will see restaurants serving food from almost every country in the world. A partial list included Mexican, French, Chinese, Thai restaurants, but the list goes on and on. These restaurants source some of their food from other nations, supporting global trade. But also, perhaps more importantly, American consumers find themselves exposed to different cultures.

Cultures never stand still. Things change, and true, change can get accelerated through foreign influence, but this represents a positive force. America exemplifies a prime example of mixed culture. Almost all of us either immigrated to the United States, or have ancestors who did. We brought with us many traditions and beliefs which we still share. And, as our culture evolved over time, so has others.

### **McDonald's in Hong Kong**

People must wish for the the culture to evolve. People can, and do, resist change, but they often represent the minority. Most do in fact embrace change, and that is why it happens. Take for instance the McDonald's in Hong Kong. No one finds themselves forced to eat there. But people do. And they do so in large numbers. The restaurants attract thousands of people and become "hang-out" places for retirees and teens, similar to Wawa in the United States (Watson 5). In addition, rewards for good behavior often include a meal at McDonald's (Watson 4). In addition, the threat of withholding visits deters children from disobeying their parents (Watson 4). In fact, Chinese often regard McDonald's as comfort and local food (Watson 6). One eight-year-old Korean arrived in American and exclaimed, "Look! They have our kind of food here" after seeing a McDonald's (qtd. in Watson 3). Lastly, a simple fact remains, these restaurants must make money in order for them to continue operating. If people do not like McDonald's the stores would fold from lack of business.

And, in fact, McDonald's has changed local culture. But they have changed it for the better. Many local restaurants have adopted McDonald's ways (Watson 6). Some local Chinese chains feature employees wearing bright colored uniforms, and clean toilets (Watson 6). Customers now line up orderly instead of attempting to shove their money into the face of the person running the cash register (Watson 5). McDonald's keeps children away from bad influences like drugs and alcohol (Watson 5).

### **Sati**

But also, globalization has ended negative cultural practices. After the British arrived, sati, the practice of ritual suicide by widows onto their husband's funeral pyre, declined ("Woman commits 'sati' in UP village" 2). The process is rare today after being outlawed by Lord William Bentinck in the 1800s ("Woman commits 'sati' in UP village" 2). Foreign imperialism was the first to try and reduce this horrific culture. As the world increasing becomes more global, human rights violations goes down (stats). Industrialization nations usually happen to be democracies with clean records. It is hard to have a stable economy, into one which investors want to invest, without a government committed to ending such violent practices.

### **Women and Discrimination**

In addition, women become increasingly equal with globalization. The represent a large potential workforce which becomes necessary to increase production. In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). Not only do immigrants help grow the workforce, but in the 50s, 60s,



and 70s, our growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. That is why many nations find themselves forced to reduce discrimination against women. Societies which discriminate against women include many Muslim-ruled nation. Afghanistan, under the Taliban, had a horrible record against the treatment of women.

All of this made Afghanistan one of the world's least developed countries according to a UN study conducted in February 2005 (CBC). Only five sub-Saharan Africa nations manage to surpass it for dishonor of the lowest position in the development index (CBC). In Afghanistan, one hundred forty-two out of every one thousand babies died before age one and every thirty minutes another woman dies in pregnancy (CBC). All of this contributes to the very low life-expectancy of forty-two and one half years (CBC).

Discrimination will never help a nation advance. Hopefully, globalization can pressure strict Muslim and other religious societies to ease and remove discrimination against women. This pressure to change culture could positively affect the lives of many women, along with the entire population of the Earth.

## **Pro: Democracy and Freedom (Jeff)**

(jeff)

## **Conclusion**

## **Cut**

(leave for archiving --Plaz 22:18, 3 January 2007 (EST))

## **Support**

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession. Thus artificial or protectionist trade barriers are harmful to a nation's aggregate economy, as well as the global climate.

(more Jeff's section)

## **Growth**

(?cut) Growth is the means which reduces the burden of scarcity (Brue 369). "An economy experiencing growth is better able to meet people's wants and resolve socioeconomic problems" (Brue 369). Growth allows more finished goods to be produced either by increasing imports or making production more efficient (Brue 369). This means we are able to do more with less or the same amount of resources.

Looking back a hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. Technological advancement has been the largest source of growth in the United States making up 28% of the increase in productivity according to Edward Denison and



projected to 1998 by McConnell and Brue (374). New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!). Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and technological advancements are what power it.

In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). This has been in part because of our open arms towards immigrants. In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. Ending or reducing global trade will only have the same effect.

## Sharia

?cut in paper?

## Rebuttal to cultural revolution by plaz

(oh i see, i was thinking about the pro view, but I too thought forced change was bad) Forcing culture to be protected might incite another backlash similar to the Cultural Revolution. The Cultural Revolution showed what can happen when rapid cultural change gets attempted. Culture seems to change at its own pace, the pace accepted by the people in China. Attempting to artificially alter that change only seems to incite corruption, and greed.

## Sources

(will format later --Plaz 23:54, 31 December 2006 (EST)) (need to do mla for some)

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia
- ?Riley interview
- The Choice
- encarta: monopoly
- Gonzalez, Gustavo. "Latin America: Globalization Doesn't Correct Inequalities." Global Policy Forum. 2000. Global Policy Forum. 29 December 2006  
<<http://www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/develop/devthry/poverty/2001/0118gonz.htm>>.
- Hilton, Isabela. "Forget Cancun, Globalization Has Destroyed the Real Latin America." NewsCenter. 2001-2006. Guardian Newspapers Limited. 29 December 2006  
<<http://www.commondreams.org/views01/0808-02.htm>>.
- Watson, James L. "China's Big Mac Attack." Foreign Affairs. May/June 2000. Council Foreign Relations, Inc. 29 December 2006
- 1/5/07  
[http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS/India/Woman\\_commits\\_sati\\_in\\_UP\\_village/articleshow/msid-15383](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS/India/Woman_commits_sati_in_UP_village/articleshow/msid-15383)
- "CBC News In Depth: Afghanistan." CBC News. 6 March 2006. CBC/Radio-Canada. 26 Oct 2006  
<<http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/afghanistan/>>.

## Further Reading

- The Choice



# World Cultures Comparison Project/Paper

From ThePlaz.com

World Cultures World Cultures Comparison Project Paper Template:World Cultures Comparison Project

 **Only a DRAFT!**

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

may contain to-be verbs (Oh no!)

## Contents

- 1 Opening
- 2 Pro: Economics
  - 2.1 Introduction
  - 2.2 Specialization
  - 2.3 Currency
  - 2.4 Trade Barriers
  - 2.5 Innovation
  - 2.6 Exports
  - 2.7 Conclusion
- 3 Con: Pollution
- 4 Con: Outsourcing
- 5 Con: McDonalds in China
- 6 Con: Changes in Latin America
- 7 Pro: Spread Positive Culture
- 8 Pro: Democracy and Freedom
- 9 Conclusion
- 10 Cut
  - 10.1 Support
  - 10.2 Growth
  - 10.3 Sharia
- 11 Sources
- 12 Further Reading

## Opening

(opening)



# Pro: Economics

## Introduction

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations. Increasing trade between nations helps both parties advance by allowing them each to produce what they can do best and able to sell those products around the world. In addition, globalization increases competition which prevents lazy monopolies and inefficient means of production. It drives innovation and world peace with a spirit of interdependence. Trade barriers only prevent these benefits from realization and hurt society as a whole. Globalization represents a positive trend which must continue to drive growth to make the world a better place.

## Specialization

No one person can do everything, and the same holds true for nations as well. For starters, not every nation has enough of every natural resource. The United States does not have enough oil to survive efficiently. Sure, if necessary we could end our dependency on oil, but this represents an enormous cost to our current industries. Alternative fuels currently cost too much, or we would have adopted them already. But the same also holds true for manufacturing.

The United States only has a certain amount of workers and a certain amount of land. It's best to distribute that land to make the most goods as possible for our society. Of course we can't make everything equally well. We would need to make trade-offs and produce more of some things than others. This would decrease total output. Consider, for a minute, a smaller scale. What if each state could not trade with one another? Where would we get cotton or computers? In every state a computer factory would rise. Currently, a few, well-equipped, very efficient factories make most computer parts. If a factory was needed in every state, many more resources would get consumed to produce the same amount of products. Sure the factory owners would grow wealthier, but at the expense of everyone else. In addition, the cotton plants would have lower yields here because of the colder weather. In total, production goes down. In fact, since the Constitution banned trade barriers between states, one of the largest free-trade areas has emerged (Brue 780). Economists cite this as a leading factor in the United States' development (Brue 780). This represents an example of how free trade has played out.

Specialization solves the problem of inefficiencies. For example, Pennsylvania can produce large amounts of coal and agricultural goods. We trade these items for cotton and computers, which other states produce well. In total, with the same amount of input, more cotton, coal, computers, and agricultural goods get produced each year.

This same pattern holds true between nations as well. Asians can produce televisions more efficiently than we can. However, we do not come out worse off because Americans can produce medicines extremely well, comparatively, due to our highly trained workforce. Thus we can trade medicine for televisions. This represents the most efficient use of the scarce resources which exist in the world.

Wal-Mart represents another example of the power of maximum efficiency. Wal-Mart, the world's largest retailer and domestic private employer, achieves the lowest price possible through massive operations around the world (via Wikipedia). They show success because of the principle of economies of scale. They use technology and specialization to remove as much waste from their operation as possible. Consumers must like this efficient, low-cost process because more than one-third of the United States' population visits a Wal-Mart every week (via Wikipedia). Most do not concern themselves that most production comes from China and other foreign factories. Yes, some people do raise concerns about Wal-Mart's effect on local communities and global industries, however, low prices usually draw people in, and in fact, represents a positive net effect.

## Currency

And indeed, global trade helps everyone. By buying goods from China, we as the United States, put our currency



into the hands of foreigners. What do these foreigners do with these American dollars? They can either buy our exports, thus bringing the money back to our domestic industries, or invest it, again bringing our dollars back. They also can trade the dollars in the foreign exchange market, but someone must buy them. They too much invest and purchase American goods. It's foolish to lock the money up in a vault because it loses value during inflation. Therefore it must go elsewhere to investment and eventually brought back to America.

## Trade Barriers

Many who become scared of Wal-Mart and global competition try to lobby governments to pass trade barriers. In addition, workers about to lose their jobs become very vocal about installing trade barriers. The rest of America usually supports the politicians, not know the benefits trade can have. Trade barriers include both quotas and tariffs. Both harm consumers, foreign markets, and even domestic production. They artificially increase prices by reducing the number of producers able to sell a product in a certain region. This shows very similar tendencies to installing monopolies, at least among domestic producers.

Throughout history evidence has amassed that monopolies represent a detriment to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies do not find themselves governed by market principles, and therefore do not operate for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole (Brue 85). Throughout history, starting with the Sherman Act of 1890, the United States has tried to regulate or break monopolies (Brue 85). Thus, regulations actually trying to create monopolies or monopoly-like situations with domestic producers represent poor ideas for the macro society.

Thus, globalization serves to increase competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices, which as shown above with Wal-Mart, get demanded by consumers.

## Innovation

In addition, protective tariffs reduce innovation. Once a producer has a monopoly they no longer need to innovate to stay competitive. Their products will continue to sell regardless of their quality and features. Without the drive for innovation, few advancements will get funding.

This dearth of innovation hurts future industries. Over time some jobs get replaced by other jobs. Farming once employed many people in America. Today very few people have careers as farmers. Does this mean we suffer? Of course not! Americans have a higher standard of living than ever. Increasingly, Americans do less manual labor in their jobs. What happened? New technologies brought around new industries which brought new, higher skilled jobs. Twenty years ago, very few people dreamed of becoming computer programmers. Today, many find employment in computer-related fields.

The same patterns will occur during globalization. Yes some will lose their jobs, but the increased competition creates more new technologies which have the potential to employ large numbers of workers. Thus the benefit of new, higher skilled jobs reduces the pain of losing lower-skilled jobs to foreign nations in the long-run.

## Exports

Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods get sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land as we have. We also sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products both essential and luxury (Brue 103).

Thus we rely, both our consumers and exporters, on free global trade. This trade will come along with globalization and must get encouragement.



Nevertheless, enacting regulations and protectionist policies to protect our domestic markets will only encourage protectionist policies against our exports. Enacting these policies will only start a downward spiral, plunging the world into the past by restricting globalization. This hurts the many US businesses which export goods from the United States.

In addition, we export services. In 1996, service exports exceeded service imports by \$80 billion (Brue 765).  
?normal service exports -

When tourists and foreign students come to the United States, we actually export services to them whenever they spend money here. When a tourists comes from another nation they bring foreign currency and trading it for things from the US like meals and hotel rooms (Choice 82). In addition students coming for education in the United States bring a lot of money with them to spend both on tuition and living expenses (Choice 82). Without global trade no dollars can be found to spend on these "exports."

## Conclusion

Thus, global trade, in the long run, has a positive impact on the United States. But lets not forget about developing nations which we provide jobs to. These jobs help make them richer, and in turn, increasingly able to purchase US exports. The global economy helps all of us make our lives better and increases worldwide standards of living. Globalization has and continues to have a positive impact on our lives.

## Con: Pollution

(David) (?Move down??? --Plaz 22:18, 3 January 2007 (EST))

## Con: Outsourcing

(David)

## Con: McDonalds in China

Over many years of globalization and influences from the outside world, China has modernized from the days of Daoism and Confucianism into a bustling, highly populated, and overly crowded nation... for the worse. Nowadays, American franchises such as Starbucks, Kentucky Fried Chicken, McDonald's, and Xerox crawl all over China, tainting traditional customs and cultural values (Watson 1). These franchises and companies expose only American culture to youthful minds, blocking away their own traditional culture. Some parents view McDonald's as a way to "connect" their children with the outside world (Watson 2). However, this could lead to children attending American universities, thus abandoning Chinese universities and education. Also, with globalization in the economy come changes in society. In China's larger cities for example, the male no longer rules the household (Watson 3). The conjugal unit, a new family system that attends to the whims of the married couple has also emerged (Watson 3). This type of family system undermines traditional ways of filial piety and Confucianism (Watson 3). McDonald's has become too popular with China's younger generations, teaching American culture before Chinese culture at such an early age (Watson 3). All these recent and rapid changes could send society abuzz, causing chaos to break loose. A clash between traditional Chinese and modernized Chinese could spark. This could eventually divide China's cities and society into a war zone.

Since McDonald's draws anti-American protestors, some of which who have even bombed and attacked restaurants, the influence of this fast food establishment has only negatively affected Chinese society (Watson 4). Hong Kong special foods and delicacies have already succumbed to "industrialized food" (Watson 4). New, exotic cuisines from Europe have poured into China furthering the food competition (Watson 4). Fast food eateries cause children to often eat outside their homes, without consumer protection (Watson 6). Although dining outside the home may seem



## Pro: Democracy and Freedom

(jeff)

## Conclusion

## Cut

(leave for archiving --Plaz 22:18, 3 January 2007 (EST))

## Support

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession. Thus artificial or protectionist trade barriers are harmful to a nation's aggregate economy, as well as the global climate.

(more Jeff's section)

## Growth

(?cut) Growth is the means which reduces the burden of scarcity (Brue 369). "An economy experiencing growth is better able to meet people's wants and resolve socioeconomic problems" (Brue 369). Growth allows more finished goods to be produced either by increasing imports or making production more efficient (Brue 369). This means we are able to do more with less or the same amount of resources.

Looking back a hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. Technological advancement has been the largest source of growth in the United States making up 28% of the increase in productivity according to Edward Denison and projected to 1998 by McConnell and Brue (374). New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!). Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and technological advancements are what power it.

In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). This has been in part because of our open arms towards immigrants. In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. Ending or reducing global trade will only have the same effect.

## Sharia

?cut in paper?



## Sources

(will format later --Plaz 23:54, 31 December 2006 (EST)) (need to do mla for some)

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia
- ?Riley interview
- The Choice
- encarta: monopoly
- Gonzalez, Gustavo. "Latin America: Globalization Doesn't Correct Inequalities." Global Policy Forum. 2000. Global Policy Forum. 29 December 2006  
<<http://www.globalpolicy.org/soecon/develop/devthry/poverty/2001/0118gonz.htm>>.
- Hilton, Isabela. "Forget Cancun, Globalization Has Destroyed the Real Latin America." NewsCenter. 2001-2006. Guardian Newspapers Limited. 29 December 2006  
<<http://www.commondreams.org/views01/0808-02.htm>>.
- Watson, James L. "China's Big Mac Attack." Foreign Affairs. May/June 2000. Council Foreign Relations, Inc. 29 December 2006

## Further Reading

- The Choice

Retrieved from "[http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\\_Cultures\\_Comparison\\_Project/Paper](http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World_Cultures_Comparison_Project/Paper)"

---

- This page was last modified 21:30, January 4, 2007.
- Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 license



Tecker Tecker 8911 Conflicter Minisites

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Pro: Economics

From ThePlaz.com

World Cultures World Cultures Comparison Project Paper - Pro: Economics by Plaz Template:World Cultures Comparison Project

 **Only a DRAFT!**

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

may contain to-be verbs (Oh no!)

## Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Specialization
- 3 Trade Barriers
- 4 Innovation
- 5 Exports
- 6 Conclusion
- 7 Cut
  - 7.1 Support
  - 7.2 Growth
  - 7.3 Sharia
- 8 Sources
- 9 Further Reading

## Introduction

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations. Increasing trade between nations helps both parties advance by allowing them each to produce what they are best at and being able to sell those products around the world. In addition, globalization increases competition which prevents lazy monopolies and inefficient means of production. It drives innovation and world peace with a spirit of interdependence. Trade barriers only prevent these benefits from realization and hurt society as a whole. Globalization represents a positive trend which must continue to drive growth to make the world a better place.

## Specialization

No one person can do everything, and the same is true for nations as well. For starters, not every nation has enough of every natural resources. The United States does not have enough oil to survive efficiently. Sure, if necessary we could end our dependency on oil, but this would be at an enormous cost to our current industries. Alternative fuels



are just too expensive, or we would have adopted them already. But the same also holds true for manufacturing.

The United States only has a certain amount of workers and a certain amount of land. It's best to distribute that land to make the most goods as possible for our society. Of course we can't make everything equally well. We would need to make trade-offs and produce more of some things than others. This would decrease total output. Consider, for a minute, a smaller scale. What if each state had to be independent. Where would we get cotton or computers? A computer factory would be needed in every state. Currently, a few factories exist which are well-equipped and very efficient. If one would be needed in every state, much more resources would need to be used to produce the same product. In addition, the cotton plants would have lower yields here because of the colder weather. In total, much less would be produced.

Specialization solves the problem. For example, Pennsylvania can produce large amounts of coal and agricultural goods. We are able to trade these for cotton and computers, which other states produce well. In total, more cotton, coal, computers, and agricultural goods are made each year with the same amount of input.

This same pattern holds true between nations as well. Asians are able to produce televisions more efficiently than we are able to. However, we are not worse off because Americans are very good at producing medicine due to our highly trained workforce. Thus we are able to trade medicine for televisions. This represents the most efficient use of the scarce resources which exist in the world.

Wal-Mart represents another example of the power of maximum efficiency. Wal-Mart, the world's largest retailer and domestic private employer, achieves the lowest price possible through massive operations around the world (via Wikipedia). They are successful because of the principle of economies of scale. They are able to use technology and specialization to remove as much waste from their operation as possible. Consumers must like this efficient, low-cost process because more than one-third of the United States population visits a Wal-Mart every week (via Wikipedia). Most are not concerned that most production comes from China and other foreign factories. Yes, some people do raise concerns about Wal-Mart's effect on local communities and global industries, however, low prices usually draw people in, and in fact, are for the better.

## **Trade Barriers**

Many who are scared of Wal-Mart and global competition try to lobby governments to pass trade barriers. Trade barriers are both quotas and tariffs. Both are bad ideas and they hamper both consumers, foreign markets, and even domestic production. They artificially increase prices by reducing the number of producers able to sell a product in a certain region. This shows very similar tendencies to installing monopolies, at least among domestic producers.

Throughout history there has been consistent evidence that monopolies are detrimental to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies are not governed by market principles, and therefore are not run for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole (Brue 85). Throughout history, starting with the Sherman Act of 1890, the United States has tried to regulate or break monopolies (Brue 85). Thus, regulations actually trying to create monopolies or monopoly-like situations with domestic producers are inherently flawed.

Thus, globalization serves to increase competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices, which as shown above with Wal-Mart are demanded by consumers.

## **Innovation**

In addition, protective tariffs reduce innovation. Once a producer has a monopoly they no longer need to innovate to stay competitive. Their products will continue to be purchased regardless of their quality and features. New technologies will not be created without the drive for innovation.

This dearth of innovation hurts future industries. Over time some jobs are replaced by other jobs. Looking back,



many Americans in the past used to be farmers. Today very few happen to be farmers. Does this mean we are worse off? Of course not! American have a higher standard of living then ever. In addition, American are increasing being employed in jobs requiring less manual labor. What happened? New technologies brought around new industries which brought new, higher skilled jobs. Twenty years ago, very few people dreamed of becoming computer programmers. Today, many are employed in computer-related fields.

The same patterns will occur during globalization. Yes some will lose their jobs, but the increased competition creates more new technologies which have the potential to employ large numbers of workers. Thus the benefit of new, higher skilled jobs reduces the pain of losing lower-skilled jobs to foreign nations in the long-run.

## Exports

Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods are sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land as we have. We also sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products bot essential and luxury (Brue 103).

Thus we rely, both our consumers and exporters, on free global trade. This trade will come along with globalization and must be encouraged.

Nevertheless, enacting regulations and protectionist policies to protect our domestic markets will only encourage protectionist policies against our exports. Enacting these policies will only start a downward spiral, plunging the world into the past by restricting globalization. This hurts the many US businesses which export goods from the United States.

In addition, we export services. In 1996, service exports exceeded service imports by \$80 billion (Brue 765).  
?normal service exports -

When tourists and foreign students come to the United States, we actually export services to them whenever they spend money here. When a tourists comes from another nation they are bringing foreign currency and trading it for things from the US like meals and hotel rooms (Choice 82). In addition students coming for education in the United States bring a lot of money with them to spend both on tuition and living expenses (Choice 82). Without global trade these "exports" would not be possible because of the complicated foreign exchange markets.

## Conclusion

Thus, global trade, in the long run, has a positive impact on the United States. But lets not forget about developing nations which we provide jobs to. These jobs help make them richer, and in turn, increasingly able to purchase US exports. The global economy helps all of us make our lives better and increases worldwide standards of living. Globalization has and continues to have a positive impact on our lives.

## Cut

## Support

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession. Thus artificial or protectionist trade barriers are harmful to a nation's aggregate economy, as well as the global climate.

(more Jeff's section)



## Growth

(?cut) Growth is the means which reduces the burden of scarcity (Brue 369). "An economy experiencing growth is better able to meet people's wants and resolve socioeconomic problems" (Brue 369). Growth allows more finished goods to be produced either by increasing imports or making production more efficient (Brue 369). This means we are able to do more with less or the same amount of resources.

Looking back a hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. Technological advancement has been the largest source of growth in the United States making up 28% of the increase in productivity according to Edward Denison and projected to 1998 by McConnell and Brue (374). New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!). Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and technological advancements are what power it.

In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). This has been in part because of our open arms towards immigrants. In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. Ending or reducing global trade will only have the same effect.

## Sharia

?cut in paper?

## Sources

(need to do mla)

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia
- ?Riley interview
- The Choice
- encarta: monopoly

## Further Reading

- The Choice

Retrieved from "[http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\\_Cultures\\_Comparison\\_Project/Pro:\\_Economics](http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World_Cultures_Comparison_Project/Pro:_Economics)"

- This page was last modified 16:06, December 29, 2006.
- Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 license



Tecker Tecker 8211 Conflicter Minisites

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Pro: Economics

From ThePlaz.com

World Cultures World Cultures Comparison Project Paper - Pro: Economics by Plaz Template:World Cultures Comparison Project

 **Only a DRAFT!**

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

Still very rough; needs a major re-organization!; may contain to-be verbs (Oh no!)

Globalization, in the long run, has had a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations. Increasing trade between nations helps both parties advance by allowing them each to produce what they are best at and being able to sell those products around the world.

No one person can do everything, and the same is true for nations as well. For starters, not every nation has enough of every natural resources. The United States does not have enough oil to survive efficiently. Sure, if necessary we could end our dependency on oil, but this would be at an enormous cost to our current industries. Alternative fuels are just too expensive, or we would have adopted them already. But the same also holds true for manufacturing. The United States only has a certain amount of workers and a certain amount of land. It's best to distribute that land to make the most goods as possible for our society. However, in some cases, other nations are better at producing certain goods. Asians are able to produce televisions more efficiently than we are able to. However, Americans are very good at producing medicine due to are highly trained workforce. Thus we are able to trade medicine for televisions. Both parties make out richer because this represents the most efficient means of production.

And the most efficient means of production also represents the cheapest. And almost everyone wants the cheapest product, regardless of its origin. For example, Wal-Mart, the world's largest retailer and domestic private employer achieves the lowest price possible through massive operations around the world (via Wikipedia). They are successful because of the principle of economies of scale. They are able to use technology and specialization to remove as much waste from their operation as possible. Consumers must like this efficient, low-cost process because more than one-third of the United State's population visits a Wal-Mart every week (via Wikipedia). Most are not concerned that most production comes from China and other foreign factories. Yes, some people do raise concerns about Wal-Mart's effect on local communities and global industries, however, low prices usually draw people in, and in fact, are for the better.

## Contents

- 1 Trade Barriers
- 2 Innovation
- 3 Exports
- 4 Support



- 5 Growth
- 6 Sources
- 7 Further Reading

## Trade Barriers

Many who are scared of Wal-Mart and global competition try to lobby governments to pass trade barriers. Trade barriers are both quotas and tariffs. Both are bad ideas and they hamper both consumers, foreign markets, and even domestic production. They artificially increase prices by reducing the number of producers able to sell a product in a certain region. This shows very similar tendencies to installing monopolies, at least among domestic producers.

Throughout history there has been consistent evidence that monopolies are detrimental to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies are not governed by market principles, and therefore are not run for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole (Brue 85). Throughout history, starting with the Sherman Act of 1890, the United States has tried to regulate or break monopolies (Brue 85). Thus, regulations actually trying to create monopolies or monopoly-like situations with domestic producers are inherently flawed.

Thus, globalization serves to increase competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices.

## Innovation

In addition, protective tariffs reduce innovation. Once a producer has a monopoly they no longer need to innovate to stay competitive. Their products will continue to be purchased regardless of their quality and features. New technologies will not be created without the drive for innovation.

This dearth of innovation hurts future industries. Over time some jobs are replaced by other jobs. Looking back, many Americans in the past used to be farmers. Today very few happen to be farmers. Does this mean we are worse off? Of course not! Americans have a higher standard of living than ever. In addition, Americans are increasingly being employed in jobs requiring less manual labor. What happened? New technologies brought around new industries which brought new, higher skilled jobs. Twenty years ago, very few people dreamed of becoming computer programmers. Today, many are employed in computer related fields.

The same patterns will occur during globalization. Yes some will lose their jobs, but the increased competition creates more new technologies which have the potential to employ large numbers of workers. Thus the benefit of new, higher skilled jobs reduces the pain of losing lower-skilled jobs to foreign nations.

## Exports

Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods are sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land as we have. We also sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products both essential and luxury (Brue 103).

Thus we rely, both our consumers and exporters, on free global trade. This trade will come along with globalization and must be encouraged.

Nevertheless, enacting regulations and protectionist policies to protect our domestic markets will only encourage protectionist policies against our exports. Enacting these policies will only start a downward spiral, plunging the world into the past by restricting globalization.



- end edit\*\*

?money drive and exporting services (edu and torism) p62 The Choice.

## Support

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession. Thus artificial or protectionist trade barriers are harmful to a nation's aggregate economy, as well as the global climate.

## Growth

Growth is the means which reduces the burden of scarcity (Brue; start of growth chapter). It allows more finished goods to be produced either by increasing imports or making production more efficient (Brue ?).

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and technological advancements are what power it. Looking back a hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. Technological advancement has been the largest source of growth in the United States making up 28% of the increase in productivity according to Edward Denison and projected to 1998 by McConnell and Brue (374). New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!). Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). This has been in part because of our open arms towards immigrants. In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. Ending or reducing global trade will only have the same effect.

?shria here?

more international perspectives

## Sources

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia
- ?Riley interview
- The Choice
- encarta: monopoly

## Further Reading

- The Choice

Retrieved from "[http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\\_Cultures\\_Comparison\\_Project/Pro:\\_Economics](http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World_Cultures_Comparison_Project/Pro:_Economics)"



3rd  
Tecker Tecker 8911 Conflicter Minisites

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Pro: Economics

From ThePlaz.com

World Cultures Paper - Pro: Economics by Plaz Template: World Cultures Comparison Project

## Only a DRAFT!

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

Still very rough; needs a major re-organization!; may contain to-be verbs (Oh no!)

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations. Increasing trade between nations helps both parties advance; globalization does not represent a one-way street. Both parties can prosper through growth, the act of expanding outputs, as well as the law of competitive advantage.

No one can do everything, and the same is true for nations as well. For starters, not every nation has enough of every natural resources. The United States does not have enough oil to survive efficiently. Sure, if necessary we could end our dependence on oil, but this would be at high cost to our current industries. Alternative fuels are just too expensive currently, or we would have adopted them already. But the same also holds true for manufacturing. America represents one of the most efficient producers of medicines. Other countries could also make medicines if they wished, but at higher cost then importing them from the United States. On the other hand, Asians are the cheapest manufactures of televisions in the world. We trade them our medicines for televisions. This represents the most efficient means of production.

The most efficient means of production usually comes out the cheapest. And the cheapest product usually gets purchased, regardless of origin. For example, Wal-Mart the world's largest retailer and domestic private employer (via Wikipedia) use the economies of scale to achieve the lowest price possible through massive operations around the world. They are successful because of the principle of economies of scale. They are able to use technology to remove as much waste from their operation as possible. Consumers must like this because more then one-third of the United State's population visits a Wal-Mart every week (via Wikipedia). They come for the low prices. In fact this savings on purchasing basic household needs at lower prices gives them extra money to purchase other things. This has increased the standards of living in the Unites States by saving money from reducing inefficiencies to spend on luxury goods or vacations.

## Contents

- 1 Trade Barriers
- 2 Growth
- 3 Sources



#### ■ 4 Further Reading

### Trade Barriers

Trade barriers, like quotas and tariffs, hamper both consumers, foreign markets, and even domestic production. They artificially increase prices *on both domestic + foreign goods. ↗*

In fact inefficient businesses function like

trade barriers harms

Thus

Globalization increases competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices.

Throughout history (give example) there has been consistent evidence that monopolies are detrimental to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies are not governed by market principles, and therefore are not run for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole. The blockage of trade between nation, therefore, shows tendencies and qualities of monopolies (Brue 85). explain it better

Monopolies also result in higher prices for consumers. Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. Not only does the US import final consumer goods, but many goods made in the United States are assembled with foreign components (Brue 101). The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods are sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land as we have. We also sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products both essential and luxury (Brue 103).

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession. Thus artificial or protectionist trade barriers are harmful to a nation's aggregate economy, as well as the global climate.

Protectionism, the act of establishing trade barriers to shield domestic production from foreign competitors does more harm than good. Sure times are hard, if people are put out of work. ?why bad - ask reily ?move wal\*mart here

### Growth

Growth is the means which reduces the burden of scarcity (Brue; start of growth chapter). It allows more finished goods to be produced either by increasing imports or making production more efficient (Brue ?).

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and technological advancements are what power it. Looking back a hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. Technological advancement has been the largest source of growth in the United States making up 28% of the increase in productivity according to Edward Denison and projected to 1998 by McConnell and Brue (374). New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!).



both tariffs and quotas have the same effect  
on prices. ~~They~~ Through the law of supply +  
demand they force prices to be raised on  
foreign products



Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). This has been in part because of our open arms towards immigrants. In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. Ending or reducing global trade will only have the same effect.

?shria here?

more international perspectives

## Sources

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia
- ?Riley interview
- The Choice

## Further Reading

- The Choice

Retrieved from "http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\_Cultures\_Comparison\_Project/Pro:\_Economics"

Category: World Cultures Comparison Project

- 
- This page was last modified 01:52, 21 December 2006.
  - Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 license



Tecker Tecker 811 Conflicter Minisites

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Pro: Economics

From ThePlaz.com

(add title and stuff)

**Only a DRAFT!**

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

Still very rough; needs a major re-organization!

growth lessens burden of scarcity - Brue Growth Chapter  
More markets to sell stuff

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations.

Globalization increases competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices.

Throughout history (give example) there has been consistent evidence that monopolies are detrimental to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies are not governed by market principles, and therefore are not run for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole. The blockage of trade between nation, therefore, shows tendencies and qualities of monopolies (Brue 85). explain it better

Monopolies also result in higher prices for consumers. For example, take Wal-Mart the world's largest retailer, and domestic private employer (via Wikipedia). They use the economies of scale and globalaization to achieve the lowest price possible. Thus, more then one-third of the United States's population visits a Wal-Mart every week (Wikipedia). They come because the store offers the lowest prices of any store near to them. This savings on purchasing basic household need gives them extra money to purchase other things. This has increased the standards of living in the Unites States by reducing prices.

Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. Not only does the US import final consumer goods, but many goods made in the United States are assembled with foreign components (Brue 101). The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods are sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile land as we have. We also sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives through products bot essential and luxury (Brue 103).

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession. Thus artificial or protectionist trade barriers are harmful to a nation's aggregate economy, as well as the global climate.

Protectionism, the act of establishing trade barriers to shield domestic production from foreign competitors does more harm then good. Sure times are hard, if people are put out of work. ?why bad - ask reily ?move wal\*mart here

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and technological advancements are what power it. Looking back a



hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. Technological advancement has been the largest source of growth in the United States making up 28% of the increase in productivity according to Edward Denison and projected to 1998 by McConnell and Brue (374). New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!). Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

In the United States increases in the amount of people willing to work has amounted to a third of our growth (Brue 374). This has been in part because of our open arms towards immigrants. In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, growth was largely due to women joining the regular workforce (Brue 374). Prior to this, discrimination and domestic duties kept women in the house. New technologies permitted millions of women to spend less time cooking and more time producing goods and services. This goes to show what happens when discrimination gets removed.

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners, or people of color hurts the economy by reducing the amount of labor available (Brue 749). This increases the cost of labor while decreasing productions; both propel the economy backwards. Ending or reducing global trade will only have the same effect.

?shria here?

more international perspectives

## Sources

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia
- ?Riley interview

Retrieved from "[http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\\_Cultures\\_Comparison\\_Project/Pro:\\_Economics](http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World_Cultures_Comparison_Project/Pro:_Economics)"

- This page was last modified 13:28, December 17, 2006.
- Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 license



Tecker Tecker 8311 Conflicter Minisites

# World Cultures Comparison Project/Pro: Economics

From ThePlaz.com

(add title and stuff)

**⚠ Only a DRAFT!**

May change/be updated - still in progress - may still contain inaccuracies

Still very rough

Globalization, in the long run, has a positive impact on both richer and poorer (or developing) nations.

Globalization increases competition, granting the most efficient operation the business. This trims the excess fat from supply chains, providing for lower prices. Throughout history (give example) there has been consistent evidence that monopolies are detrimental to society as a whole. They allow a smaller subset of producers to artificially raise prices (Brue 85). Monopolies are not governed by market principles, and therefore are not run for the good of consumers or the economy as a whole. The blockage of trade between nation, therefore, shows tendencies and qualities of monopolies.

Monopolies also result in higher prices for consumers. For example, take Wal-Mart the world's largest retailer, and domestic private employer (Wikipedia). They use the economies of scale and globalaization to achieve the lowest price possible. Thus, more then one-third of the world's population visits a Wal-Mart every week (Wikipedia). They come because the store offers the lowest prices of any store near to them. This savings on purchasing basic household needs gives them extra money to purchase other things. This has increased the standards of living in the Unites States.

Many countries depend on global trade, for both imports and exports, including the United States. Many products made in the United States are made of foreign parts (Brue 101). The US has and continues to benefit from exporting our goods (Brue 102). Many agricultural goods are sent out of the United States to nations which do not have as much fertile soil as we have. We sell automobiles, airplanes, and coal to nations around the world. In fact, 42% of our exports go to developing nations, helping to improve their lives (Brue 103).

Thus, the amount of tariffs, and other trade barriers, both internationally and in the United States has gone down in the last 100 years (Brue 115). In fact, many economists consider the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 to be a major cause of the Great Depression (Brue 114). The Smoot-Hawley act attempted to choke off import to help domestic producers. Instead, it raised prices for goods, leading to the recession.

Growth is keystone of improvement in our lives, and techonological advancemnts are what power it. Looking back a hundred years, standards of living were much lower (cite). There were no airplanes, requiring long voyages on ships or trains to reach destinations. In fact, the US was even more polluted (CITE!!!) then then it is today. Life expectancy and life quality have both risen. The reasons for this growth is technological advancement. New farming techniques have risen farm output (give ###!!!). Less farmland, and less farmers support more people. Computers take the pain out of rewriting essays.

tech progress



→ trade barriers are harmful to a nation's domestic economy as well as the global climate.

Protectionist policies do more harm than good to the aggregate economy. Sure times are hard ~~and~~ if people are put out of work by foreign competition. However, erecting ~~at~~ tariffs & trade barriers raises prices domestically, I move next - next here

(ask Riely/textbook)



less discrimination

growth

protectionism - hurts more

more international perspectives

## Sources

- Brue Textbook
- Wikipedia

Retrieved from "[http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World\\_Cultures\\_Comparison\\_Project/Pro: Economics](http://theplaz.com/wiki/index.php?title=World_Cultures_Comparison_Project/Pro:_Economics)"

---

- This page was last modified 13:28, December 17, 2006.
- Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 license



(get ~~an~~ growth stat)

Discrimination, whether against women, foreigners or people of color hurts the economy by reducing

(-?end with  $\rightarrow$  shria)

the quantity of people able to work.  
(stat) This only reduces production output.  
~~Ending~~ Global trade will only have the  
same effect. ~~or~~ Ending or reducing