

INGS Notes (Lectures 1-8)

Semester 1, 2017

Contents

L1: Introduction.....	2
L2: What is Globalisation and its Significance.....	5
L3: Framing Global History.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
L4: Starting with China	Error! Bookmark not defined.
L5: Empires, States and New World.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
L6: Case Study: Cotton	Error! Bookmark not defined.
L7: The Industrial Revolution and its Consequences	Error! Bookmark not defined.
L8: The Gap	Error! Bookmark not defined.

L1: Introduction

Niall

Ferguson:
Philosophy
of the Great
divergence

The great divergence

- Most of the 102B people who've ever lived were/are Asian (60%) and were or are poor
- Most of the \$195000B of wealth in the world was made after and around 1800 and was made/is wealthier by westerners (19% of population, 66% of the wealth)
- By the 1970's the average Englishmen is 10x wealthier than the average Indian
- The average American is over 20% wealthier than the average Chinese
- This is not only due to economics, but political reason i.e. Empires
 - It is because they have 'laws and rules invented'
- It is not due to geography, but more ideology
 - i.e. Split of Germany/Korea
- 6 institutions that explain the great divergence leading the west above the rest of the world
 - Competition
 - Within each of the institutions within the west, there was strict competition, trying to outbid the others
 - Scientific revolution
 - Whereas in Asia, society was run by a single monolithic faith/institution creating uniformity and cancelling out this competitive aspect.
 - No ambition
 - The scientific revolution
 - West ahead of the rest of the world in science
 - East still ruled by faith
 - Property rights
 - West could own land by the 19th century whereas other parts of the world's land were still held by an elite class
 - Modern medicine
 - Breakthrough's throughout the west - doubled human life expectancy including throughout the west's empires
 - The consumer society
 - Needed for the industrial revolution to have a point - propels economic growth
 - The work ethic
 - Institutions created a work ethic
 - Today, the average Korean works 1000 hours more than the average American. This shows the end of the great divergence as the east is catching up to the west.
 - East is now technologically more advanced and has taken over the ideology that the west found first.
 - The Great Re-convergence
 - Western decline isn't inevitable however it may collapse as success grows on the edge of chaos

Critic by
Pankaj
Mishra

- Ferguson has a very brief and vague analysis, he basically states that the west was and is the very best
 - He does not take into context art and culture of the time

- He holds the west and east as separate counterparts, not showing links between or achievements that each did together besides showing the west in the east as empires.
- "Contrary to Ferguson's Hegelian picture of stagnation and decline, China and Japan enjoyed buoyant trade and experienced a consumer boom as late as the 18th century. The pioneering work of the Japanese historian Hamashita Takeshi describes a pre-European Asia organised by China's trans-state tributary network, demonstrating that there were many other centres of globalisation in the early modern world apart from those created by Western Europe. From <https://www.lrb.co.uk/v33/n21/pankaj-mishra/watch-this-man>"
- Ferguson argues that the industrial and scientific revolutions was purely a Eurocentric invention
- HE offers no evidence to back up any of his arguments, especially when saying geography is not the cause of the divergence.
- Although the west had a boom in modern medicine leading to higher population growth, Asia also got by expanding its society without corresponding economic growth, pushing many into destitution
- Ethno-centric - slides towards the west being the best
 - Implies that modern development is only from the west and ignores eastern Europe's contribution
- Only refers to western Europe, only one sided, disregards eastern Europe's role in the establishment of modern civilisation
- While Niall simplifies ideas, he's doing rather unacademic practices in his research as he glosses over facts that don't necessarily agree with his argument
 - Not much texture in his arguments
- Mishra revisionist historian - he doesn't acknowledge that most history is written by western males and doesn't acknowledge that in his argument, rather just accepts this as right
- Ferguson is making assertions of what success is, taking selective measures not the whole picture - arguing that other societies also had success due to other measures not just life expectancy and consumerism
- Idealises western society - says these ideas are great because they are from the west, states that other societies methods of modernisation are wrong because they are not doing them the same way as the west
- Why imperialism was so strong for the western community- he didn't touch on how the westerners stole resources from other parts of the world, but shows that the west was the best due to empires - no permission involved - glorifying western culture but not showing any negative aspects
- Idea that you can refute geography based on Germany/Korea as he states this was pure ideology when these divides did not show a proper implementation of the ideology shown rather forced institutions/ politics

Brexit

- A sign that Globalisation has failed?
- The extent to which the free movement of people and capital has reached a limit i.e. Global fiscal crisis 2008
 - Recognition has contributed to not only the Brexit vote/trump has caused political stress and immigration

- Spill over into the financial market
- Immigration blamed/ exploited by politics to show the negative aspects of globalisation - translated into political capital
- Very unequal distribution of global wealth
- Issues of globalisation today
 - With Brexit, one of the reasons why it happened the way it did, people expected to get the no vote, people became lackadaisical and didn't go out to vote believing it was fine - no motivation
 - Fear of the circulation of people - no trust in change - especially in older conservative generations
 - Me first - trade embargos - protectionism
 - The whole global system would be more successful as a collective yet countries want to be independent, less willing to depend on others
 - Idealistic values of what they want, when ideals don't meet perceptions of globalisation (e.g.) gains vote of Politian's to close borders to think about themselves before opening and talking about the issue
 - Fear of the western decline - racial superiority??
 - Deeper causes
 - Economic vernacular - globalisation was supposed to be a natural product of modern advancements, Politian's have lamented fear of immigration and having nothing as your own - everything shared
 - Regardless of economic change, due to massive media, cultural and social values expressed more globally, shared
 - The way we talk about globalisation - organically expressed as a wonderful thing that everyone will be included in a global market - creating disillusionment as older generation left behind and don't understand
 - Cultural lines being blurred
 - As it happened over a relatively brief period, it polarises the ideas that it is good/bad- allows extremist views to come into play
 - Enemy of globalisation is nationalism - trump acting as a populism using globalisation as a scapegoat to not address deeper issues but using it as an overarching concept
 - Product of attention between social, political and economic factors - amalgamate together - homogenisation of culture - influence of politics, quick fixes
 - Can disadvantage certain people especially older generation
 - Can facilitate global crisis i.e. climate change, extreme global change
 - Focus being generalised to western countries specifically
 - Issue not being able to govern the changes and responsibility of the changes happening - selective benefits

L2: What is Globalisation and its Significance

What is Globalisation and how do we make sense of it according to.

- Transnational relations
- The process of bringing the world together in more intense interaction through all the transnational activity such as economics, demographics, social, cultural and technological relationships
- Globalisation is a process
- Result being a more unified, interactive planet

- Manfred Steger
- Argues Globalisation has significantly increased after the Cold war era and the turn of the century
 - e.g. 911 Terrorist attack - the technology, media and ideology connected to the incident shows the global interconnectedness of the modern world
 - Makes relevance to the background of the terrorist attack and the global phenomenon that made the attack able to happen i.e. the modern technology and equipment Bin Laden could use to orchestrate the attack and create a video tape with smooth operation. Furthermore, the 'complex chain of global interdependencies' had existed for Bin Laden's message to be broadcasted around the world. Both the technology from the taping to the news network that broadcasted the tape simply did not exist within the Arab world before the interconnectedness of globalisation, and with unprecedented speed.
 - Within a day, the tape reached over 7M people, ranging from anyone with access to a TV, Internet and a computer world-wide due to chain of interdependencies and interconnections
 - To expand on this point, the network and broadcast station simply did not offer the range of programs with the high-power satellites launched by the US and USSR space shuttles due to the cold war. Again, the network's market share has increased due to a reduction in price and size of the satellites resulting in a more widespread use of this technology and rose Afghanistan's global reach.
 - Networks spreading themselves in Afghanistan such as CNN, BBC, CNBC and the Associated Press.
 - Hybridization: the mixing of diverse cultural forms and styles facilitated by global economic and cultural exchanges
 - Bin Laden's dress shows a cross-cultural interconnection between both Afghan and Russian military regalia. He combats dress acts as a symbolic reminder to the guerrilla war against soviet occupation in the 1980s, alike the present AK-47, most likely made in Russia, however due to the global market of war-time machinery and gun, relatively Bin Laden's gun could have been from anywhere around the world. Furthermore, he is also wearing a sports watch, originating from the US, which seems rather ironic for his conveyed message
 - Bin Laden embodies Globalisation - hybridisation/channels to spread messages
 - Referred to globalisation as a vague concept - challenging the semantics of globalisation - lead to a lack of individual agency as we are a buy product of our society i.e. Bin Laden

- Genuine fear of globalisation is founded upon the merging of culture - Laden advocating the genuineness of Afghan culture although he is a walking example of hybridisation as Steger analyses his attire etc.
-
- › Due to the dynamics of the Cold War, universalism has reached unprecedented levels only because interdependencies that connect the local to the global have been growing faster than at any time in history.
 - › Through the lens of Bin Laden, Steger examines the social, political and economic consequences of globalisation in the world, using the example of Bin Laden's speech using technology made possible only through globalisation
 - › Globalisation made possible for terrorism to expand however it is a contradiction that these messages wouldn't have expanded without globalisation - negative aspects
 - › Al Qaeda/Bin Laden was a product of Globalisation, slander against modernity is a contradiction as without the technology he possessed, he wouldn't have been able to spread his message
 - › Intricacy of globalisation - unavoidable - within society, but only through these examples and by examining that you can pin down this analysis of what globalisation is - greater understanding of how intricately linked globalisation is - networks and connectivity's.
 - › While globalisation does have benefits i.e. spread of communication, bin Laden exemplifies globalisation has facilitated over reactions and the spread of fear - overreactions by government (US) outstrip the capacity of states to react
 - › Globalisation is in some sense an uneven process, some areas are more affected than others, both neg and positives, certain areas are pushing back as its blurring cultural barriers through communications
 - › How the ease in which Bin Laden could transmit information, multifaceted nature of globalisation to blur and make people more aware of the interconnectedness of global and local (distance) - counter systemic movements
-
- Thomas Friedman
- › Globalisation is a relatively new concept, beginning around 1989, at the end of the cold war and is fundamentally a cause of the ideology and confrontation that rose out of it.
 - i.e. from the rigid societies of Capitalism and Communism rose a more fluid and varied concept of world order as each superpower raced to advance themselves through their economy and expand themselves on a global market.
 - › Example of the closing 56 of the top 58 Thailand banks due to bankruptcy of the Thai currency, the baht
 - Borrowed heavily from the US which was meant to stabilise the economy - plummeted 30% - first example of what was to be the global fiscal crisis of the new era of globalisation
 - This triggered other southeast Asian markets to fall and more closely, investors started scrutinizing this economics and found people were moving their investments away to safer havens
 - Within a few months, the southeast Asian recession began to influence the commodity prices of the world as Asia had been an important engine for worldwide economic growth i.e. consuming copious amounts of raw materials and creating consumer goods and low prices.
 - When this started falling prices of raw materials and most importantly, metals and oil started to drop

- In turn, this started to fall of the Russian economy which relied heavily on revenues from crude oil to fund its operating exports budget. They had also become dependant on foreign borrowers which they now couldn't pay back. As a result, the IMF would generally bail them out, but now with the failing economies of south-east Asia, the IMF was putting support into them, and couldn't afford to support Russia any longer, unless the Russians first fulfilled their promises to reform their economic, starting with getting their biggest businesses and banks to pay tax.
- › The collapse of the Russian economy thence leads to a domino effect impacting the global system
 - Brazil raised interest rates as high as 40% and began selling assets to compensate for their losses
 - Other countries began placing all money into U.S bonds which sharply drove up the value of the US T-bonds and drove down the interest that the US government had to offer
- › Due to the magnitude of invention i.e. Steamships, telegraph, railroads, telephones and that before 1914, people could travel freely without a passport, the inklings of globalisation had begun. This was the first introduction of globalisation
- › The divided world then became one after the Cold war as it created an international system that tied the world together into a single globalised marketplace
 - Daily foreign trading in 1900 was measured in millions
 - In 1992, it was \$820B a day according to the NY Federal reserve
 - By 1998 it was up to \$1.5T a day and still rising. In the last decade alone, cross border lending by banks around the world has doubled
 - According to IMF, in 1997, private capital flows from the developed world to all emerging markets totalled @215B
- › Today's era of globalisation is built around falling telecommunications costs thanks to microchips, satellites, fibre optics and the internet, these technologies have woven the world together.
- › Technology has allowed companies to be interconnected all the time
 - people can offer service globally as a global trade
 - Reach farther, faster, cheaper and deeper
- › Some things about globalisation we have seen before, i.e. physical attributes, some are so new we don't understand them yet, which has thus shaped the world domestic politics and international relations
- › Globalisation is not the only thing shaping the world today but it is its guiding system. Through this, reveals the clash and homogenization of society, both through the triumph of liberal, free-market capitalism and the backlash against it, both the durability of nation-states and the rise of enormously powerful non-state actors.
- › Friedman starts with the Asian financial crisis as the pin of the modern globalisation - puts globalisation in a post and pre-war time
- › Given considering current events this is what we are experiencing now, it's not time in globalisation, it can't be stopped, the challenge of globalisation to find new beginnings
 - How much of a small world globalisation has created - interconnections - there are so many benefits, and a fine line between where you can cross over into dangerous territory - domino effect
- › How globalisation is ultimately a new part of a very old puzzle, the politics and interaction between clashing civilisations are old, yet its imposed on a new global

system - essentially, we are going to get increasing clashes - environmental/political - larger backlash as ever before

- › How do we get the best out of it and cushioning from the worst?
- › Comparing how the two eras of globalisation - post period is shrinking the world, emphasising a more borderless world, more deeply connected - growing economic interdependencies
- › Critical dimension; quite prophetic, appreciating how freedman how he compares the eras, striking how many similarities there are between the collapse of economy before and now
- › Not only the speed of how communications are spread, influencing individuals on a global scale
- › Critical of people who tried to put a definition on globalisation - slanders writings of individuals who try to capture globalisation in a single element. He wants to treat it as a multifaceted system. What he wants to do is give responders a better understanding and a more holistic view of globalisation - applying issues and relationships to the understanding of the system

- Steve Weber
- › There are both positive and negative aspects of globalisation
 - › After the cold war era, the national superiority of the superpowers has opened their economies to rivalling power over the world
 - › No longer does national security become an independent issue but a transnational issue as each nation relies upon other countries and the interconnectedness of their relationships between these countries to reduce conflict and create mutual, collective security.
 - › Weber exerts that globalisation today has been facilitated by a unipolar world, the dominance of the United states. This has made the world more dangerous and less orderly allowing for the spread of international terrorism and more nuclear proliferation than it did in the 1990's. Furthermore, the threats of pandemic disease and climate change are stronger; using the analogy that the world is like a 'petri dish' breeding new bacteria and infections that the worlds security cannot keep up with.
 - › He believes that the result of the Cold was meant to make the world stronger, but in fact it only made it more unstable, revealing a dark, dangerous side to globalisation
 - Internet - spread of extremist ideology
 - Global fiscal crisis
 - Disease
 - Exploiting openness, mobility and freedom
 - › The US's strategy is thus to push for more trade, connectivity, markets and openness, and merely attributes the dark side of globalisation to exploitive behaviour by criminals, religious extremists and other anachronistic elements which can be eliminated; a naive point of view, as the US believe they can do this as the single superpower
 - › The mobility of innovative ideas, people, capital and technology is not a new concept, but the rapid advance of it's dark side is. What changed profoundly since the 1990's is the polarity of the international system, superimposed into a world with a single superpower, thus the dark effects emerging out of the post-cold war era is not due to globalisation but America's predominance
 - › Unipolarity and globalisation don't mix
 - Enhances the capability other state to do things, and to worry about

- a. Large spheres of influence and their security that touch every corner of the world cannot be protected by one dominating power
 - b. This idea has already been seen in history I.e. roman and Byzantium empires which eventually reached a point of unsustainability\
 - c. If there were many superpowers in the world, this would almost certainly fix the problem as one of them would be able to exercise some control over a given combination of space and fix the problems prevalent
- Creation of more ungoverned zones, acknowledging that highly connected networks can be efficient, robust and resilient to shock but it can also breed resilience in the cover of unprotected zones.
 - a. i.e. Al Quada
 - i. A multipolar world would confuse this clear framing of the 'west' and US dominance that pits Islamic extremism against the US
 - b. In a world of multi-superpowers, the environment is more interest rich and makes it harder for trouble to arise as globalisation is held together by stronger ties
- No one wants to be told what to do by one over imposing force across the world. Therefore, nations may go underground and use nuclear power, counterfeiting or raising uncertainty of natural resources such as oil to impose a threat of the hierarchical force.
 - a. In a multipolar world, relatively weaker states would have choice of allies and have choice, creating stronger ties and a stronger world.
- The United States is bearing most of the burden of globalisation, the overlap of unipolarity is detrimental to the US security
- If there were rival superpowers, with diverse cultural and ideological leanings, globalisation's darkest problems would look quite different as there may be a unique way of dealing with the issues
- There is a growing anti-globalisation sentiment, often which is blamed on the US's foreign policy community, a shift in the unipolarity balance would shift some of the burden over.
- Globalisation is bad because it is only dominated by the US (unipolarity) and that is bad because it alienates those who don't identify with that culture and narrative i.e. Islam, disillusioned by the west, there is no alternate power to represent their view
- Central argument; in contemporary political discussion, there has been backlash against unipolarity, US has begun to move away from their vast international power than coming back into their own national security
- Globalisation is a burden, that tilts towards a small portion of countries that monopolies that power
- Highlights the critical issues that US as a hegemony presents, not critical of the US but rather concerned how that one country alone is able to deal with the power/burden - wants diversification
- Reminiscent of what Friedman was saying, globalisation produces vulnerability, when one country is at the top, when they fail there may be chaos
- Problems created by the unipolar power have exceeded the ability to fix them
- Paradoxically, this system may encourage organised crime
- In the cold war period, Korea was protected under the soviet umbrella, but now trying to be strong without this protection they have felt they need nuclear weaponry to be safe

- › There is no alternative for states that want to retain their autonomy besides terrorism, no appeal to alternative sources of geopolitics, sociological argument, attempt to govern the world with one power creates disillusionment and chaos
- › The action of what is happening globally now is largely due to America being an overarching power and other nations really can't do much due to the cold war politics i.e. Brinkmanship
- › Now, Obama was succeeded power to a multipolar world, i.e. Russia has power in Lebanon
- › The importance of deterrents for smaller nations, but they can make it painful enough that the cost is too high for the US to retaliate
- › Article is framed that the growing incentive for the growing of weaponry for smaller powers, ignoring foreign serenity, the procession is weaponry is acceptable for the us but not for other nations, - US's burden,

Susan
Heald

- › Heald's report critiques the way globalisation has spread throughout the world, both positively and negatively from a feminist perspective, drawing on examples of females who have had opportunities given to them in suppressing the patriarchal beliefs of their societies and in turn getting a better life
- › Feminist analysis shows that we as responders need to understand the ways in which globalisation not only oppresses women but opens new avenues and spaces of possibility, including the possibility of escaping patriarchal, recast and classist structures.
- › Globalises is something more than the spread of capitalism and commercialised culture but as a complex web of social relationships and movements
- › Through movements of resistance, power and change, attracted to globalisation has taught responders of how to be critical of typical theories of power
- › In terms of the feminist label that gets put on it, interesting because she often disaggregates both sides of the argument, one point she talks about the positives and negatives of globalisation for women, labels- third world romanticised, what she thinks is about globalisation is hard to rule out as she focuses on multiple views and labels
- › She agrees that globalisation can oppress various minorities, however we can just view it from a western perspective, the people in these countries are also using globalisation from their advantages to find positive avenues i.e. Corporate businesses giving women social mobility
- › Hybridisation
- › Women can create a sense of autonomy from globalisation i.e. sex industry in Thailand
- › Argues that sex workers as it gives them agency however this is a veil to cover the injustices of sex working, sugar-coating the injustices
- › She aggregates and disaggregates, it's hard to figure out what she means, it makes sense when you use the labels in the right context
- › The theory of globalisation is a masculinist form of theory
 - Arguing against masculinist theories
 - Arguing against the romanticised view of globalisation and how the west is the best, east being a passive agent in world agent
 - Women are carving out agency in other areas of the world, looking deeper

