

Argument against globalization assignment

Sociology



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Globalization is the name for the process of increasing the connectivity and interdependence of the world's markets and businesses. (www. dictionary. com) Over the last 2 decades, the globalization process has been accelerated by rapid advances in technology such as the rise of the internet and advanced telecommunications. (www. investorwords. com) This paper will argue why globalization is not the best course of action in the long run because it can not be done fairly and the long term trade offs are far to detrimental. Experts do agree that continued growth via globalization does cause some aspects of the environment to decline. Pugel, 2003) This is a direct result of more people using more goods and services, which causes more waste. The question is how long can a pattern of degrading the environment continue before the environment becomes unlivable?

Additionally, if multiple countries that trade with each other all have different rules and regulations, how can global trade ever be fair? For example, a US company might open a factory in China because the Yuan is valued much lower than the dollar, therefore, they have a financial incentive to produce as much as possible out of China.

This action certainly benefits the US company making the foreign investment, and it even benefits the Chinese workers, although this might not seem to be the case from other US workers, as the wages would seem menial. However, what happens to the US worker whose job was just given to a Chinese worker for half the price? If China is a growing country, they do not have the ability to reciprocate. Imagine this process repeated 1 million times over and the end result would be some very happy Chinese workers, unemployed US workers, and a much richer corporation.

The overall quality of life has not increased, but degraded and higher paid US workers are unemployed, the Chinese workers, while making more than before, still are no where near the lifestyle the US workers were living doing the same job. This is simply one example of how globalization does not work. Countries routinely do not adhere to international trade laws or impose tariffs and other trade barriers in order to accomplish their goals. What one country thinks or can justify could be detrimental and illegal in another.

With some many countries going through such a variety of stages of development, it is impossible to level the playing field. (Ponniah, 2003) In 2001 the United States imposed tariffs on all imported steel. This was a move that was politically motivated in order to get more votes for a mid-year election. After 20 months and intense pressure, Bush faced the specter of \$2. 2 billion in retaliatory tariffs from the European Union on popular U. S. exports ranging from Florida oranges to Wisconsin-built Harley-Davidson motorcycles. " (Vaughan, 2003) It was because of this potential retaliatory action, the tariffs had to be dropped.

This is another example of one country making a decision to deny free trade and the result was anger and retaliation. In conclusion, globalization benefits the few, alienates the masses, and causes irreparable damage to the environment by using more and more resources that cannot be replaced quickly or replaced at all. Over time, this will degrade the eco system to a point where all lifestyles of lowered. This writer is not suggesting that growth is bad and increasing the lifestyles of some is a negative step. However, globalization displaces the masses to benefit the few.

Unless each country can engage in global trade in a fair manner by adhering to international trade laws that respect the environment and the human rights all of people, globalization will continue to displace workers, degrade the environment and enrich the already wealthy. References Ponniah, T. (2003) Democracy vs. Empire: Alternatives to Globalization. Presented at the World Social Forum Pugel. (2003). Trade and the Environment. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies. Vaughan, M. (2003) As steel consumers applaud, critics response muted. National Journals CongressDaily. www.investorwords.com www.dictionary.com