Geneva 2.0 carpenter: discusses how two sides to opinions on bush when comes to POW status. Its between us govt and human rights policy is normally a compromise. Carpenter wants a compromise. Therefore both sides should seek to update the laws in 2.0. Hope is to make both sides on same side instead of adversaries.

Old laws are outdated and they need a new conference. The old laws don’t really fit. When these laws were agreed were no terrorists like al-Qaida. Human rights organizations over simplifiy matter of war says carpenter. Says they neede to get outta midlle ages. Cant pretend the world hasn’t changed.

She isn’t sideing with bush admin. Whose is old geneva laws don’t work any more so, throw the baby out with the bath water.

UN Stedman: talks about kofi anon did. Most ambitious. Who major reasons was that he was worried that the us would walk away from un after it said no Iraq. And that the un’s ideas on terrorism were on correct. Kofi did a lot. He legalized humanitarian intervention. He wanted to do more, but us’s Bolton couldn’t work cus of Bolton the us’s appoitee to the un. He messed allot a shit up. He says that Bolton was rouge. Stedman says us didn’t wanna change and that their views would become irrelevant

Now actual presentation on 2/24. On comerical liberalism

Milon and rose friedman. Free to choose. Tariffs bad, cuz messes up world trade. This protectionism makes trade not interdependent and this causes conflict. Look at pp by posner.

Neoliberals fous on interdependence institutions ngo’s while comm.. liberals look at economy and trade.

Notes on 3/3/09

In the news, the EU is kind of falling apart because of financial problem because they are increasing government spending and EU is hesitant. They denied loan to Eastern Europe. Hungry is doing particularly badly, thy proposed that there is a universal bailout paid by rich countries, Germany completely rejected, because they would have to pay for it. Posner thinks that the EU won’t break up.

Real stuff:

DP approach Russet’s main argument, democracy doesn’t fight each other. And if you have a bunch of democracies, they work together interdependence makes cost of war go up, merge with commercial liberalism. Kant is like democratic peace approach, Hobbes is realist, and Locke is neoliberal. Democracies don’t fight democracies but they still may go to war with other non democratic countries. Critiques: domestic institutions have more of critique than norms and cultures. Russet about democracies know that non’s don’t have same restraints. It doesn’t make semce that democratic take a long time to go to war with other democracies. But shouldn’t that be the same with non democracies?

Zakaria: DP democ is not only thing that makes a country sussessful, they need a constitution, democ doesn’t guarantee not go to war. IE Iran, they hostil and other stuff. Constitutional liberalism matters more, which is protecting individuals autonomy in the state, according to zararia. EX: freedom of speech, rule of law, religion, that’s self autonomy. Anyody can have an election, but constitutipon is not respected. Whats important is deeper notion of whats happenind in the west. Jordan is example, has constitution, but no elections. Hong Kong under british rule. Good autonomy but no elections under britis rule.

Realists… disagree because of you only care about yourself.

Is it true that democracies don’t fight each other? Are stats wrong? Flawed logic? Confounding variables? Conceptual confusion? Narrow, besides the point and dangerous? MOST IMPORTANT, states that go to war when they are transferring to democracy.

Mansfield thinks that the reason is because leaders use nationalism to gain support. Pakistan and india. Posner is skeptical overall.

Other guy:

World is devided into two groups democ and dictatorship. Time for us to stop thinking that there will be global conversion and that they need to make themselves stronger.

China will eventually be like us, because of the helpfulness of us to them.

Constructivist approach to world politics:

Check out lecture slides. Given US unipolarity, why didn’t other states for together in order to counter US power. Better question, why did they pose this question. Realists Hobbes. Anarchy, realitive power, us pulled ahead by long shot. Security main rival, ussr, imploded, capitalism won against communism. Japan, econ rival was stagnat. Realists thought that another check of power would happen, USSR, Europe, China work together to check US’s power.

Why didn’t it happen? Constructivist saw no puzzle. If w want to understand behavior of states we need to not look at power distribution, we should be looking at set of shared ideas norms beliefs, world political culture. That is constructivists starting point. They see that most normal states belong to liberal security community. Practically everyone a member, and states socialized and identify themselves together, so they don’t need to for a security. France and UK had nukes whole time, but we didn’t find them threatening, so we didn’t point our nukes at them, because we are part of their world culture. Fact that states didn’t bind together is not weird. States from same community all think the same way. Closer look,

Constructivism: Many possible world political cultures they take third view of world anarcy, con.say that anarchy doesn’t tell you how states will behave. The more important thing to look at it world political culture. At times states will behave just as realists think they will. Culture goes crazy because culture tells leaders to be fearful. In 90’s not hobbes but, working together good.

What constructivists complain about:

1. realists look at wrong phenomena, complaint about empirical. They think theyre looking at wrong thing. Theoryies searchlight. Con. Think realists search light looking at wrong thing.
2. World politics is not always the same @ every moment. One person’s puzzle is confusing because of where they are coming from. This is easy to see with realism. Over time intl polit pretty much the same.
3. Ignoring questions and actors. Not asking the most pressing ?’s and not paying attention to most important actors.
4. Questions
5. What are origins of world political nvm. ttyl

3’5’09

Intl notes on consructivist approach world political culture can change over time. Thomas risig

4 parts security comm. 3 parts transnational intl structure govts social sturcue. I cant understand her, ill read it my self

No price, landmines guy

Constructivist answers state to state interactions create new norms, the more you intercat and stuff new norms develop

Global civil society- ngo’s changed the ways aregentina and mexico treated its citizens. They made ideas that made leaders in arg and mex to change ideas on human rights

Elemts of constructivist approach:

Social structure not power structure, they are third level idea people/ countries

Scoail structure takes us back to anarcy: don’t adont hobbes or lock. They look at anarcy in different ways depending on culture.

. Cultues change over time gives rise to new questions: Whos responsible for cultural chanfe and spreading – a global civil society.

Investigating state interests. People think that there is only enemies and friends. But you need to investigate time and goval views to see if they are actually friend or foe.

One more approach.

Radical approach to world politics. .Major themes. .elements of the approach. .origins in WWI.

Pretty much Marxism.

Major themes

Deep concern with weak concern underdog, moral. Realists don’t care, they only care about look.

A focus on intl system as a whole, not like DP’s. Economy favors rich and power full and injures weak.

Markets, like comm.. liberals, and to some extent neolibs. Interdependence across boarders. Marxist, are pesimistics. Markets across boarders aren’t neutral. Unstable. Marxists are disequlibruim. Econ teacher’s ideas com from adam smith, who is equibrium. Supply balances with demand. Marxist don’t believe this. Markets can spin outta control, pessimistic.

Elements:

1 actors- come in clashing. Classes workers, rich, oppressed. Always powerful and weak. Big guy vs little guy. Always rpresent big guy

States represent dominant econ classes “

Goals- are econ. Want stuff. Relative gains over abloute gains. Yes im getting rich every year, but I need to be getting richer than you.

Markets- drive internation politics. In 2x2 marxists driving force is economics. Think global capitisist. One groupkicks the shit outta others.

Interpednedence- Marxist interdependence is asymmetrical. When two countries work to gether, one countrie is more dependent than other. Parents with money. Im more dependent on them then vice versa. Same with countries. Hitler made countries reliant on him, then made those countries help his cause. Therefore a souce of conflict. Kinda similar to realist, Posner thinks a lot. Realists just foucs on big countries

Intl institutions- rules of game for governing econ activicty, and a bunch of other stuff. Clear that Marxists think that these are rigged, because it helps Leftover Crack basically, WTO and IMF suck massive balls because they totally make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Wade, radical, also gunder frank.

Ponser thinks Marxist are synical. Thinks university is crzy because the econ teachers.

Econ teachers that were Marxists got pused out, but coming back in.

Origins of WWI, Multipolarity, uncertainty and the cult of the offensive vs. finance capitalism and imperialism.

Multi (realists)- five great powers uk germany humgry blah blah blah. Realists think that mulit polar in anarchy is unstable. Should scare you. Are friends gonna have your back, uncertainty. Cult- since we live in multi polar, and the military stuff favors offensive. Therefore, your super scared so you think their gonna hurt you with their super offensive weapons so you hit first.

Lenin’s argument was super different. Captitalism inside countries is really explotitive, then over time you get monopolies. The bankers end up with all the money. In country with abundance of capital, your country doesn’t need no more money. But if you own the capital all the money. Its saturated at home, so you look abroad. Finacners looked arounf to see where they could make money abroad because there is no where in your country to do it. Interests become in favor of the capitialists. All the investiments. Came with high risk but also high return. Britian money going all over the world. But, the world is territoaril. The need is for the govts to control terityories for their people to get rich because they have the colonies. Inperialsim led to conflict. Would have huge giant war. Super Marxist, explotation, econ.

Notes st patty’s day.

Job to answer ? in form of an argument.Argument is your point. Claim and warrant. Impact. Rebuttals against those that oppose you. Adopt approach, DP, realism, constructivist. Or combos.

1st or 2nd para. Question how I interpret. And what answwr is to ?. and mention that there are those that believe im wrong, and im right.

Spend rest of essay explaining why you are right. Don’t create a straw man argument, or false argument. Easy to shoot down that is . say stupid, recgnise that writer accepts an opposing point of view. You have to be consistant, and use all tools all first 2nd power econ

Main point is this for com. Liberal say it is on econ don’t really mention the other power idas etc. can say I, but don’t say I think. Say this is this because this. Not I think this because this happened. Reaistl neoliberal commercial liberal DP constructivism and radical

Readings constructivist on landmines. Language is weird. Price.

Normsand intl poly. Apartied supported that was norm that peeps don’t question. Can figure our which matter by looking at intl scheme. He wants ban on landmine, brings up intal. Human rights only in big important countries. Democ. Means civil society and civil society means thy can ban land mine. Technology. Hypermedia makes it difficult for govt to monopolize info. They can see bomb effects. High intense to low intense conflict, guerrilla warfare. Advance states ay low ones are illigetamite. Concordance. More peeps that support means more likely top ban most effective to ban 100% because absoulote, than twisting word. Longevity is indeterminate. Poison gas, bad. Opion jusit, demonstarion. Violation nation isindicative of its weakness. Murder by self defence. Iraqi vs german use, german said its noble. But Iraqi hid it. End enforcement of land mine ban if peeps have material and they are right there its more likely. Intel vigalece and tachics in philipines because they bande. Laws don’t prevent murder, no one says get rid of laws.

Why is this constructivist? Posner asks. Realists say. Whats mst effective, to meet security changlange. DP’s look at empirical finding look at democracy or domestic norms.

But price and constructivist looks at international norms and worls poly culture. Adjitating activists cause this.

Radical, WADE!!!!.

Focus on world bank on stiglis who offered different view. US would control WTO and IMF. IMF makes it work for them, but not anyone else. Worl develop revie on poverity, opp empow and security. Instead of debating to see which is right, put aside differences.

Posner? Why radical. Wade asks weather US looking out for itself or everywhere. Fuck US. Weak getting stomped on by big powerful. Fuck America. Us only cares about money. US position is Wall sTreets position. Marxists think as a whole economics.

Notes on foreign policy notes not on test.

Foregn policy approaches

Foregn poly vs international structure.

Explaining non rational behavior

Aluminum tubes and he second Iraq war

Elements of foregn politcy approach.

Must first understand before wars and cooperate or anything else. Have to understand how individual foren policy gets made.

Best explain development by studying individual 2nd level. Slide important. Theory tell what you need to look at. Why do sates not act rationally. Four answers from foreign policy approach

Decision making, groupthink, dysfunctional dome. Organizations, bureaucratic politics.

Rationality get most by doing least.

Decision making approach- 2 conomin traversisiky. People don’t make decisions not for calculated decisions but for other reaons. Ie no info. People take mental shortcuts. Leaders copy what other leaders did in the past, or what former pres did even though stuff is different. Vietman fighting korea (US). States overestimate chances of winning a war. WWI cult of the offensive. Multi polar. Misperception.

Groupthink. Janis. What happens in groups. Stop being rational. Instead they don’t want to offend others in the group. Care more along with going with the group than. Bay of Pigs. Forenpoly FAILURE!. CIA backed 130 anti castro exiles to get rid of carstro. Adli stevensons, kept in dark, who is UN guy. And told the world that the usdidnt do it. Embarasment. Not just because lie but because Castro defended it with just his troops. Kennedy put in a brain trust and were afraid to challenge stuff because their ideas were good. Memebers afraid to speak minds, assuming everyone else is on board except themselves.

3/19/09

You look at other countries involved domestic policies. He’s talking about bureaucrats, bad connotation in America.

Cuban missile crisis of 62 is an example. Why did the soviets not protect missiles from detection? Answer: organizations in charge if constructing the missiles sites in Cuba followed standard operating procedure.. why not kill planes, why no camouflage? Missile sites set up identical to the way they are in USSR. Did good job shiThey pping. When in cuba tho another organization took over, and they only knew how to do one thing. And did it how they did in Russia and they fucked up royally.

Another…

Bureaucratsic politics. Rivalries between different departments. Ehy states not act rationally. CIA and dept of energy. Aluminum tubes that saddam was trying to buy. We learned a lot about tubes. Invasion necessary. senators on both sides said that they wanted to give bush II atourithy.

Groupthink among in intel. Community. Go back to before 9/11. Us intel conculedes that Iraq got rid of nucke program. Early in 01. Discovery that Iraq looking for aluminum tubes, hich is illegal. Tubes can be helpful in enriched uranium. In 01 junior anylis at CIA says tubes are for nukes. In june 01, us gets hands on one of the tubes. In comes energy dept. experts, who are mest smartest nuke guys in this country say that this cia anysis is wrong, they are for small artillery rockets, wrong size too long too heavy they say. And no other evidence. Internation atomic agency also agrees with edpt of E and say CIA is wrong. 9/11 happens. CIA didn’t let go of hypothesis. Didn’t let it go. They ignored stuff. And dept of E further develops conterarument w/ help from state dept. and others to support their theory.

CIA was responsible for material sent to senate. CIa is filter between what people think and what the white house hears. CIA could say that they can stop dept. from making shit public. Dept. E couldn’t get argument out. Senators could get to hear what they had to say, Dept. of E that is. A remaining ? is extent to which administration was involded in vcoiver up.

Forign policy approach, you need to look at inside of the shit in there. Not international. States don’t always act rationally. What is getting in the way?

Wanna see something funny?

So I was bored and on yahoo answers and was answering questions and I got an email from them lol

Notes 3’24

Looking at bush foreign policy. Neoconservative ideas means that they take the aggressive stance on international. Post WWII foreign policy: nuclear deterrence (MAD), containment of USSR and alliances. Tensions in US foreign policy.

Liberal internationalist, theoretical basis:

DP, commercial liberalism, neoliberalism

REALPOLITIK their basis, realism.

REALPOLITIK:

threats to US security: hobbesian but realistic.

Power: military counts most, conscious of limits to us power.

Force: use only to pursue narrow national interests/ use caution

Promote us values: no

Multilateral institutions: when usefull.

Don’t think its that easy to hreaten the US. Military power trumps other power. Alliances useful if us wants to get what it wants.

Thought Vietnam and Iraq was a bad idea, because they weren’t really threats.

Other guys, liberal internationalist

Neoconservative turn. Theoretical basis: DP is right, so is commercial liberal. Power, if available can be successfully used to spread to other contries. Use military to spread the word, aka the bird, bird bird bird bird is the word.

Neocons: threats to us ar much greater than others think. Say people underestimate the threats of Iraq. During cold war thought USSR was more threatening than others thought. Power, military counts most. US ha unprecedented amts of power. Us has all this power and no one to check its power thought they should promote us values. USSR. Look at the slides online

Notes 3’26’09

Bush doctorine. Congress says admin. Must make a document like this every 2 years. But this one is super important.

Neoconservaties say they are in intl natonal intrest in long term. Debate in rep. party. Some on far left in favor of iraq, they represented. Humanitarians, citizens of the world have oblogation to people of the world.

NSS national security strategy. Create counterbalance. USSR and US came together to fight hitler. They use balance of power as w/ us or against us. France and germany against it an normally with us. Spain, supported then change of party and they took out troops. Canada was pussy too.

Preemption. Most significant. Take us out b4 they take us out. We start violence and we prevent them from attacking. Preemption legal under intl legal law. But prevention doesent. Us goals and those of other states dead. Bush doc. Says goals are universal. Every state wants same thing. Hegemons think everyone sharessame values. Demo. And capitalism are the real ideals.

Fukayama piece neo con moment. The end of history. Idea arrgument battle over ideas commies vs capilatists is over so now one one idea left so only ? of time til everyone adpots it. He attacks one guy, charles cratamner, a friend of fukayama. Posner says its important

Actual paper, both are neocons. He spells out out neo cn ideals are. Something really wrong. Because he is writing when everyone else says that iraq is in the shitter, and everyone still tourings saying iraq is good. He says those guys are locos. His number 1 objection to the neo con agenda is exisential threat is defined too broadly. If a nation pases threat to our allies then why don’t we pay attention to those guys instead of just our allies, aka iran. He says iraq was threatinging to some other countries but not too the US. Iraq was a beginning point not an endpoint. Us has a bad record of are terrible at picking up countries and helping them reconstruct.

Neo con policy so succesful. Read ur self posner says. Walt the realist, temaed up with merchimer and they published b4 thewar a good realist areument against war in iraq, saying that …

Realists are causcious to us power. Realists afriad of using force in aggressive way and its implications. Saddam, was suni and iran was shiite w. tensions was a stabilizing force in region. Iran and iraq bloody war in 80’s arch enemys millions died. So… ralists think what we really care about is balance of power, best you can do to intl politics is keep the lid on. What happens if we take out iraq, lots of peeps thought it woldnt stay. Ethinic groups fall of. Recent victor is iran because we made the chanlengeing power to ourselves. Saddam not gret for his people, but he was containd so keeping the peace.

Terrorisms. Ridel and muller. They oppose.

Me too that sucks for you tho

Notes 4’2’09

Us foreign policy after 9/11

Preemption aka prevention… force to promote democracy…unilaterlsim not multilateralism…avoid intl institutions…expansion of military presence abroad.

How did we get this shift? Leading argument

Multipolarity. Bids for hgemony checked by others…intlproblems need a coalition

Bipolar…neither superpower has a lot of incentive to become to powerful competition short of major war

Unipolarity… hegemon not constrained by other states …can solve intl problems alone.

Jervis is realist with why we got US is unchecked power so it keeps expanding bipolar to uni gets rid of check of power. US is stupid giant. Wasn’t bush admin that was the shift to more aggressive.

What would we see is jervis was correct (irl)?

Us getting its way…symptoms of overreach… rising hegemons from free riding

When you become so powerful you realize that econ needs to be spread all over the world and now you need to defend them. Thereofre other countries can free ride let hegemon stend all their money and the freeriders use their power to invest and become a contender for power.

In first gulf war was really narrow.

Alternative arguments:

Forign policy approach…. Misperceptions about dist of power… not unipolarity but uni-multi polarity…Us adopted policies US locked in ideology since reagan big govt bad and low taxes solve problems. If not gonna tax. Only great big powers can think like that.

Are other countries free riding on US? Europeans hardly pay for military. Japan actually pulls its weight military.

Huntington: global poly is for struggle of power uni bi and multi have intrest in maintaing we are in uni multipolar and we are uni and there are others regional powers china and india then there are secondary higher but not as big as uni japan to china. Want to change to multipolar. Econ sanctions don’t always work because if its only UIS doing it it hurts us more than helps them. US claims to be a beign hegemon to everyone else is big giant. Americans think they need to police world. Some peple may form stuff for kicking americas ass. America is selfish. World doesn’t want US to watch over them so they have become alone. Sherif postion will disapera and will make community protecter. He is realist . he is doing what realist do. AMERICA sucks because we don’t see it. Forgn plicy officals don’t see the world that they live in. they don’t realize that they are in a mulit polar world we suck misconseptions on dist of power.

Different expectations:

Realist: US gets its way.

/\/\/\/\/\/China and the US (this is non weber, aka ikenberr) china will make us not unipolar and this doesn’t mean there will be a war. China is on rise military and econ this is a challenge to US. Doesn’t need to be violent. UK used to be in power and Germany challenged and it was violent bt that doesn’t always happen. To porevent this war Us can intergrate china into them by stengthing the rules of the intl system. China is rising. If you look at history this can often lear to war because rising powers are unsatified with rules of the game. We should creat strong incentives for china to come into institutions: WTO that means we now have to treat china well like ourother trading powers. Ikenberry also suggests. Us made a buch of rules, and china is fed up. China wants a new currency intl other than us dollar.

Weber: china inda and russia are rising superpowers they can directly challenge US of assimilate. So. Now non are doing either. Now it’s a world w/o the west. The three are starting their own poly structure, webber says Us needs to change view on the world. China is fostering a new world order that sub saharan afraica likes a lot. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . if you want stuff from places like IMF and world bank you have to do certain shit.

Notes 4’7’09

Gat readingL

2 issues face global democratic islam: China and russia and islamic terrorism. Liberal demo. Reasons not always clear. Us is most important hope for.

Fin.

Politics of Africa. Intl politics in one part of world will be hobbesain. And it can look different in other places. He’s comparing Africa with EU.

Lot of coops in africa. But Posner says they don’t do much. Independent africa became in 1958. Were weak states. Leaders cared about soverntiy. And wanted to consulidate power. This is very difficult. Coop is really had in africa, while in europe it is a picnic. Single financial market. Africa is a hobbesan nightmare says Posner. weak states under anarchy.

Why post independence why did pboarders remain same. Posner says that is an awesome question. Original boarders not identified ethographically. 1870 colonial powers imposed the boarders. There is no logic on design of african sates. You would think that after the colonial powers have been fought, that the boarders would be weird. Mali, kinda sucks economically. New leaders none of them wanted to redraw. They were like shit, now im in power, I wanna keep this. Fuck you guys, im not talking about changing boarders. Precursor to AU was founded so that leaders DIDN’T change boarders. Realists say if you live in anarcy you gotta take care of yourself. This is opposite of Africa.

Weak states under anarcy:

Consolidating Domestic Authority.

Don’t fight your neighbors…developa a strong norm against invasions…OAU Charter. Weak states work together Organization of African Unity. Im tiny and vulnerable and you are tiny and vulnerably: UNITY!!!

Realism and Bipolarity:

Cold war rivalry in africa… security umbrella in europe. None in africa. Superpower cometition. Rivalry not the security africa. These leaders proped up by rivalry between superpowers. Aka mingistu. Brutal dictator. USSR backed mingistu. Then in somalia, bare is the guy in change and a soviet allie. There is then a dispute. Somilia claimed part of ethipia. Us then started to support somilia. And we gave up with ethiopia. If you get one superpower invovled. The other does too, therefore no one changes.

Invasions werent worth it…

International norms:

Constructivism… WWI after, norms said self determination to see if they were a country. But then norms change. As long as not colonial people but locals running show.therefore we don’t care and don’t get invovled. This meant these leaders got seats at UN and aid and GNO assistance.

DRC: foregin troops left, kina, and its still very violent. Despite 10 or 11 countries with soldiers in last 10 years and no one talkes about changing boarders. Ziaere. Mubuto is a crazy leader who was a tirant and thief of reciusces and sent the money to swiss banks. Started from rewanda. Perpetrators fled .

Shifting world norms about statehood.

Notes 4’14’09

States and world economy.

What is the global economy. Integrating national economies..effects and prescriptions…contemerary debates. Relationship between state system and economy. States care about security, but thet also care about wealth. To have a global econ. States need to coopoerate, whcihc can be difficult.

What is a global economy?

Global economy rests on political foundation

Economic transactions depent on foindations. American see getting govt outta buisness is good. In reality, econ activity doesn’t take place in weak govts.

Econ exchange doesn’t happen in a void. Exchange of goods require rules of the game. Cant sell stuff in rusiisa unless russia lets you. There are rules. Where do they come from?

National firms…

Possilbe ways to link together national econs:

1.trade in the broadest scense.

foreign diret invewstmnet

mutual recognition… way that countries link their economies together. Requires alotta trust. This is hard

regulatory harmonization. this is harder. Canada and us try to harmonize their regulaions so they are practically the same, never get completely the same unless they adopt another countries

whatvare effects of integrating econs and what shoul govt do?

There are econ ecffects and soveernity effects

3 main views part of old traditions

Commercial liberalism interdependence

David ricardo 1700’s late. Ricardo is classical liberal, like adam smith. More efficient use of scarse resourses.

Hamilton doesn’t justn care about econ, he was concerned abour sovernity realists intl state system.

3 points intl competitive industries benefit from integration if however you are a developing county and you don’t have the technology than don’t open up right away. Don’t promote free trade. Protect young indistries until they become competitive.

2nd specialization is dangerous. If you put all your eggs in one basket when someone gets it . self depencdence is good. If us goes to war, and we get amunition from hungry and we go to war with them, we are fucked.

3rd. some industries are better than others. Benefits to making sure you have a industrial thing.

Marx/ Lenin: integration is spreading of capitalism, one county wins at expence of others, their afvice is similar to hamiltons but more extreme. Advice with other developing countries, not the rich countries or stay away til you are ready.

We missed readings

Washington consenses. Set of ideas on what countries should do. View of wealthy countries extreme version of ricardo approach. Got loged with WTO and IMF. Problem with developing countries is they got politics in the way. They say shrink govt and open free trade and market forces will fix and make you rich. Utter disaster. Hamiltonian approach did better.

Notes 4’16’09

Ricardo commerical liberalism. Hamilton syas be caustous about opening up. Don’t be stupid so that you are completely reliant about intl system. He’s a bid realist.

Washingotn consensus, wealthy countries used as giudelines for their aide and advice from ’80 to ’97 it was the spence report. IMF and world bank shove this down your throat developing countries hate it. American hypocratic because we say open borders complety but we don’t.

Advice was cut down on govt spending. Great suffering Posner IMF sucks. Michael spence was chariman that wrote the report. Roderick is critic of washington consensus. Roderick trading in illusions. If ur counrty in africa how should we think about your relationship to world econ. He says don’t automatically open up. Strong relationship between opening up and getting rich. Correlation vs causation. He says world bank is wrong because using bet ter stats, he says sequence is better. Sucessful countires get rich first then they open up. When a poor country oen up boarders between really rich winners and really poor losers.

Offshoring, offshoring in idustrial revolutions… out tech is improving which increases offshoring, alots view it as bad thing, but its not if US repsondes appropriatley. Textile industry went from UK to US to china. Not agriculture disapeared, just became more about industry. In our case its not a difference between skilled and skilled now it is personal and oppisite, deviding up wether it is personal or impersonal. But thanks to tech. dotors are really personal but robots can do surgey. W shouldn’t worry bout china but india. As long as skilled youll be fine w/ offshoring. Because its unkilled peoples jobs who are losing jobs. This guy says this is not the case. So cops janitors are safe. These are rally well organized politically. Salaries so high for doctors because ama only lets a certain amout a doctors let in.

Fergeson: during 1870 huge globalization and WWI brought it down. Free trade blah blah few regualtions. Empires overstreched. Rouge recimes sponsoring power and rise of revolutionary. Unstable alliance system. Parallel to US . Us is overstreched. US and china unstalbe alliance system. Doomsday senario is plausiable.

Empires overstrech

Great power rivalry

Unstable alliances

Rouge regimes

Rise of revolutionary terrorists

Why globalization come to an end. And why WWI? Those up top.

Wonders if globalization 2 is likely to fail. Are those causes present today. He says yeah its arguable is great power rivalry.

The financial crisis: connected american homebuying patterns to the rest of the world. Investors grouped together morgages and then sell them off globally. So a town in germany that was looking to buy assets bought these. What happednwas it was risky to everytime there is a downturn. They sold mogages packages to investment banks. Securities less risky. Then these sold to little towns in Norway. They don’t know what to do. They want to buy safe bonds they want CDO’s if no one wants to buy a risky product, pool all the risky little parts into a big sum of risky. Banks love gicvin out morgages. Because they don’t need to worry about that anymore. So, they don’t care because its not their problem.