History of Globalization – Two Flavors

*Imagine going to an ice-cream store and them having only two flavors. It would certainly be sad wouldn’t it. Well, it’s even sadder that the two perceptions of globalization are either its evil or its amazing. This isn’t a factual statement of course but I think you can agree that if you ask someone out in the world about what they think about countries, people, and civilizations all talking, communicating and trading they will have only one or the other.*

*In Jan Aart Scholte’s text there is a far better description of globalization then most. It does entail the ups and downs of what has happened and why, but I find it very clear that the pros of globalization are being focused on more than the negatives. The central idea of the text being that the connections that have been made between civilizations have enabled the trade of all types of products including technology, religion, culture, foods, etc.*

*However, in Philippe Diaz’s documentary these positive points are just entirely left out. Being replaced by the central argument that globalization has caused some of the most impoverish countries in the world and has failed to address the problem.*

*Both of the statements above being true; it is extremely easy to get sucked into the idea that one is more relevant than the other and it is certainly suggested that way in both of the authors works.*

*Mr. Diaz’s documentary details the many break downs that have happened because of the globalization. Most notably the supply chain that has been constructed by the colonization of underdeveloped countries by developed countries in the late 1400’s. Which is when Diaz claims globalization started its influence on the world.*

*Some examples of this supply chain included the supply of raw materials to developed countries, which is claimed to be solely responsible for the plight of nom-developed countries. Saying that “the industries of the developed world import raw materials from the developing countries at a very low cost and use the raw materials to convert their own countries into export economies for finished products.” Also detailing how the impoverished countries pay huge amounts of money to their former colonizers to repay debts that were built up. As these countries repay, their citizens continue to suffer under the obligation of globalist inefficiencies.*

*In the text however the first large claim that is made in comparison to the documentary is that there is no historical origin of when globalization started. Saying that “any attempt to identify the first global act would be arbitrary.” Rather than saying one point was when globalization started it is suggested that it was more of a build up over time of small transitional acts. It is even suggested that these small acts weren’t even events, but rather just the notion that someone could conceive globalist acts.*

*Moreover, the events of globalization told through Jan Aart Scholte’s eyes detailed the many positives in which culture and technologies were traded and transferred back and for from different civilizations. Communications networks were able to grow and increase the acts of globalization. Markets for trade between countries were constructed and built for the sole purpose of obtaining materials from other lands. All points are very one sided and temporary in a way that they are brought up and then never discussed in how they have continued to affect the world in history.*

*It is very clear that Jan Aart Scholte’s perspective on globalization is one of a higher privileged view. Throughout the text there is only mention of connectivity between countries, cultures, and civilizations. There is little mention of the negatives that have resulted from globalization. Now is this wrong? No of course not. Failing to mention something does not make it wrong but it can certainly warp someone perspective. This same theme though is throughout many other text and documentaries that try and fail to educate but instead just try to impose their thoughts on others.*

*The very same thing is happening albeit even more in the documentary where the sole perspective of globalization is how its negatively impacted colonized countries. This is true of course but they also fail to mention other aspects of globalization that are improving certain parts of the country as well.*

*This singular mindset when presenting the large topic of globalization can easily cause the warped perspectives and thoughts that are often associated with rejectionists. Not presenting all the negatives and positives of globalization gives a false perception of what that topic is really about.*

*Having educational materials built around documents and videos like this makes it that much more of a challenge to educate the general public on the meaning of a topic like globalization. It has become so much of a problem as of late that in order to get the real picture of a topic you will have to read or watch multiple sources of educational material just to get all the facts.*

*In a society that has benefited so much from the information exchange aspects of globalization don’t you think we would have the ability to teach and educate without imparting our own perceptions.*