

The UConn Undergraduate Political Review

Edition Four

Editorial Board

Editor- In- Chief

Maye L. Henning

Associate Editor-In-Chief

Will Fricke

Editors

Darren Daughtry, Jr.
Nicholas Fuller
Evelyn Luchs
Cailin McHugh-Roohr

Special thanks to the University of Connecticut Political
Science Department for their continuing support

Contents

Letter From the Editor Maye Henning	4
America Withdraws from More than a Trade Agreement Kyle Adams	5
Progressive Politics in a Globalizing America Lucas Bladen	8
The Cracks on Trump's Wall Caio Goncalves	11
Trade, Trade, Trade: How Trump Utilized Systemic Disappointment in the Rust Belt to Win the White House James R. Brakebill	14
When Money Rules the World, Is Complete Globalization a Possibility? Mary Vlamis	16
Neo-Colonialism in the Global Economy Will Butler	19
The China-Angola Model: An Alternative to Neocolonial Globalization Cailin McHugh-Roohr	23
On the Question of Ends: U.S.-Iran Relations through a Kantian Vista Samuel Rostow	27
Globalization and the Fate of the International Austin Beaudoin	30
Frostbite: The Cold War and its Globalizing Effects Sahar Iqbal	34
A Reexamination of Global Media as a Revolutionary Tool Jessica Kirchner	37

Letter From the Editor

Dear Readers,

It is an honor to write to you as Editor-in-Chief of the University of Connecticut Undergraduate Political Review. The theme of this fourth edition is *Globalization: Past, Present, and Future*. This theme- intentionally broad, considers how individuals, institutions, and nations shape our world today.

The Undergraduate Political Review emphasizes diversity in the subject matter discussed in each edition. Article topics range from the impact of perceptions of globalization on the 2016 presidential election to global media as a tool for revolution.

The Editorial Board takes pride in the nuance of our writers' ideas and the integrity with which they approach their writing. As you read through this edition, we encourage you to read these articles in conversation with one another and identify overlapping or opposing perspectives.

If you would like to become involved in undergraduate editing or writing for the 2017-2018 year please direct inquiries to uconnpoliticalreview@gmail.com. We accept new writers every semester, and encourage undergraduates who take an interest in political discourse to apply to be a writer or editor by emailing a writing sample and resume to uconnpoliticalreview@gmail.com.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Undergraduate Political Review editors and writers for their hard work and the Political Science Department for unwavering support. I extend a special thanks to our adviser, Professor Oksan Bayulgen, and to the Political Science Department Head, Professor David Yalof, without whom the Undergraduate Political Review would not be possible.

Sincerely,

Maye L. Henning

Editor-in-Chief

America Withdraws from More than a Trade Agreement

Kyle Adams

The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) has received significant attention from American politicians, media, and voters since its inception in October 2015. The trade pact became an unsung and decisive issue during the 2016 US presidential election, and it has proven to be nearly as divisive within political parties as it has been across them. However, despite a focus on the TPP inside the Beltway, a Politico-Harvard poll taken in September 2016 showed that 70% of Americans did not know anything about the TPP¹. This widespread lack of knowledge about an agreement invoked so frequently by American politicians is concerning. By better understanding the basic goals and history of the TPP, one will be able to better appreciate the foreign policy benefits of the agreement and recognize that the implications of President Trump's withdrawal expand well beyond economics.

Pioneered by the Obama Administration, the TPP would have enhanced economic ties between the United States and eleven other nations bordering the Pacific Ocean by slashing tariffs, promoting free trade, and coordinating economic policy and regulations, while simultaneously stunting the growth of Chinese influence in the region². These eleven nations and the United States together accounted for 40% of the world's total economic output, and five were ranked top-20 in the world for nominal GDP (United States, Japan, Australia, Canada, and Mexico)³. However, despite President Obama placing pressure on Congress to approve this deal throughout his second term, opposition from what Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) described as a "a strong coalition of members of Congress and labor, environmental, faith, and human rights organizations and activists," was too much for him to overcome (Behsudi 2016). Indeed, opposition to the TPP united the strangest of partners when Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX) and Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-VT) both unsuccessfully attempted to block a measure giving President Obama "fast track" negotiating authority⁴.

Even as President Obama struggled to push his trade agenda through Congress, some held optimism that a new president would be able to persuade Congress to ratify the TPP. However, this hope slowly began to dissipate as Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, who started the campaign supporting the TPP, switched her position on the deal. Many doubted the sincerity of her position change, but after Donald Trump became the President-elect of the United States, few doubted that the TPP was just a couple of months away from extinction. Trump railed against the TPP and other "bad trade deals" on the campaign trail. He even once described the TPP as "a rape of our country," while campaigning in Ohio⁵. Unsurprisingly, just

¹ Palmer, Doug. 2016. "POLITICO-Harvard Poll: Americans Say 'TPP Who?'" September 23. <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/americans-say-tpp-who-228598> (February 23, 2017).

² BBC Staff. 2017. "TPP: What is it and Why Does it Matter?" January. <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-32498715> (February 23, 2017).

³ Statistics Times Staff. 2016. "Projected GDP Ranking (2016-2020)." December 16. <http://statisticstimes.com/economy/projected-world-gdp-ranking.php> (February 24, 2017).

⁴ Greenberg, John. 2016. "Ted Cruz: 'I Always Opposed the TPP (Trans-Pacific Partnership)'" March 10. <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2016/mar/10/ted-cruz/ted-cruz-i-always-opposed-tpp-trans-pacific-partne/> (February 22, 2017).

⁵ Cirilli, Kevin and David Knowles. 2016. "Trump Likens Trans-Pacific Partnership Deal to

days after taking office, newly elected President Trump turned his campaign rhetoric into action when he withdrew the United States from the negotiating process of the TPP on January 23, 2017¹.

In the United States, the debate over the TPP in has typically been framed as one of economic philosophy. Supporters argue that freer global markets will promote economic growth across all nations involved, while opponents challenge either that the deal will empower big business, harm the environment, or cause American jobs to disappear overseas. Based on most economic analysis of the deal, both sides have some justification for their claims as the TPP would have led to an estimated drop in consumer prices, a slight increase in US incomes (.4% by 2025), and a small number of jobs lost in import-competing industries².

However, lost in this economic analysis is the idea that the TPP represented more than a trade agreement for the Obama Administration. Rather, it was likely part of a greater geopolitical strategy aimed at limiting China's growing influence in the Pacific region. To truly understand the implications of withdrawal from the TPP, one must consider both the economic *and* geopolitical consequences of the decision.

Chinese expansionism has often been pushed to the backburner of US foreign policy during an era dominated by concerns over the rise of ISIS, Iran's nuclear ambitions, North Korea's unpredictability, and Russian expansionism. However, over the past decade, China has pursued "an extensive campaign of dredging and creating man-made islands in the South China Sea"³. This expansionism has focused primarily on three main islands, the Fiery Cross Reef, the Mischief Reef, and the Subi Reef, in disputed areas near the Philippines. China appears to be using these islands for military purposes such as building airstrips that can receive military aircrafts, ports that can receive tankers, and helipads. This expansion has created significant territorial tensions in the region, especially between China and Vietnam, the Philippines, Taiwan, and Malaysia. However, despite these increased tensions, China has also rapidly expanded its trade links with nations in Southeast Asia. An Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)-China free trade zone came into effect in 2010, which helped China increase its trade to ASEAN nations increase by 10% in 2012 and surpass the EU and Japan to become ASEAN's number one trading partner⁴.

Clearly, with China pursuing expansionist and militaristic policies in the Pacific region while simultaneously becoming the leading trading partner in the southeast Pacific, it is understandable that the Obama administration would be concerned. The United States had a significant foreign policy interest to push back on Chinese expansion and prevent Pacific nations

Rape." June 28. <https://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2016-06-28/trump-channels-brexit-in-anti-trade-speech-at-pennsylvania-factory> (February 24, 2017).

¹ BBC Staff. 2017. "Trump Executive Order Pulls Out of TPP Trade Deal." January 24. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38721056> (April 2, 2017).

² Gunn, Dwyer. 2017. "Will the U.S. Economy Pay the Price for Pulling out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership?" January 23. <http://www.newsweek.com/trans-pacific-partnership-pulling-out-bad-us-economy-donald-trump-547173> (February 23, 2017).

³ Macias, Amanda and Jeremy Bender. 2016. "These Images Might Just be the Clearest Signs of China's Expansion in the Disputed South China Sea." March 20. <http://www.businessinsider.com/images-chinas-expansion-in-the-disputed-south-china-sea-2016-3/#fiery-cross-reef-january-2006--june-2015-1> (February 22, 2017).

⁴ Le Pla, Ruth. 2013. "China-Southeast Asia Trade Links Expanding Rapidly." January. <http://www.asianz.org.nz/bulletin/china-southeast-asia-trade-links-expanding-rapidly> (February 22, 2017).

from becoming too heavily dependent on Chinese trade, and the TPP was an agreement that could help achieve that interest.

Following the American withdrawal from the TPP, China seems set to continue to expand its role as both an economic and political power in the Pacific region. Since the election of President Trump, China has been pushing aggressively for an agreement with Pacific nations called Regional Comprehensive Partnership (RCEP). Many nations who would have been part of the TPP are reportedly “shifting their focus to RCEP” which is catastrophic for the United States from both a geopolitical and economic perspective. Geopolitically, China will be able to expand its sphere of influence as nations such as the Philippines, Vietnam, and Singapore, who have already faced territorial pressure from China, will be less willing to fight such territorial expansion as they become increasingly economically dependent on China. Economically, American companies could see erosion of their access to markets in Pacific countries relative to Chinese firms due to RCEP tariff cuts¹. This could be especially devastating should Japan agree to RCEP as the US currently sells \$5.3 billion worth of goods to Japan.

In conclusion, President Trump’s decision to withdraw from the TPP will likely have geopolitical ramifications that few are anticipating. Beyond losing a few minor short-term economic benefits of the deal itself, America has more importantly lost an opportunity to push back against Chinese expansionism and secure long-term access to Southeast Asian markets. Instead, China has now been left with a gaping hole to continue its economic and territorial expansion into the Pacific. America has not only withdrawn from an impactful trade agreement, but also from its role as a geopolitical force in the Pacific region.

¹ Gunn, Dwyer. 2017. “Will the U.S. Economy Pay the Price for Pulling out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership?” January 23. <http://www.newsweek.com/trans-pacific-partnership-pulling-out-bad-us-economy-donald-trump-547173> (February 23, 2017).

Progressive Politics in a Globalizing America

Lucas Bladen

Still recovering from President Donald Trump's first few months in office, Democratic officials have struggled to keep pace with the development of a grassroots insurgency in their party. The state and national elections of 2016 have reminded us that globalization has not produced universal prosperity; just as Brexit and the political ascendancy Vladimir Putin have exemplified the rebirth of nationalist anti-liberalism, so too has the Republican rise to power. Democrats have been increasingly criticized by economically insecure voters for their emphasis on cultural issues, but skeptics, rather than demonstrating the party's failure, neglect the fact that such an approach has successfully driven Americans to the left socially.¹ The 2016 presidential election, however, was about more than a collection of isolated issues; Donald Trump ran and won on a nationalist platform based on structural questions of trade, economic mobility, immigration, and American national identity.² Though it is impossible to ignore islamophobic, xenophobic, and sexist rhetoric in the President's victory, Democrats found themselves overly reliant on name-calling and perceived moral superiority, limiting their chances to broaden the base of their party.

With President Trump in the White House, it appears that Republicans have taken a decidedly nationalist policy outlook, preferring the certainty of an inward-looking economy and narrow national identity. Democrats, assuming unequivocal support for globalization among voters, have adopted a postmaterialist message as the primary foundation for their party, meaning that they stress issues such as environmental well-being and political and civil liberties over domestic law and order.³ Globalization has not brought about universal prosperity and international solidarity, though; Democrats have been heretofore unable to avoid being labeled the party that prioritizes lofty ideals over basic societal needs. Responding to globalization requires that politicians take a drastic set of measures, but instead of pursuing nationalist withdrawal, Democrats can empower their progressive wing to advocate structural changes to the American economy and conception of national identity. Though loosely defined, conventional usage of the term "progressivism" is rooted in the trust-busting, anti-corruption movements of the early 20th century.⁴ Modern progressive politicians find themselves in an unorganized, minority branch of the Democratic Party whose most notable members include Senators Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, and Democratic National Committee Deputy Chairman Keith Ellison. Despite a lack of internal structure, progressivism urges broad institutional changes to tackle globalization-driven questions of income equality and social inclusion, placing industrial reform, diversification of economic opportunity, and a welcoming national identity.

¹ Jones, Jeffrey M. 2016. "Democrats More Liberal on Social Issues Than Economic Ones." *Gallup.com*. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/191741/democrats-liberal-social-issues-economic-ones.aspx> (February 21, 2017).

² Flegenheimer, Matt, and Michael Barbaro. 2016. "Donald Trump Is Elected President in Stunning Repudiation of the Establishment." *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/09/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-president.html> (February 21, 2017).

While some conservatives may be content in waiting patiently for market forces to shift back to Americans' favor, a progressive solution relies on economic action, preparing a new generation of skilled, computer-literate workers for modern factory floors.⁵ Under the guise of "America first," Republicans and the Trump Administration have already begun to enact policies deregulating large corporations and empowering fossil fuel industries,⁶ providing them with dangerous international influence that isolationism cannot counterbalance. International cooperation and interdependence define the role of the nation-state in today's globalist era;⁷ by retreating into a nationalist paradigm of closed borders, the United States will be more likely to suffer the abuses of powerful transnational corporations. Progressivism views global transparency and coordination, rather than an idealized, nostalgic past, as the foundation for a future in which citizens can be proud of their country. A new wave of industry based on infrastructure, technology, and clean energy are some of the progressive economic possibilities for sustaining American competitiveness in a global economy.

Praise for global free trade has historically characterized both American political parties, rising from the ashes of the Second World War and culminating in such accords as the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). However, cheap labor and economic liberalization in developing nations have incentivized manufacturers to move overseas in the name of free markets. The working class that relied on factory jobs has seen its infrastructure crumble, its neighborhoods decay, and its high unemployment rates endure.⁸ Indeed, attacks directed at free trade by then-candidates Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders are representative of Americans' economic discomfort and insecurity. It is an accepted truth that capitalism results in both winners and losers, but Americans whose jobs have disappeared, instead of finding new economic opportunities, fear the possibility of becoming a permanent underclass.

A reconsideration of the country's businesses, on the other hand, is useless without guaranteeing the wellbeing of the individuals responsible for perpetuating them. Millennials have found or are still searching for jobs in an economic era defined by the effects of the Great Recession; it is for this reason, then, that so many of them support a government commitment to infrastructure, shelter, and a living wage.⁹ While Democrats have been accused of being the "take from the rich, give to the poor" party, they have been hesitant to more strongly target the structural problems facing the economy. The American people are uneasy with the idea that they live in a nation in which the top 10 percent of households are able to accumulate 76 percent of the wealth.¹⁰ The idolization of "self-made men" has long motivated workers, but it loses salience in the face of wage stagnation and the rise of an oligarchical class. As author J.D. Vance writes in his book, *Hillbilly Elegy: A Memoir of a Family and Culture in Crisis*, the overseas migration of middle-class jobs to developing nations has given American workers the sense that their choices and work ethic do not matter in a transnational system that's meant to guarantee their failure. The economic advancement of the American people as a whole is essential to the nation's prosperity and productivity on a global scale; progressive policies acknowledge that it is cheaper to alleviate poverty than it is to sustain a class that finds itself in perpetual financial discomfort.¹¹

Yet poverty is something that affects all demographics of American society, not just those white working-class voters who found a champion in Donald Trump. As new questions of race, religion, gender, and class come to the forefront of American politics, it will be more

effective to celebrate diversity not because it represents natural "progress" but because it emphasizes community cohesion and strength. It has consistently been shown that the president found his most enthusiastic support among rural, uneducated, white, working-class men with whom the call to "make America great again" most resounded. Whether this slogan evokes a bygone era of social and economic opportunity, though, is debatable, as Trump supporters also indicate a pervasive influence of nativism.¹² The nation's demographic changes, driven by globalization, have made the American populace more diverse, a phenomenon which is not likely to slow in the near future.¹³ Changing family structures, religious affiliations, and cultural backgrounds in the population have called traditional American national identity into question.

Progressives work to spread the notion that diversity does not obstruct unity but rather encourages it; in such a framework, policy initiatives would not frame undocumented immigrants and minorities as the enemy. The basis for such a political shift is economic, empowering underrepresented groups to move from the fringes of society to the center of it. Black Lives Matter focuses on ending racially motivated police brutality, but progressive lawmakers view this goal only as a stepping-stone to long-term stability for black communities. Similarly, they do not see immigrants as merely a source of cheap labor; racial and cultural divisions are, to a large extent, artificial barriers designed to inhibit the betterment of the entire working class. Status as a "global citizen" is often less meaningful in the face of domestic conflict,¹⁴ which is why even socially marginalized groups can benefit from progressive materialist policies. Social equality of women, ethnic minorities, immigrants, and LGBTQI people can only go so far without economic protections provided by health care, reproductive care, adequate education, and a living wage. Research suggests that these material forms of empowerment provide the security that is necessary for empathy, allowing citizens to embrace inclusion rather than clinging to immediate self-interest and individualistic survival instincts.¹⁵

The repudiation of the global political "establishment" by voters has been arguably the most important shift in recent American politics, challenging norms of and expectations for candidates, elected officials, and even entire parties. Barack Obama was both a member and a victim of this establishment, and in trying to stay above the political fray he has left the Democrats in their weakest position in decades. Despite his numerous successes, his wing of the party proved unable to face underlying, big-picture questions of trade and America's place in an ever-globalizing world. Republicans have, for better or worse, organized an uneasy coalition ready to tackle these issues; Democrats can either attempt to hesitantly govern from the center or they can craft a bold progressive platform that meets the needs of those left behind by globalization. Barack Obama's call of "Yes we can" was a source of inspiration for a generation of young political activists, but Democrats must form an innovative, consistent vision if they wish to retain that message of hope in an increasingly insecure world.

The Cracks on Trump's Wall

Caio Goncalves

President Donald Trump made his fortune by being a big fan of globalization and a heavy player in world trade. Among so many unique facets to Trump's ultimately successful White House run, is the fact that the billionaire appealed to blue-collar working white men by hammering a message of nationalism, populism, and ironically being against globalization. While Trump enjoys the benefits of doing business with investors all over the world, manufacturing his products outside of America, and branding Trump properties outside of the country, Trump succeeded in framing globalization as an imminent disaster to a big portion of the electorate. Failing trade deals and the threat of open borders and illegal immigration sold Trump to just enough voters, even when many saw Hillary Clinton as a safer alternative. Sure, Clinton's candidacy and campaign were plagued with scandals and hurdles of its own, but what is remarkable, is that at every step of the way Trump misrepresented how he and his businesses benefit from globalization. Trump painted the picture that globalization is hurting our country, and that his policies against globalization and illegal immigration will ensure America's economic prosperity.¹

Trump relished in the country's populist mood with the mantra of "America First". "Our politicians have aggressively pursued a policy of globalization -- moving our jobs, our wealth and our factories to Mexico and overseas," he said in a campaign rally in Pennsylvania.² "Globalization has made the financial elite who donate to politicians very, very wealthy. I used to be one of them. Hate to say it, but I used to be one of them."

It was remarks like these and others, such as telling the Wall Street Journal, "As a businessman and a very substantial donor to very important people, when you give, they do whatever the hell you want them to do," that gave Trump this fake aura of authenticity to his supporters. Trump appeared to be unwaveringly candid, and honest about the how he - a man admittedly a part of the swamp he promised to drain, was more morally apt to become president than his Democratic counterpart.

The looming question is this - what does a Trump presidency, one that promised to "Make America Great Again" at all costs mean for the future of globalization? After Brexit, as improbable as it seemed back then, a Trump win appeared even more ludicrous to fathom. Yet here we are, two months into the Trump Administration. The effects of his policies on the world cannot yet be quantified at length, but what we can examine so far are the few policies he has kept a more clear and consistent stance on throughout the campaign and after his inauguration.

One of Trump's central campaign promises, the Mexican border wall, may get an earlier start than some thought. The Associated Press reported that U.S. Customs and Border Protection

¹ Tankersley, Jim. 2017. "Globalization was great for Trump's business. As president, he hates it." *Vox*. <http://www.vox.com/2017/1/20/14339424/globalization-trumps-business-china-trade-protectionism> (April 5, 2017).

² Diamond, Jeremy. 2016. "Trump slams globalization, promises to upend status quo." *CNN*. <http://www.cnn.com/2016/06/28/politics/donald-trump-speech-pennsylvania-economy/> (April 5, 2017).

expect to award contracts for construction as early as mid-April,¹ and Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly told Fox News he hopes to have a wall between the U.S. and Mexico built within two years.²

Despite this accelerated schedule, questions and controversy remain. Issues include the cost and who will pay for the wall, protests over its location and whether the “beautiful wall,” will even be a wall after all.^{3,4,5} Trump has been vague on the timeline of construction, telling the Conservative Political Action Committee late last month, “We’re building the wall. In fact, it’s going to start soon. Way ahead of schedule.”⁶ But one thing has remained consistent, and in January during his first press conference as the President-elect, Trump repeated that Mexico would pay for the wall, just as he promised during his campaign.

What followed after Trump’s inauguration was another blunder by the administration, with the tumultuous back and forth between America and its southern neighbor. In the midst of a barrage of hostile remarks made by both Trump and Mexico’s president, Enrique Peña Nieto, Nieto cancelled a scheduled meeting with a statement released on Twitter, Trump-style.

Trump still maintains that Mexico will pay for the wall, and his press secretary, Sean Spicer, has said that Trump is calling for a 20% tax on imports to pay for it.⁷ At this time, it is unclear how much money, if any, Congress would eventually allocate for the project.

Here’s the problem with Trump’s border tax. Trump and Spicer’s assertions that the tax translates into Mexico essentially paying for the wall, is far-reaching to say the least. Export barriers would most certainly hurt Mexico’s economy, but it would actually be the American people who would pick up the tab. Since companies selling their products in the U.S. pay for a border adjustment tax, these same companies would likely have to drastically increase prices in order to protect their profit margins.⁸ Consequently, American consumers would pay higher

¹ Spagat, Elliot. 2017. “Agency plans to award Mexico border wall contracts by April.” *Yahoo! News*. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/agency-publishes-timetable-mexico-border-wall-191426103.html> (April 5, 2017).

² Herridge, Catherine. 2017. “DHS secretary: Border wall should be finished in two years.” *Fox News*. <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/02/02/dhs-secretary-border-wall-should-be-finished-in-two-years.html> (April 5, 2017).

³ Schmidt, Samantha. 2016. “A 75-Mile-Wide gap in Trump’s wall? A tribe says it won’t let it divide its land.” *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2016/11/15/a-75-mile-wide-gap-in-trumps-wall-a-tribe-says-it-wont-let-the-wall-divide-its-land/?utm_term=.f23179166941 (April 5, 2017).

⁴ Crocker, Lizzie. 2017. “Who Will Really End Up Paying for Trump's Mexico Wall?” *The Daily Beast*. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/01/25/who-will-really-end-up-paying-for-trump-s-mexico-wall.html> (April 5, 2017).

⁵ Bronstein, Scott. 2017. “Trump wants a wall. Border experts want a fence.” *CNN*. <http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/16/politics/trump-border-wall/> (April 5, 2017).

⁶ Stoltzfoos, Rachel. 2017. “Trump: Border Wall Will Go Up ‘Way Head Of Schedule’ [VIDEO].” *The Daily Caller*. <http://dailycaller.com/2017/02/24/trump-border-wall-will-go-up-way-head-of-schedule-video/> (April 5, 2017).

⁷ Bryan, Bob. 2017. “Trump press secretary says the administration is considering a 20% border tax on Mexican imports to help pay for the wall.” *Business Insider*. <http://www.businessinsider.com/sean-spicer-trump-considering-20-tax-on-mexican-imports-2017-1> (April 5, 2017).

⁸ Bryan, Bob. 2017. “There are a lot of problems with Trump's 20% border tax idea.” *Business Insider*. <http://www.businessinsider.com/problems-with-trumps-20-mexican-border-tax-idea-2017-1> (April 5, 2017).

prices in order to fund the wall, not the people of Mexico.

Trump has acknowledged the complexities of border adjustment, saying, “Anytime I hear border adjustment, I don’t love it,” Trump told the Wall Street Journal. “Because usually it means we’re going to get adjusted into a bad deal. That’s what happens.”¹ But he has yet to produce any meaningful plan that outlines how a border tax will actually result in Mexico paying for the wall as promised.

The fact is President Trump totally misunderstands globalization. While he has arguably mastered it by doing business all over the world and further enriching himself and his family, as the man who holds the highest office in the country, he has no idea how to negotiate in that same kind of global market for the interest of the American people. The empty promise that “Mexico will pay for the wall,” was never anything but, and it was his rebuke of globalization and incendiary tactics, coupled with the country’s populist direction and unserious attitudes toward politics, that gave way for the most unserious candidate to become the most unserious and incompetent president to date.

¹ Freund, Caroline. 2017. “Trump Is Right: 'Border Adjustment' Tax Is Complicated.” *Bloomberg.com*. <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-01-18/trump-is-right-border-adjustment-tax-is-complicated> (April 5, 2017).

Trade, Trade, Trade: How Trump Utilized Systemic Disappointment in the Rust Belt to Win the White House

James R. Brakebill

When Donald Trump continued to campaign throughout October in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, many believed his campaign was dead. After a string of controversy early in the month, Hillary Clinton was dominating the polling of the Rust Belt, supposed to act as her Electoral College “firewall” in case Trump gained ground in both Ohio and Florida. Fast-forward to November 8th, however, and Trump’s gamble on the Rust Belt paid off. He extinguished Clinton’s firewall, as well as her chances of winning the presidency.

The reasons for her surprise losses in these states, none of which have gone to a Republican presidential candidate in nearly three decades, center on Trump’s ability to tap into voters’ fears over economic globalization, particularly international trade. People in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania are much more likely to believe that free trade has a negative impact on jobs and the economy compared to the rest of the nation. Roughly 58 percent of the nation thinks free trade is generally good for jobs¹ compared to only about a third of the voters in WI, MI, and PA.²

18 percent more voters believed trade takes away U.S. jobs than believed it created U.S. jobs. Among the former group, Donald Trump bested Hillary Clinton by nearly 30 percentage points. Union households, a group that traditionally favors Democrats as well as protectionist anti-free trade policies, backed Donald Trump substantially more than they have previous Republican candidates. While still not a majority, Trump improved upon Mitt Romney’s 2012 performance among union households by 10 percentage points.³

Part of the reason trade became an important issue was because candidates on both sides of the aisle were promising to rewrite trade deals and stop future ones. Both Donald Trump and Senator Bernie Sanders lambasted our current trade agreements as unfair and harmful to American workers. During the Democratic primaries, Senator Sanders criticized Hillary Clinton for her support of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and questionable position on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)⁴. Both Trump and Sanders have also been highly critical of China, accusing China of manipulating their currency to improve their trade balance. Sanders won primaries against Clinton in Wisconsin and Michigan where trade was part of his central message.⁵

¹ “American Public Opinion on Trade.” Gallup, <http://www.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/190427/american-public-opinion-foreign-trade.aspx>

² Exit Polls, Election 2016. CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/election/results/exit-polls>

³ Exit Polls, Election 2016. CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/election/results/exit-polls>

⁴ Gaudiano, Nicole. “Bernie Sanders Pledges to Rewrite Disastrous Trade Deals.” USA Today, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2016/03/31/bernie-sanders-pledges-rewrite-disastrous-trade-deals/82473012/>

⁵ Kerson, Roger. “Money and Ground Game Alone Can’t Explain Bernie Sanders Stunning Win in Michigan.” Salon, http://www.salon.com/2016/03/11/money_and_ground_game_cant_explain_bernie_sanders_stunning_win_in_michi

The critiques of free trade by Trump and Sanders are not unfounded. Estimates from the Economic Policy Institute reveal that NAFTA has cost the United States over 700,000 jobs and the Korea-US Trade Agreement displaced another 70,000.¹ Since China entered the World Trade Organization in 2001, the United States' trade deficit with China has grown 285 percent and the United States is estimated to have lost upwards of 4.1 million jobs due to trade with China.² In addition to job losses, U.S. workers' wages have been suppressed due to high trade deficits. Even as corporate profits skyrocketed and the economy expanded, those increases have not translated into real wage growth or job creation; most of the benefits have gone to shareholders and executives.³ Economists from the National Bureau of Economic Research also have argued that free trade has reduced the number of manufacturing jobs in the United States, affecting political cohesion and the behavior of voters⁴. Furthermore, they concluded that if import penetration had been 50% smaller between 2001 and 2016, Hillary Clinton would have won the states of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, as well as the requisite number of electoral college votes to win the presidency.⁵

Taking voter opinion and economic data into account, it is not too surprising that Trump pulled off slim victories in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania despite the favorable polling for Clinton and them being reliably Democratic. Trump spoke directly to the people about the issues concerning them the most. Clinton's criticism of Trump's character flaws and lack of experience were simply not enough to overcome it.

gan_so_what_was_it_what_about_nafta/

¹ Faux, Jeff. "NAFTA's Impact on U.S. Workers." Economic Policy Institute, <http://www.epi.org/blog/naftas-impact-workers/>

² Kimball, Will and Scott, Robert E. "China Trade, Outsourcing, and Growing U.S. Trade Deficit." Economic Policy Institute, <http://www.epi.org/publication/china-trade-outsourcing-and-jobs/>

³ Reich, Robert. "How Trade Deals Boost the Top 1% and Bust the Rest." RobertReich.org, <http://robertreich.org/post/111210323485>

⁴ Autor, David et al. "Importing Political Polarization? The Electoral Consequences of Rising Trade Exposure." National Bureau of Economic Research, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w22637>

⁵ Autor, David et al. "A Note on the Effect of Rising Trade Exposure on the 2016 Presidential Election." Economic Policy Institute, <http://www.ddorn.net/papers/ADHM-President2016.pdf>

When Money Rules the World, Is Complete Globalization a Possibility?

Mary Vlamis

Since ancient times, globalization has caused international mutual benefit from state specialization. Of the classical civilizations, one of the most culturally significant was Ancient Greece. The Greeks had everything from philosophy to geometry, early medicine to modern scientific ideas, and, of course, democracy. However, the rocky and mountainous geography of Greece did not exactly lend itself to agricultural prosperity. In order to avoid becoming a group of starving artists in togas, the Greeks participated in the contemporary trade network that had originated with the Sumerians. Sure, the Greeks had metalwork, honey, olive oil, and pottery, but surrounding Black Sea countries had grain, Turkey had timber, Egypt had Papyrus, and the Phoenicians carried luxury fabrics. Trade during the Hellenistic Age stretched from Spain to Asia, connecting the Old World first by goods, then by ideas.

These economic ties grew stronger as international bonds became even more important on a political and social level. Ideas spread faster, migration increased, and state relations became more important than they ever did before. States were no longer isolated groups of people whose primary interactions were acts of war. Now, everyone was bound together.

Although trade brought states together and fostered cooperation, there still existed clear divides among them. There were tariffs in place that made it more expensive to purchase foreign goods than domestic goods. And, yes, states were friendlier and supported each other, but the success and failure of one state did not affect that of the others. The fall of the Roman Empire resulted in the enfeeblement of many land trade routes and other economic downfalls, yet the economies of Eastern Europe, Northern Africa, and Asia continued to be prosperous. Trade continued, as did the flow of ideas and people, however divisions among states were clear.

As always, history repeats itself. Similar processes carried out with the Islamic Golden Age, Columbian Exchange, and even the modern day. Of course, as humans advance trade and international relations become more and more complex; however, the same pattern continues today. Trade persists and connects us all, but at the end of the day, each country's preservation falls on itself.

A prime modern day example of this mentality is President Trump's desire to renegotiate the terms of the NAFTA agreement. "The North American Free Trade Agreement is a three-country accord negotiated by the governments of Canada, Mexico, and the United States that entered into force in January 1994. NAFTA's terms, which were implemented gradually through January 2008, provided for the elimination of most tariffs on products traded among the three countries." (Council on Foreign Relations)¹. The goal was to promote mutually beneficial trade, protect intellectual property, and regulate labor and environmental standards. President Trump's general argument for modifying the NAFTA agreement and restricting free trade with Mexico is that Mexico is profiting much more off the agreement and America is suffering for it. He has

¹ James McBride and Mohammed Aly Sergie, Council on Foreign Affairs, "NAFTA's Economic Impact."

declared the NAFTA as the “worst trade deal in history” and blames it for the loss of manufacturing jobs in the South (Gillespie)¹.

During his campaign, Trump gained a lot of support in the Southern states that lost the most jobs to the NAFTA agreement. Once major manufacturing companies moved to Mexico for cheaper production, many parts of Southern American went into deep poverty since these companies played a central part in their economies. Many American nationalists see this specific instance as all the reason to restrict trade with Mexico as it is costing American welfare. They see their fellow Americans suffering, 20 million job losses, and higher income inequality, and they do not like it (Wallach)².

We are all on one planet, and we are all human. With transportation and communication technology, the things that divide us are simply agreed upon boundaries and different cultures. If this is the case, why did ancient countries create tariffs to protect domestic merchants? And, why in the modern era is there a dispute over who should profit because of nationality? Essentially, why do we tend to favor our country’s preservation over that of another? The answer lies in the psychological concept of ingroup bias.

The main factor of social psychology that explain the prevalence of nationalism is ingroup bias. Ingroup bias, put simply, is the tendency to favor one’s group. “Continued devotion to a group becomes entangled with the way one perceives his or her relations to the world” (Druckman)³. Eventually, membership to a group is an integral part of one’s self-identity. Preservation of the group, thus becomes preservation of the self. Loyalty and defensiveness of the group develops, and in a political lens, becomes nationalism. People are citizens of the United States, France, or Turkey before they are members of planet Earth.

Additionally, psychologists have found that making decisions that will benefit one’s group results in higher self-esteem (Druckman)⁴. As motivated beings, the majority of humans desire to achieve acceptance and pride of one’s self. So, if one has the choice of enhancing the welfare of the group over making sacrifices to help another group, the clear choice is to favor his or her group. That is why leaders institute tariffs to benefit domestic merchants, and why most Americans want to help the South flourish again with the presence of the manufacturing industry.

Furthermore, in a world of majorly democratic or republican institutions, the feelings and beliefs of the majority of people determine the path of the nation. In the United States, a champion of ending such a relationship was elected, but there of plenty of other examples of ingroup basis prevailing around the world. On Thursday June 23, 2016, a referendum vote was held in the UK on the question of whether or not the UK should remain part of the European Union. Frustrated with limitations of the European Union, 51% of the people of the United Kingdom voted to leave (Hunt, et al)⁴. Additionally, rumors are circulating of a possible

¹ Gillespie, Patrick. "NAFTA: What It Is, and Why Trump Hates It." *CNNMoney*. Cable News Network, 15 Nov. 2016. Web. 27 Mar. 2017.

² Wallach, Lori. "NAFTA at 20: One Million U.S. Jobs Lost, Higher Income Inequality." *The World Post*. The Huffington Post, 06 Jan. 2014. Web. 27 Mar. 2017.

³ Druckman, Daniel. *Mershen International Studies Review*, “Nationalism, Patriotism, and Group Loyalty: A Social Psychological Perspective.”

⁴ Wheeler, Alex, and Brian Hunt. "Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU." *BBC News*. BBC, 30 Mar. 2017. Web. 31 Mar. 2017.

“Grexit,” a Greek Exit from the European Union as the tension between the nation and the EU regarding Greece’s insurmountable debt and high interest rates. If the people feel as though certain international relations are taking advantage of their nation or ingroup, then changes will be made and lines will be drawn.

There are two major lens to look through when thinking about the future of mankind: psychology and history. After all, human nature and set precedence are the most concrete pieces of evidence when predicting one’s behavior, whether that be a powerful individual or entire nation state. Unfortunately, when looking at history, psychology, and recent events it seems as though the idealist dream of a borderless world is only that, a dream.

Neo-Colonialism in the Global Economy

Will Butler

Within the past thirty years, financial globalization has dramatically changed the flow of capital in and out of industrialized nations. This shift has affected developing countries in particular, which have benefited from large inflows of foreign capital. However, in many circumstances the benefits have been substantially outweighed by the debt that those developing countries accrue. Institutions such as the IMF and World Bank have exacerbated the debt in developing countries through structural adjustment programs, which entail new conditional loans. These programs have made it nearly impossible for developing nations to even pay the debt service on their loans. The result has been widespread economic stagnation in developing countries, while wealthy financial institutions profit immensely off their misfortune. This unequal system is predicated on the old system of colonialism, where wealthy, industrialized nations benefited from the primary goods of underdeveloped countries. These industrialized nations rose to become global economic superpowers through exploitive relationships that harmed colonized nations. The international economic hegemony of the colonial period has been preserved through globalization and has reinforced the unequal relationships between former colonizers and former colonies. As a result, developing nations are obstructed from economic growth by neocolonial international economic institutions.

By the late-nineteenth century, industrialized nations had overwhelmed their domestic economies and were forced to seek new markets abroad.¹ Imperialists saw the demand for cheap labor and raw materials and maintained tighter control over colonized regions as a result.¹ The economic benefits from this “new imperialism”, as it was later coined, were reserved mostly to citizens of industrialized nations, as colonized regions were often too poor to buy the goods.¹ Colonized regions were also beneficial for military strategy during this period. The concept of nationalism and border security led nations like Britain to set up Navy harbors across their colonized lands.¹ The effects of colonization were disproportionately injurious to colonized regions, whose native culture and natural wealth were stripped away.¹ The practice impeded the regions from developing their own industry and led to underdevelopment in the post-colonial era.

The unequal power dynamics that catapulted industrialized nations to economic superiority during the colonial period continues to plague underdeveloped countries today. This is reinforced by the Dependency Theory, which explains that economic success in wealthier nations does not translate into prosperity for poor nations.² These countries have undergone an economic reorganization that commits them to the production of primary goods for industrialized nations.² The Dependency Theory serves a response to the modernization theory, which asserts that modern ideas and technological change will diffuse from wealthier nations to poor nations.² The modernization theory assumes that non-western countries can follow the same path as industrialized nations, but this does not take into account the competition that these nations face in the global economy. Developing nations must compete with giant industrialized economies as

¹ "The Age of Imperialism (1870-1914)." (n.d.): n. pag. *Tamaqua*. Web.

² Ferraro, Vincent. "Dependency Theory." *Encyclopedia of Geography* (n.d.): n. pag. July 1996. Web.

well as multinational corporations. A pertinent example that supports the dependency theory is the nation of Nigeria, which has enjoyed an abundance of resources and a fast growing economy since its independence in 1960.¹ During the early period after its independence, Nigeria was wealthy enough to finance its 30- month civil war without taking out a single foreign loan.³ By the early 1980's, Nigeria had begun to take out foreign loans to maintain economic growth and soon became intertwined in a debilitating foreign debt crisis.³ The crisis negatively impacted the nation's economic progress and political stability and forced the nation to reschedule its debt in exchange for complying with new economic reforms that would liberalize the economy and make it more open for private participation.³ As of 2006, Nigeria had paid more than \$16 billion on the initial \$5 billion it borrowed and still owes another \$32 billion.² It is important to note that African nations spend roughly \$1.51 on debt services for every \$1 received in foreign aid.⁴ With most of the payments by these countries going towards servicing the interest on the debt, it seems unlikely that repayment will ever be achieved.

The amount of debt developing countries accrue from foreign capital constitutes perhaps the largest factor suppressing their growth. Developing countries receive capital through mainly two sources: foreign aid and private capital flows. Institutions such as the World Bank (IBRD) or industrialized countries like the United States provide the majority of foreign aid.³ Private Capital is transferred through commercial banks based in industrialized countries, which lend to developing countries as well as through bonds that can be bought and sold in developing countries. Multinational corporations also supply capital each time they decide to build in developing countries.⁵

Foreign capital is extremely attractive to developing nations because it results in higher investment for the country. An inflow of capital can fuel greater economic development within the country. While foreign capital is not an automatic remedy for economic stagnation, it can provide new opportunities to fund various domestic development projects.⁵ The issue with this method of receiving capital is that it often leads to over-borrowing and large deficits for developing nations. The deficits produced by over borrowing hinder economic development and lead developing nations to rely on the IMF and World Bank for Structural Adjustment Programs, which further the problem.⁵

The solution to the debt crisis in developing nations has come to be known as the Washington Consensus.⁴ Under this system, Washington based institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) seek to reshape the debt of developing countries by eliminating the indebted government's role and promoting a market-based system instead.⁶ The goal is to lessen the large deficits accrued by developing nations by instituting structural adjustment programs that give IMF programs, the World Bank, and commercial banks control over development.⁶ Countries under structural adjustment programs are given conditional loans to promote private sector operations and solve monetary issues such as inflation. While the IMF

¹ Aluko, Funso, and Dare Arowolo. "Foreign Aid, the Third World's Debt Crisis and the Implication for Economic Development: The Nigerian Experience." N.p., 8 Mar. 2010. Web.

² Iheke, George. *You Can Avoid Debt Now*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.

³ Oatley, Thomas. *International Political Economy*. N.p.: n.p., 2015. Print.

⁴ Ranis, Gustav, James Raymond. Vreeland, and Stephen Kosack. *Globalization and the Nation State: The Impact of the IMF and the World Bank*. London: Routledge, 2006. Web.

and World Bank have lauded Ghana as being successful in their implementation of Structural Adjustment Programs, they fail to acknowledge their primary object in instituting these programs: poverty alleviation.¹ After the Structural Adjustment Programs, poverty in Ghana was actually higher than before. Despite a 75% increase in the minimum wage, most people in Ghana never felt the effect because of a surge in prices for food and social services.⁷ Furthermore, the programs failed to address the regional inequalities that have shaped poverty in Ghana. Nearly 80% of Ghana's poor live in rural regions where farmers sell food locally instead of participating in the country's export market.⁷ Because these regions are lacking in resources, they failed to benefit from the structural adjustment program. The IMF and World Bank argue that focusing resources on urban farmers is an inefficient way of alleviating poverty. However, evidence shows that rural farms maintain higher productivity than larger farms because they use their own labor as opposed to larger farms, which are likely to use more capital-intensive modes of production.⁷ The structural adjustment program employed in Ghana actually perpetuated poverty instead of alleviating it. The programs also contributed significantly to the country's high unemployment by requiring the government to cut back on public sector jobs. Unemployment went from 10% in 1980 to nearly 21% in 1993 with job losses affecting primarily uneducated citizens.⁷ The rapid economic liberalization of Ghana by the IMF and World Bank appear to have worsened poverty and increased the debt owed by the nation. The result of these programs has been catastrophic because of their basis on questionable comparative advantage aimed solely at primary commodities. Countries under the control of structural adjustment programs lack economic diversification and rely on a small number of primary goods to export.² The programs serve as unequal exchange tools to sell primary goods from developing countries for next to nothing compared to western nations.⁸ This is evidence of the unequal power dynamics that have been reinforced since the early period of colonialism. Structural dependency, a system created by colonialism, was designed to put industrialized nations at a considerable advantage when purchasing goods.

Structural Adjustment Programs are undemocratic because they give decision-making powers within the country to foreign actors who have their own economic agenda. Kwame Nkrumah, the former President of Ghana, described neo-colonialism and its tools as a system where the state's social and political systems are controlled from the outside.⁸ The programs primarily enrich the trading classes in these developing nations while the poor are largely left behind. Because women make up the majority of the poor in these countries, the programs have contributed significantly to the wage gap between the genders.³ The creation of Special Economic Zones within developing nations has also worked to exploit the female workforce.⁹ These zones exist outside the policies of the particular country, allowing companies to hire and exploit cheap labor. Women often work in the lowest paid positions and are forced to work long hours with little benefits. Many are forced to work night shifts where sexual harassment from

¹ Odotayo, Aramide. "Conditional Development: Ghana Crippled by Structural Adjustment Programmes." *E-International Relations*. N.p., Mar. 2015. Web. 03 Apr. 2017.

² Nkrumah, Kwame. "Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism." *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism by Kwame Nkrumah*. N.p., 1965. Web. 03 Apr. 2017.

³ Paul, Saine. "Special Economic Zones and the Exploitation Underneath." *By Saine Paul :: SSRN*. N.p., 26 Feb. 2014. Web. 03 Apr. 2017.

male employees is common.⁹ The profit driven system of Special Economic Zones is yet another neo-colonial tool to enrich industrial nations through the exploitation of the global poor.

People in the developing world do not see globalization as a positive process. To these people it has become a framework for plundering the resources of the third for the benefit of wealthy, western nations. Indeed, international economic institutions that work to maintain the hegemony of industrialized nations are fueling globalization. In order to solve underdevelopment, developing nations are going to need to find ways to relieve their debt burden. One solution might be to adopt no strings attached foreign investments, which would free developing nations from the commercializing economic programs put forward by the IMF and World Bank. Perhaps these investments can come from oil rich nations or the BRIC nations, a term describing the five major emerging economies of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. This would provide foreign capital to developing nations without having to rely on capital from former colonizers. Ultimately, the neo-colonial model that has reinforced the unequal power system will have to be dismantled in order for developing nations to achieve significant economic development.

The China-Angola Model: An Alternative to Neocolonial Globalization

Cailin McHugh-Roohr

In discussions of the implications of globalization, China has been accused, at times, of imposing neocolonial relationships on African nations. In these cases, the relationship between China and Angola emerges often as a primary example onto which conclusions about the general nature of Sino-African relations are projected. Western scholars have called China's role in Angola a sort of "new imperialism,"¹ and some have gone so far as to say that China is "colonizing" African nations.² Such characterizations demonstrate a lack of understanding of the complex historical context in which Sino-Angolan relations operate. On the other hand, official Chinese sources describe a "strategic partnership,"³ with economic and political ties constituting a "win-win" for both nations.⁴ While the official Chinese assessment is perhaps optimistic, China's real relationship with Angola is neither purely exploitative, nor strictly benign.

In order to contextualize the relationship between China and Angola, it is important to note that although their formal diplomatic relationship began in 1983,⁵ upon Angola's independence from Portugal, the Chinese government had been involved in Angola during the first period of that country's anti-colonial liberation struggle, which began in 1961. In the first three years of the Angolan liberation movement, China offered mostly rhetorical support, formally framing the Angolan conflict as similar to China's Communist Revolution because of its anti-imperialist motivations.⁶

After 1963, as Sino-Soviet relations became more adversarial, China began to try to establish independently favorable relationships with non-aligned nations in Africa, including Angola.⁷ In the mid 1960's, as China experienced its Cultural Revolution domestically, its foreign policy became more ideologically driven, and it gradually came to provide increased arms and monetary support primarily to liberation groups in Angola that openly espoused Maoism.⁸ By providing support based on ideological purity rather than the size and sophistication of liberation forces, China prioritized its own regional ideological interests over the successful liberation of Angola. This was true until Chinese diplomacy shifted away from being primarily driven by ideology towards the end of the Cultural Revolution. At the end of 1973, China began to support one of the liberation factions with which it had not been strongly aligned before, the FNLA (Frente Nacional de Libertação de Angola), not only because it opposed Soviet-backed groups, but because China received advice to do so from regional

¹ Marques de Morais, "The New Imperialism, China in Angola."

² Aidoo, "China and Angola: The True Dynamic Duo in Sino-African Relations."

³ "China and Angola," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China*.

⁴ Huaxia, "Xi Urges More Momentum for China-Angola Common Development."

⁵ "China and Angola," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China*.

⁶ Jackson, "China's Third World Foreign Policy: The Case of Angola and Mozambique, 1961-93," 393.

⁷ Ibid. 395.

⁸ Ibid. 396.

diplomatic partner, President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania.¹ This foreign policy shift on the part of China, while not disadvantageous for China, did demonstrate a recalculation of priorities that better accounted for Angolan popular interests.

In return for the material, monetary, and expertise-based assistance given to Angolan groups during the anti-colonial liberation movement in the 1960's and early 1970's, China expected to receive political support in the United Nations and other international organizations.² Although Angolan liberation fighters may not have been in a position to plausibly turn down Chinese assistance, the political support they offered in return was not coerced. Depictions of Sino-Angolan relations as colonial rarely acknowledge this initial peaceful partnership as a meaningful starting point for the relationship between these two nations. However, from both Angolan and Chinese diplomatic perspectives, these initial exchanges set the tone for the increasingly close economic ties established later.

While China and Angola have had political ties dating back to the Angolan liberation movement, their significant economic partnership largely developed, at a rapid rate, in the early 2000's.³ A Joint Economic and Trade Commission between the two countries in 1988 lay relatively dormant until after Angolan President José Eduardo dos Santos visited China in 1998.⁴ It is difficult to assess the impact of official state aid from China, as some of that information is not released by the state;⁵ however, decisions to facilitate trade certainly corresponded with increasing trade between the two countries. According to records from the International Monetary Fund, Angola's trade with China totalled \$706 million in 2001, numbered at over \$6 billion in 2005, and had reached \$22 billion in 2010.⁶ In addition to providing direct economic aid, China has assisted Angola through multi-billion dollar loans since 2004, with credit backed based on Chinese access to Angolan oil.⁷

It is partially the manner in which China receives so much oil and other natural resources from Angola that some observers make the accusation of colonialism. In 2016, Angola became China's top source for oil imports, overtaking Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and even Russia, a neighbour of China's.⁸ Some of these oil imports are derived from agreements through what has been termed "the Angola model" within Chinese diplomacy, wherein in exchange for Angolan oil and other resources, China provides funds for infrastructure development.⁹ In some cases, loans are considered conditional to some degree, often stipulating that a Chinese enterprise is to be used for the development project, and that 50% or more of necessary equipment or services are

¹ Ibid. 401-402.

² Jackson, "China's Third World Foreign Policy: The Case of Angola and Mozambique, 1961-93," 401.

³ Hseuh, Hseuh, and Byron, "How China is Impacting Business-State Relations in Africa: The Cases of Angola and Nigeria," 10.

⁴ Ibid. 13.

⁵ Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift*, 3.

⁶ Hseuh, Hseuh, and Byron, "How China is Impacting Business-State Relations in Africa: The Cases of Angola and Nigeria," 8.

⁷ Hseuh, Hseuh, and Byron, "How China is Impacting Business-State Relations in Africa: The Cases of Angola and Nigeria," 13.

⁸ Meng and Aizhu, "Update 1-Angola Becomes China's Biggest Oil Supplier In Sept."

⁹ "China in Africa." *Institute of Developing Economies: Japan External Trade Organization*.

sourced from China.¹ Estimates from 2011 have put the number of Chinese nationals living and presumably working on these development projects in Angola from 60-70,000.² These deals are seen by some scholars in the West as the Chinese government taking advantage of an underdeveloped Angola, exploitation akin to colonialism as Chinese settlers move in and natural resources move out.

It is important, when assessing the Sino-Angolan relationship, to take into account not only the economic and political might of China, but also the agency and intent of the Angolan government as well. To treat the current economic and political partnership with China as something that happened to Angola, rather than treating Angola as an active participant, is to ignore major trends in Angolan diplomacy. Infrastructure development has been a keen interest of the Angolan government, which experienced a decades-long internal conflict after achieving independence in 1983, and which had inherited little infrastructure from departing Portuguese colonizers.³

In its efforts to receive the monetary aid needed to develop, Angola has been able to lend not only from China, but from other national and international institutions as well, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In 2009, for example, the IMF “made provisions for a standby loan of \$1.4 billion for Angola, 300 per cent of Angola’s drawing quota.”⁴ One of the reasons that Angola has so often chosen to lend from China is because other countries and bodies like the IMF, rather than following the “Angola Model” of backing loans with resources, stipulate that they will provide funds only if Angola agreed to meet certain conditions to restructure their government. In the early 2000’s, Angola was actively seeking to secure large IMF loans, but grew reluctant due to the required Staff Monitoring Program, which would minimize the political power of Sonangol, the state-owned enterprise overseeing domestic oil and natural gas production.⁵ Chinese lending, though resource-expensive, provided a means of development without restrictive programs that would alter how the Angolan government ran the country. While Angola remains free to trade and borrow money from other partners, China is the partner of choice because its non-interventionist foreign policy aligns with Angolan national interests.⁶

Ultimately, it is a mistake to characterize the albeit unequal relationship between China and Angola as neocolonial or imperialist. Chinese foreign policy largely adheres to its strong non-interventionist ideals and is motivated by Chinese economic expansion, but those principles are not inherently threatening to Angolan interests. In fact, Angola finds in China a very compatible global partner, one that will assist Angola in profiting off of its natural resources while providing much-needed infrastructure for development, and one that will not seek to fundamentally change the Angolan political system in the process. Rather than behaving as an imperial power, China provides Angola with an alternative to working with proven neocolonial international bodies. It remains to be seen whether the Sino-Angolan partnership will provide a

¹ Ibid.

² Power and Alves, “A Strategic Partnership?” 77.

³ De Oliveira, Ricardo Soares. “Illiberal Peacebuilding in Angola,” 16.

⁴ Corkin, “Angolan Political Elites’ Management of Chinese Credit Lines,” 57.

⁵ “China in Africa.” *Institute of Developing Economies: Japan External Trade Organization*.

⁶ De Oliveira, Ricardo Soares. “Illiberal Peacebuilding in Angola,” 16.

model for Sino-African relations more generally, and whether such a partnership would be possible between former colonies and former colonial powers.

On the Question of Ends: U.S.-Iran Relations through a Kantian Vista

Samuel Rostow

Diplomatic relations between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran disintegrated in 1980 after the Khomeini-led overthrow of the Shah. Recently, however, the nature of the relationship between our two countries has changed both dramatically and abruptly. President Obama's presidency was characterized by a new diplomatic engagement with Iran. President Obama's objective pertaining to ends represents an appallingly low expectation. He stated, "My goal, when I came into office, was to make sure Iran did not get a nuclear weapon" and went on to say, "We can't bank on the nature of the regime changing".¹ Obviously, something can't be "banked" upon if one makes no effort to *do* something. In this instance, the former President exhibited a basic understanding of the law of inertia.

One key reason why many believe that the Iranian regime must be changed is due to their nefarious activities within the region. As noted by the U.S. State Department's annual "Country Reports on Terrorism" released in 2016, Iran continues to be designated as the world's foremost state-sponsor of terror. The Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps-Qods Force (IRGC-QF) is the primary vehicle that the Iranian regime utilizes to wreak havoc across the region and within its own borders. Specifically, the State Department's report notes that "Iran has also provided weapons, funding, and training to Shi'a militants in Bahrain. In 2015, the Government of Bahrain raided, interdicted, and rounded up numerous Iran-sponsored weapons caches, arms transfers, and militants. This includes the Bahraini government's discovery of a bomb-making facility with 1.5 tons of high-grade explosives in September."² Other terrorist groups that Tehran has provided material support for include Hamas and Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ). Originally created in 1981, the PIJ is committed to the destruction of Israel via military means and opposes Palestinian factions that attempt to solve the conflict diplomatically.³

Another key reason why many believe the Iranian regime must be changed is the domestic human rights record. Large numbers of homosexuals have been executed, human rights activists have been targeted, and women are treated as chattel. Former United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon documented the vast oppression perpetrated by the Iranian government. Two-thirds of women are subject to domestic violence. Specifically, he also noted the large amount of child marriages of girls under the age of ten. He explained that child marriage puts girls at risk of physical psychological, economic, and sexual violence and can lead to a range of poor health and other negative outcomes, including early pregnancy and high rates of maternal

¹ Obama, Barack. "Transcript: President Obama's Full NPR Interview on Iran Nuclear Deal." *National Public Radio*, 7 Apr. 2015, www.npr.org/2015/04/07/397933577/transcript-president-obamas-full-npr-interview-on-iran-nuclear-deal. Interview.

² Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism. *Country Reports on Terrorism 2015*. 2 June 2016. *United States Department of State*, www.state.gov/documents/organization/258249.pdf.

³ Fletcher, Holly. "Palestinian Islamic Jihad." *Council on Foreign Relations*, www.cfr.org/israel/palestinian-islamic-jihad/p15984.

and infant morbidity and mortality.¹

In 2009, the United States had a unique chance to change the Iranian regime in a manner that could have utilized Iranian dissidents that were part of the Green Revolution. Jay Solomon, the chief foreign affairs correspondent for the Wall Street Journal, documented the Obama administration's policy in his book, *The Iran Wars*. In it, he noted that the CIA always has contingency plans for supporting democratic uprisings anywhere in the world. This includes providing dissidents with communications, money, and in extreme cases even arms. However, the Obama administration ordered the CIA to stand down.² The problems with the Iranian regime persist today.

Turning to the future, President Trump's statements are indicative of a so-called "realist" foreign policy that has manifested itself historically as disastrous, leading to the support of brutal dictators such as Saddam Hussein and Mobutu Sese Seko. This version is an outdated, immoral, and unsustainable foreign policy. As Dr. Robert Kagan and William Kristol once noted, "For conservatives to preach the importance of upholding the core elements of the Western tradition at home, but to profess indifference to the fate of American principles abroad, is an inconsistency that cannot help but gnaw at the heart of conservatism."³

As it is early in the administration, this does not mean that President Trump cannot switch course with the help of good advisers. Although the White House has rejected experts such as Elliott Abrams, there is hope in officials such as Ambassador Nikki Haley and National Security Advisor Herbert Raymond McMaster. McMaster is a decorated veteran who has worked closely with General David Petraeus in the past several decades.

The hard truth that Americans must come to grips with is something that countless international affairs experts have noted for years. It is that there is no viable alternative to the United States as an actor to protect the free world and transition those that are not part of it. Douglas Feith, the former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, recently wrote about the overall importance of America's role abroad, noting, "Since the sun set on the British Empire, the United States has been instrumental in keeping the world's seas open to commerce. Without open lines of communication, much of the world's trade would cease to flow."⁴

What the United States desperately needs is an educated internationalist such as Tony Blair, who was instrumental in finally convincing the Clinton White House to stop Serbian President Milosevic's genocidal campaign in the Balkans. In a famous 1999 speech in Chicago, Blair laid out what is now referred to as the Blair Doctrine that entails a globalist action for human rights. Speaking of the gross indifference of Prussian statesman Otto von Bismarck, Prime Minister Blair stated, "Bismarck famously said the Balkans were not worth the bones of one Pomeranian

¹ Ki-moon, Ban. *Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran*. United Nations, 20 Feb. 2015. *United Nations Office of the High Commissioner and Secretary-General*, www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/HRC/28/26.

² Solomon, Jay. *The Iran Wars: Spy Games, Bank Battles, and the Secret Deals That Reshaped the Middle East*. New York, Penguin Random House, 2016.

³ Kagan, Robert, and William Kristol. "Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs*, July 1996, carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=276. Accessed 20 Mar. 2017.

⁴ Feith, Douglas, and Shaul Chorev. "Middle East Problems -- Isolationism Wouldn't Protect the U.S. from Them." *Hudson Institute*, 5 Sept. 2016, www.hudson.org/research/12807-middle-east-problems-isolationism-wouldn-t-protect-the-u-s-from-them.

Grenadier. Anyone who has seen the tear stained faces of the hundreds of thousands of refugees streaming across the border, heard their heart-rending tales of cruelty or contemplated the unknown fates of those left behind, knows that Bismarck was wrong.”¹

Some of this universalist thought dates back to Immanuel Kant. In 1795, Kant, the leading scholar and proponent of cosmopolitan philosophy, was in his final phase of teaching at the University of Königsberg. This was also the year in which he published one of his greatest works, entitled *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. In it, Kant touches upon two crucial points germane to the discussion of diplomatic relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United States. Since recent U.S. policy towards Iran has been dominated by the mere prevention of nuclear development, the larger cosmopolitan concern of Iranian liberation (entailing domestic human rights and regional freedom from subversive proxies) has been unashamedly disregarded.

The first relevant Kantian concept is cosmopolitanism itself. Cosmopolitanism is the ideology that the human race is part of one community and is based on shared moral values. For Kant, this entails an eventual federation of all states (which are all free). The constitutions of these states should be based upon the law of world citizenship, or *ius cosmopolitanicum*.¹ As for the criteria, the respective constitutions must specifically be established “Firstly, by principles of the freedom of the members of a society (as men); secondly, by principles of dependence of all upon a single common legislation (as subjects); and, thirdly, by the law of their equality (as citizens).”² It is the responsibility of enlightened individuals, whether they are in the form of philosophers or government officials, to take any feasible steps toward the realization of these principles.

The second relevant concept Kant provides insight into is the definition of a valid peace treaty. He wrote, “*No Treaty of Peace Shall Be Held Valid in Which There Is Tacitly Reserved Matter for a Future War...* Otherwise a treaty would be only a truce, a suspension of hostilities but not peace, which means the end of all hostilities.”³ The distinction of the mere suspension of hostilities from a true, perpetual peace is key in understanding the contextual situation of current diplomatic relations. A so-called peace treaty that fails to address the prospect of the conflict itself is a masquerade, inhibiting the chances of a just resolution. As Ambassadors Dennis Ross and James Jeffrey noted in their policy analysis discussing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), Iran is allowed to increase the size and enhance the capability of its nuclear enrichment infrastructure after the year 2026.⁴ The threat has not been seriously mitigated due to this so-called sunset clauses.

¹ Blair, Tony. Speech. Chicago Economic Club, 24 Apr. 1999, Chicago.

² Kant, Immanuel. “Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch.” 1795.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ross, Dennis, and James F. Jeffrey. *General Principles to Guide U.S. Middle East Policy*. Jan. 2017. *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/general-principles-to-guide-u.s.-middle-east-policy.

Globalization and the Fate of the International

Austin Beaudoin

The fundamental tenants and catalysts of any macro socio-economic phenomenon are often subject to frequent debate. Globalization is no exception, existing in the minds of many as an abstract world-shaping concept that has little prescriptive influence beyond the exchange of commerce between foreign markets. To have a meaningful discussion on these colossal mechanisms of global development, globalization must first be given a coherent and operational definition. As the focus of this article will be within the context of globalization as a holistic phenomenon while framing its repercussions largely within the economic, a definition such as the following shall suffice: “Globalization is not just an economic phenomenon, but a political, cultural, military, and environmental one as well.”¹ Such an assertion begs the question: if globalization is a set of phenomena changing almost every aspect of global society, who or what is driving this change? Again a subject of controversy, ascribing a specific epoch of history to these processes is difficult to the point of near subjectivity. That concession being made, I conceptualize globalization as a distinctly modern phenomenon born out of the post-Cold War internationalization of previously fragmented regions of the world. Far from putting an end to conflict, the emergence of the United States as the unipolar hegemon in the international system has paradoxically constructed the overarching system of the international while contributing to its negative externalities through its endless pursuit of capital accumulation.²

Globalization is a multi-faceted process of social, political, and economic integration driven by state and non-state actors alike in their pursuit of material gain, unleashing potentially devastating reactionary forces as a byproduct of its inherently uneven development. The resurgence of populism, and to some extent conservatism in the West within the neoliberal global trade system is a simple conclusion to draw from the complicated repercussions that a truly globalized world produces. In its lengthy treatise on the state of global democracy, *The Economist* acknowledges globalization’s role in these changes, arguing “globalisation has changed national politics profoundly. National politicians have surrendered ever more power, for example over trade and financial flows, to global markets and supranational bodies, and may thus find that they are unable to keep promises they have made to voters. International organisations such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organisation and the European Union have extended their influence.”³

What is glaringly missing in this diagnosis is the role of one nation’s politicians in diluting the powers of the individual state: the United States of America. In playing a reduced role in the specific development of regions that do not offer inherent economic value, the nation-state and the United States in particular have systemically reinforced the exploitative nature of

¹ Daalder, Ivo H. and Lindsay, James M. 2003. “The Globalization of Politics: American Foreign Policy for a New Century”. <http://www.cfr.org/world/globalization-politics-american-foreign-policy-new-century/p6330>.

² Robinson, William. 2007. “Beyond the Theory of Imperialism: Global Capitalism and the Transnational State.”

³ *The Economist*. 2017. “What’s Gone Wrong with Democracy?” March 2017.

<http://www.economist.com/news/essays/21596796-democracy-was-most-successful-political-idea-20th-century-why-has-it-run-trouble-and-what-can-be-do?fsrc=scn%2Ffb%2Fte%2Fbl%2Fed%2Fdemocracy>.

North-South relations. The U.S. has ‘paved the way’ for global integration, but until it acquiesces its global dominance in favor of a truly international body tasked with the responsible integration of global economic integration, globalization will continue to be a force that harnesses a dichotomy of harmonious and chaotic forces of change. Before the negative externalities of these processes can be discussed meaningfully, the distinctive policy goals of the United States in recent years must be taken into consideration.

The U.S. did not establish itself as the unipolar hegemony in the world system simply through its emergence from World War Two as an industrial juggernaut nor through its ideological and economic victory over communism in the following decades. These defining events rather ‘set the stage’ for globalization, actualized particularly through the policy actions of the Clinton administration. While Clinton would prefer to be remembered through his support of the international and development of world trade, the true legacy of the administration is found in shaping world institutions to serve the interests of the United States. As Walter LaFeber pointed out somewhat critically, “the actual Clinton Doctrine that will be remembered... [is] the doctrine embodying his policies to batter down barriers to U.S. trade and especially investment. Certainly Clinton was more consistent and successful in maintaining this particular doctrine, notably in his fights to complete the North American Free Trade Act, help establish the World Trade Organization (WTO), and work to bring China into the WTO.” These economic successes and resulting homogenization of capital in terms of trade and investment obscured the dangers of the subjective nature of capitalist investment. While the U.S. focused on developing regions such as Southeast Asia, much of Africa and the Middle East that was not oil rich was all but ignored. Embassies and military bases were closed while aid was slowly shuttered to these regions in need of basic infrastructural development in favor of nations that showed more promise, typically defined in terms of political stability.

Francis Fukuyama’s famous essay *The End of History* is a uniquely appropriate example of the promise of the dominance of both the United States and liberal democracy in terms of its potential for bettering the world. While it is often pointed to as overly idealistic in the wake of the considerable reactionary forces to liberalization, Fukuyama’s acknowledgement of the potential consequences of ideological dominance on the world stage are as poignant as ever. Mr. Fukuyama writes simply: “The end of history will be a very sad time. The struggle for recognition, the willingness to risk one's life for a purely abstract goal, the worldwide ideological struggle that called forth daring, courage, imagination, and idealism, will be replaced by economic calculation, the endless solving of technical problems, environmental concerns, and the satisfaction of sophisticated consumer demands.”¹ The postwar idealism that spawned ambitious world-building efforts such as the Marshall Plan have given way to international agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, ensuring lower rates of interest and exchange while being driven by technocrats. Instead of coordination between allies in order to help vulnerable nations, the new international initiatives are focused around the mutual increase in capital and investment among capitalists. The result is a general disregard for the nations existing on the periphery of capitalist development, lacking either the resources or infrastructural stability to facilitate the exchange of capital.

¹ Fukuyama, Francis. 1989. “The End of History?” <https://ps321.community.uaf.edu/files/2012/10/Fukuyama-End-of-history-article.pdf>.

In terms of ideology, the relative dominance of neoliberalism as the dominant idea of trade has produced a philosophical resistance to Westernization, particularly in the largely conservative Islamic nations of the world. These very same nations that were ignored as candidates for capital investment on the basis of stability in turn resist the cultural homogenization of globalization, manifesting these economic dislocations through their cultural backlashes against globalizations ‘westernizing’ tendencies in the form of terrorism. Fukuyama’s ideological assertion is very much Western-centric and does not consider largely ignored regions like the Middle East, featuring many nations whose economic and cultural ideologies can often be very different and in a state of conflict. The United States did the same, and in ignoring these nations unleashed a reactionary force in the form of terrorism that exists as a manifestation of globalizations tendency to develop regions unevenly.

Although international bodies such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and World Bank have resources allocated to the development of poor nations, their primary operations are still inextricably tied to the will of the United States. These international bodies do far more to regulate the rules of global investment than allow a viable medium for underdeveloped nations to end the miserable cycle of poverty. The United States exerts enormous influence in dictating global affairs through these bodies, a reality evident in its status as the World Bank’s largest shareholder and ownership of a highly coveted seat on the United Nations Security Council.¹ Rather than preside over the course of geopolitical affairs from this lofty position, the U.S. has done more to allow individual capitalists and corporations’ dictate the flow of capital more than anything else.

As articulated by the Marxist scholar William Robinson, “transnationally-oriented capitalists, state managers and other elites have in recent years attempted to transform existing international institutions, to create new transnational ones, and to operate through transnational institutional networks to construct a supranational legal and regulatory system for the global economy and to manage the contradictions of global capitalism—efforts that they accelerated in the wake of the late 2008 global financial meltdown.”² The resulting chaos of a global system predicated on neoliberal systems of commerce perpetuated by a hegemony exhibiting its ‘soft power’ or influence creates this crisis of capitalism. Transnational capitalists driving the flow of trade and investment hinder the ability of the world to develop evenly and allow the periphery of nations to be ignored, generating violent reactionary forces in the form of terrorism or civil war. In doing so, these nations reinforce the cultural biases engrained through centuries of exploitation in the form of slavery and imperialism. Without a truly impartial international body to regulate these global power structures, the legacy of colonialism and general exploitation of the nations of the global ‘South’ will continue unabated.³

Such a bleak prognosis is not without hope. The United States role as the world’s sole hegemony is a unique opportunity to wield its immense influence to the idealism and world-building reminiscent of generations past. Instead of merely facilitating the competition of transnational capitalists, the U.S. must acquiesce crucial levers of power to allow trade to flow

¹ Daalder, Ivo H. and Lindsay, James M. 2003. “The Globalization of Politics: American Foreign Policy for a New Century.”

² Robinson, William. 2007. “Beyond the Theory of Imperialism: Global Capitalism and the Transnational State.”

³ Ibid.

free from its undue influence in the form of independent capitalists always taking precedence over developmental concerns. A truly difficult task, such a shift necessitates the United States total commitment, as "...promoting an international order based on market democracies will require the United States to lead as well as listen, to give as well as take...multilateralism can produce a modern day Kellogg-Briand Treaty just as easily as it produces a Gulf War coalition or a World Trade Organization."¹ The U.S. has the infrastructural and technological resources to give aid to the nations that need it most to end their chronic instability and violence at a level disproportionate to the losses it would sustain in the economic realm. For the world to move towards a truly international community, the United States must allow globalizations fundamental processes of modernization to progress in a more organic manner.

¹ Daalder, Ivo H. and Lindsay, James M. 2003. "The Globalization of Politics: American Foreign Policy for a New Century."

Frostbite: The Cold War and its Globalizing Effects

Sahar Iqbal

The global political arena had transformed after the end of the Cold War in 1991. Several repercussions of this proxy war ensued, such as economic and territorial border disputes between Russia and its Eastern European counterparts. Countries like Ukraine possess a historical yet frustrating tie with this powerful country, making it difficult to claim independence from Russia. Despite Ukraine's struggle against Russia, the United States, the world's current hegemon, supported its independence after the Soviet Union had dissolved in 1991. The U.S seeks integrate it successfully within the "Euro-Atlantic Structure".¹ Russia, on the other hand, desires to maintain close relations with Ukraine in order to incorporate it within Russian's own version of the Euro-Atlantic Structure. President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin has expressed a strong interest in maintaining relations with Ukraine so that it may be incorporated within the "Eurasian Union".² To put it simply, the western demographic of Ukraine, favors that their country be more aligned with Western Europe than maintain a close relationship with Russia³. This internal division has sparked a series of violent protests that further contributes to the complexities of Eastern European politics. The United States continuously aids Ukraine in hopes of it blossoming into a strong democratic nation and as a way to combat Russian influence over other countries. The Cold War may be over, but the U.S and Russia continue to play tug-a-war with different countries to maintain their spheres of influence.

The tension between Ukraine, Russia, and the United States would not be made possible without the effects of globalization. This recent phenomenon allows for countries to be interconnected through the means of the internet by exchanging ideas with ease. Mainstream social media has been a significant platform for these ideas, however, it is also utilized as a means to heighten political conflict through the distribution of propaganda and malicious hacking. Within the early twentieth century, the American people had limited access to discover recent political events. The internet allows news sources are able to upload updated information about events occurring worldwide. The propaganda against communism does not have the same magnitude of effect it once did since the internet can be easily accessible for anyone. The internet encourages the public to think for themselves by allowing there to be a wide variety of resources, however, this does not stop the stigma of communism and the prejudice regarding Russia; the majority of Americans are still shivering from the aftermath of the Cold War. Spheres of influence that were established within the 1960s are clearly still present today since the proxy war between communism and capitalism continue. Russia and the United States continue to carve up the global pie, attempting to add Ukraine as a novelty slice.

Russia yearns to maintain a relation with Ukraine is related to the historical ties between both countries. Several czars in the 19th century had attempted to crush Ukrainian nationalism by

¹ Menendez, Robert. "S.2828 - 113th Congress (2013-2014): Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014." Congress.gov. N.p., 11 Dec. 2014. Web. 30 Mar. 2017.

² Business Insider

³ NPR

referring to this country as “little Russia” and extinguishing any movements that endorsed independence from Russia¹. It was not until 1991 where 90% of the Ukrainian population had voted to leave the decaying empire that used to be the Soviet Union.² Unfortunately, the Ukrainians still did not earn their independence due to the political chaotic event of the Orange Revolution. In the aftermath of the 2010 election, Viktor Yushchenko won in which his presidency is most notable for “canceling a trade deal with the European Union” since his candidacy was supported by Russia.³ This angered the Ukrainian people since entering the EU would enable them to have more involvement with Western European’s more “modern and productive economies”.⁴ Since the early centuries, Ukraine has had a complex and peculiar relationship with Russia where Ukraine is on the brink of gaining independence, however, Russia is persistent in keeping Ukraine in its proximity and sphere of influence. Ukraine was recently yet again in the midst of political turmoil in which the U.S gladly assisted in order to take Ukraine from the firm grasp of Russia.

The United States has a bilateral economic relationship with Ukraine, vowing to financially aid Ukraine during any political hardship. Within 2014, the Ukraine Freedom Support Act was issued, outlining the conditions the U.S will undergo in aiding Ukraine. The main purpose of this act was to “restore [Ukraine’s] sovereignty” and to deter Russian aggression from further “destabilizing and invading Ukraine”.⁵ Senator Robert Menendez, a ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued a statement that outlined the provisions of what this act entailed. Due to the ongoing havoc by “Russian supported forces”, the legislation demanded the President should impose a sanction on Russia’s energy and financial sector. Senator Menendez strongly urged Obama to “provide Ukraine with the weapons it needs” in order to properly defend itself from Russian intervention.⁶ The American public clearly sees the U.S government as a liberating force for Ukraine. The downside of this knowledge is that it reinforces the image of Russia as a “red nation” where the U.S is continuously undermining its power in order to bring forth “freedom” to those oppressed under Russia’s strict regime. Although globalization has allowed the majority of people to be educated on both sides of the issues occurring, the stigma against communism is still prominent within the American political atmosphere.

The tension between the United States and Russia escalated in 2016 when the U.S continuously imposed more sanctions on Russia. The U.S Department of Treasury had announced that the U.S remains committed to “maintain sanctions until Russia implements its commitments under the Minsk agreement”.⁷ The sanctions were placed to continue conveying

¹ Bates, Theunis. “Ukraine’s Frught Relationship with Russia: A Brief History.” The Week - All You Need to Know about Everything That Matters. N.p., 08 Mar. 2014.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Curran, John. “Russian-Ukrainian Conflict Explained.” The Huffington Post. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 06 Mar. 2014.

⁵ Menendez, Robert. “S.2828 - 113th Congress (2013-2014): Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014.” Congress.gov. N.p., 11 Dec. 2014.

⁶ Staff. “2015: U.S.-Ukraine Relations: Support at a Time of War.” The Ukrainian Weekly. N.p., 22 Jan. 2016.

⁷ Press Center. U.S. Department of the Treasury. N.p., 1 Sept. 2016.

America's solidarity with Ukraine in supporting its sovereignty and its "territorial integrity".¹ Even before 2014, former Vice President, Joseph R. Biden Jr., had stated that the U.S will continue to support Ukraine's interest in joining NATO (North Atlantic Trade Organization) despite Russia's objections.² The United State's relationship with Russia has proved to be incompatible ever since the Cold War. These two super powers are continuing to compete for territories to place them under their influence.

The internet has played a significant role in the midst of this political turmoil. Internet users within Russia have utilized the internet as a platform to promote propaganda against Ukraine, manipulating images of their military to make it appear monstrous.³ Unknown users have intercepted a phone conversation that was between the U.S Assistant Secretary of State as well as the U.S ambassador to Ukraine. The purpose was to "discredit Western policy" and to promote their exploitative power.⁴ Technology is a powerful mechanism utilized within the modern era, however, it is highly vulnerable to manipulation. Globalization has allowed for news to spread rapidly, however, like social media posts, it can be heavily manipulated. For instance, there was a false news story perpetuating propaganda, accusing the Ukrainian military for torturing a 3-year-old boy. This information had circulated on Russian television, however several Russian journalists discovered that the story was fabricated.⁵ The internet can be an excellent way to rapidly circulate information, however, the effect of spreading news can fall victim to propaganda and even internet hacking. Having access to this information in order to analyze the relationship between Russia and Ukraine can place the public at an advantageous position. Albeit this knowledge is helpful, the internet can transform the political arena into a game of chess where hacking and the spreading of false news can be spread quicker than ever before.

The effects of the Cold War have left both the United States and Russia stuck in a blizzard. The two spheres of influence such as communism and capitalism have marked their territories and still aim to bring countries under their control. Ukraine, for instance, is a country that has suffered several border disputes, continuously struggling for independence from Russia. The two global spheres of influence continuously promote their ideas of how a society and economy should function, continuously imposing their political agenda onto Ukraine. Social media and the circulation of news plays a vital part in the political arena. Globalization is a significant phenomenon utilized as a way to exchange ideas, however, it can leave each country, such as the U.S, Russia, and Ukraine vulnerable to virtual attacks. The Cold Way may be over, however, a virtual proxy war that utilizes the internet as its battleground.

¹ Ibid.

² Barry, Ellen. "Biden Says U.S. Still Backs Ukraine in NATO." The New York Times. The New York Times, 21 July 2009.

³ Ionatamishvili, Elina Lange, and Sanda Svetoka. "Strategic Communications and Social Media in the Russia Ukraine Conflict." Strategic Communications and Social Media in the Russia Ukraine Conflict | StratCom.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

A Reexamination of Global Media as a Revolutionary Tool

Jessica Kirchner

Globalization has been thought of as the ever-expanding network of connections between countries, through which trade, culture, and information travel. It's propelled by everything from tourism to television, and it binds us ever closer to rest of the world. As one of the primary means of globalized communication, social media has played a major role; more than 1 billion people are logged onto Facebook, and sites like Twitter and Snapchat grow worldwide every day. Social media grants people the ability to observe what's happening in the world in real time. However, to paint the role of social media in globalization as entirely positive would be to overlook one of the most tremendous calamities of our time: the Syrian revolution. Although the spread of social media aided the coup in Egypt, in Syria it created unrealistic expectations for the protestors and pressured the Bashar al-Assad to crack down on dissent. The idea of social media as an asset to revolutionaries during the Arab Spring was not much more than a myth in the Syrian context, and in fact persists as an element that perpetuates the ongoing conflict in Syria today.

The Arab Spring sprouted in Syria in early 2011, as citizens nonviolently took to the streets in a statement of opposition to Assad.¹ After seeing dictators in Tunisia and Egypt step down after civilian pressure, dissidents in Syria saw an opportunity to push back against the authoritarian Assad regime.² Activists within the country shared videos of Assad's repression, and used sites like Facebook to organize mass protests. The country plunged into chaos, and is now a fragmented battleground hosting a number of different factions fighting for and against the regime. The utter disorder and escalating violence has pushed millions of Syrians out of their homes and into international limbo, and the global community has taken notice. People have changed their profile pictures, shared videos, posted statuses across social media calling attention to the chaos in Syria. However, the same tactics and tools that aided Egyptian protesters have done little for their Syrian counterparts.

When the Egyptian revolution began in the streets of Cairo, social media was a dependable asset. According to the Pew Research Center, the networks online acted as a haven for free speech in Egypt, and were critical in mobilizing activists.³ The Muslim Brotherhood and similarly well-organized opposition groups had always been a thorn in the side of Mubarak, so they were able to move quickly once the revolution arrived.⁴ The freedom provided by Facebook, Twitter, and other websites allowed Mubarak's opponents to expand their network of dissent, reaching further than before.⁵ However, as the United States Institute of Peace has

¹ Gilsinan, K. (2015, October 29). The Confused Person's Guide to the Syrian Civil War. *The Atlantic*.

² Ibid.

³ Rosenstiel, T., & Mitchell, A. (2012, November 28). *Arab-American Media* [Scholarly project]. In *The Pew Research Center*.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

pointed out, the main goal of social media in Egypt was to spread information outside of the country's borders.¹ Protestors online were trying to share videos, pictures, and posts to get the attention of outside actors; they were trying to propel their struggles onto the global stage.

The Egyptians succeeded—their media spread to neighboring nations, including Syria. While the activists in Syria were logging onto the same sites as those in Egypt, they had an entirely different experience. Syrians watched from abroad as Egyptian protesters were able to organize and force Mubarak out of office in what seemed to be a matter of months. This was one of the greatest deceptions that social media relayed to the Syrian people—that dictators are easily overcome. The optimistic and simplified narrative in the media pouring out of Egypt gave the Syrian activists a false hope that they could remove Assad from office by sharing videos and going “viral.”² Bashar al-Assad is one of the most brutal dictators in the contemporary political arena: his father was Hafez al-Assad, the Syrian autocrat behind the massacre of 10,000 civilians in Hama in 1982.³ Assad grew up as the son of a strict dictator, and went on to follow in his father's footsteps. Unlike in Egypt, there had never been an established political opposition to any Assad establishment in Syria.⁴ Dissent had never been tolerated, and the videos of the revolution in Egypt caused the Syrian people to underestimate the strength of the Assad regime. As explained by Erica Chenoweth with Foreign Policy,

“It was easy for activists in those countries to watch the Arab Spring unfold in Tunisia and Egypt and conclude that, if they assembled masses of people in public squares, they too could topple their dictators in a matter of days.” (2016)

Social media created an Egyptian fairy-tale, and a gravely mistaken Syrian society thought that they could write their own story, as well.

Not only did online networks paint too optimistic a picture for the Syrian people, social media, and Facebook especially, fostered an environment of “clicktivism.” Users across the globe were misled into thinking that their online participation translated into actual impact.⁵ The Facebook page “Syrian Revolution” had 10,000 likes, but only 35% of the users were actually Syrians on the ground, and it was run by a man in Sweden.⁶ It was this kind of pseudo-mobilization that made social media users feel that there was greater momentum in Syria than what actually existed. There were Facebook events created, with thousands of RSVP's, but when the time came for the protests against Assad to materialize, the streets were left empty. Instead of social media being used to rally the effort for revolution, it diverted dissent towards ineffective means—equating changing a profile picture to showing up for an actual march.

The double-edged sword of social media is that it's almost entirely public, which makes

¹ Ibid.

² Alkousaa, R. (2016, December 04). How Facebook hurt the Syrian Revolution. Al-Jazeera.

³ MacFarquhar, N. (2000, June 11). Hafez al-Assad, Who Turned Syria Into a Power in the Middle East, Dies at 69. *The New York Times*

⁴ Rosenstiel, T., & Mitchell, A. (2012, November 28). *Arab-American Media* [Scholarly project]. In *The Pew Research Center*.

⁵ Alkousaa, R. (2016, December 04). How Facebook hurt the Syrian Revolution. Al-Jazeera.

⁶ Ibid.

it incredibly difficult to control the audience a post or a video's recipient. As Bashar al-Assad watched his counterparts in Tunisia and Egypt crumble under the weight of mass upheaval, he was likely pushed to tighten his own regime in defense. In the beginning of the 2011 Arab Spring, Assad seemed to have loosened the reigns on his power, even suggesting that Syria may need changes in its political and economic thought.¹ However, as the Syrian revolution appeared to gain traction, the Assad regime chose instead to crack down on dissent. The global media coverage flooding out of Egypt and Tunisia likely prompted Bashar al-Assad to reinforce his control of the country, moving farther away from the possibility of negotiation. He saw the houses beside him fall, and decided to bolster his foundation.

Social media not only informed the Assad dictatorship of the chaos across the region, but also provided a running list of opposition members. Facebook pages, like the "Syrian Revolution" site mentioned above, have allowed the Assad regime to have access to information about activists based on the names and interpersonal connections attached to their profile pages, which has helped the government target measures to suppress dissent.² Global social media has changed not only the aspirations and organizational capacity of the protesters, but the behavior of dictators as well.

Websites established in the U.S. enclave of Silicon Valley, such as Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, and Instagram, have expanded across the world as an agent of globalization. Suddenly, billions of people are able to share, post, and comment through a connection that transcends any physical boundaries. Globalization has allowed for an expanding network of human interaction, in which social media plays a huge part. In some cases, global media has facilitated anti-authoritarian uprisings. For the Egyptian revolution, this meant already organized opposition groups could expand their networks and channel collective participation to achieve regime change. However, there are times, like in the Syrian revolution, when the ingredients for globalization turn out to be a recipe for chaos.

As a whole, there can be no definitive statement about whether social media is a positive or negative force. The Egyptian protestors famously rode the tides of globalization to victory, as they used online pictures and video to bolster their cause. There is cause to reconsider embracing social media as a revolutionary asset, however. In Syria, the great tool of social media was used to dismantle the revolution instead. The use of Facebook and Twitter created naive expectations and a false sense of activism, all while pushing Bashar al-Assad to an uncompromising extreme. Viral images and RSVP-counts couldn't bring down a dictator, and sharing posts couldn't save a crumbling nation. An increased flow of ideas and interconnectedness through globalization has actually amounted to suffering for the Syrian people. Betrayed by the illusion of social media revolutions, Syria is experiencing a brutal, seemingly interminable conflict—one that no amount of "likes" may ever fix.

¹ Hu, Z. (2016, October 04). Why Bashar al-Assad is still in power. Al-Jazeera.

² Chenoweth, E. (2016, November 16). How Social Media Helps Dictators.