

## Lecture 12 – December 5

George Monbiot, *The Age of Consent*, ch. 1-4, 7.

1. Previous critics of globalization we have read during the semester argued for a turn to localism as the solution to the perceived ills of the economic openness. What leads Monbiot to argue that the opposite is needed? Which case do you find more persuasive? Or do you find them both fundamentally flawed?
2. At first glance Monbiot and Wolf appear at odds. Yet on closer reading there may be much in common between the two authors. Most importantly Monbiot, like Wolf, prefers democratic institutions to the alternatives, which he argues lead to similarly oppressive outcomes. Do you agree they hold similar philosophical positions? If so, what would you argue is the biggest point of difference between the two authors?
3. Monbiot argues that we must establish a world parliament to manage the democratic deficit inherent in a globalizing economic order. To what degree do you think this would solve the problems he points out with the United Nations? What new problems can you envisage such an institution might give birth to?

Martin Wolf, *Why Globalization Works*, ch. 11.

1. Critics of globalization point out that corporations are increasing their power relative to governments. Wolf dismisses these arguments as both methodologically and substantively inaccurate. What are the errors that he points to? Do you think it is meaningful to compare corporations with governments? If so, which particular characteristics lend themselves to comparison? If not, why not?
2. Naomi Klein, in her bestseller *No Logo*, argued that branding coerces people to consume. In his riposte, Wolf suggests her thesis is profoundly anti-democratic. Do you think his criticism of her ideas is accurate? Is it authoritarian to assert that people do not always act according to their free will, as Wolf suggests?
3. While denying a race to the bottom, Wolf recognizes that increasing opportunities for foreign direct investment change the relative bargaining power of employers and the employed to the benefit of the former. In what ways does their relative bargaining power change? What might be the costs, or benefits, of such change?