Global Governance and Global Convergence:

An Argument for Harmony and Policymaking

David Wolfe Bender

Indiana University

LAMP-L 216

May 3, 2022

Introduction **3**

Economic Prosperity **3**

Is the Traditional View Wrong? 5

Inequality 5

How do we protect workers? 6

The Pandemic Response 7

Is There Even a Choice? 8

Precious Metal Market 8

Oil and Gas 9

Prices Run The World 9

Harmonious Policy **10**

The United Nations 10

Peacekeeping Operations 11

The World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund 12

The European Union: A Global Superpower 12

Cooperative Negotiations 13

The EU’s Real Success Story 14

Why Did Other Globally Governing Institutions Fail? Did They Even Fail? 14

Berlin Conference 14

League of Nations 15

Conclusions 15

Why Does It Matter? 16

Global Governance as a Tool for Problem Solving **16**

Case Study: A Global Price on Carbon 17

The Worldwide Problem 17

The Need for a Global Response 18

Conclusion **19**

Bibliography **20**

Introduction

For years, economists and foreign affairs experts alike assured the American electorate that convergence — of ideas, democracy, product, material, trade, and investment — was the World's future. That belief became the establishment's view of globalism: as economies converged and as agreements and governance formed, the greater good would be served. World-famous economists and commentators — many of whom in the seat of extraordinary power — suggested that poorer, less developed countries, as well as the technologically advanced, elite powers, would all be best served by globalization. David Brooks was just one of those many commentators, but he's since shifted his view. In an April 2022 *New York Times* column, he essentially reversed his view, suggesting "this vision does not describe the world we live in today." Brooks might be right. We live in an increasingly divided, diverging world.

Yet, that doesn't change the fact that we — as a world — face extensive and multifaceted issues that demand an international response; regardless of whether we are or (in Brook's view) are not moving in that direction, we still *need* it to converge. Global convergence, trade liberalization, and global governance must play a significant role in the policymaking surrounding the pivotal international concerns of our time. Engaging in substantial international policy cooperation will enhance economic prosperity, promote harmonious policy, and encourage solutions to major disputes and concerns.

Economic Prosperity

Global convergence and governance is a proven theory through a traditional economics analysis. The long-studied, traditional approach in macroeconomics suggests different economics should specialize its production and engage in international trade in order to maximize its gains. This theory was championed by British economist David Ricardo, whose contributions to economics showed "that two countries could trade to the mutual advantage of each, even if one of them was absolutely better at producing all goods" (O'Rourke et al. 18.5). Ricardo's analysis assumes a world economy limited to two countries and two goods. Modern economists might take great issue with Ricardo's model, disagreeing with the British Member of Parliament's notion that it's at all representative of the world economy at large. Their point holds merit: today's world economy is surely more complex and convoluted than two

countries and two goods. Hundreds of countries compete in the global marketplace, and many of them play by different rules from each other. However, much of Ricardo's model is supported by real-life data. Esteban Ortiz-Ospina, a senior researcher with Our World in Data, published a data series that showed "the available evidence suggests trade liberalization does improve economic efficiency" ("Does trade cause growth?"). In other words, countries, on the whole, gain from trade.

Additionally, the liberalization of trade policy correlates with a decrease in household prices, which benefits consumers in the United States and around the world. An analysis by the World Bank found "the average amount of time US workers have to put in to afford a range of home appliances declined by 70 percent between 1973 and 2009" (Roberts and Lamp 50) The cost of color televisions dropped 84 percent in that time period, for example.

Anthea Roberts and Nicolas Lamp present an argument about the positive long-term effects of globalization, which is strengthened by global governance. For example, they write that "globalization has promoted…technological progress [and] processes that have made most people in the West unfathomably rich by historical standards" (Roberts and Lamp 53-54).

They also write about the disconcerting alternative: protectionism and trade restriction. Protectionist policies, Roberts and Lamp write, are expensive. A series of 21st century American tariffs on China, for example, "cost at least $900,000 per year for each job they saved." It's not limited to the United States, either. Australia spent more than $2 billion to "support [its] automotive sector from 1997 to 2012," and it *still* led to General Motors shutting down its manufacturing facility there (Roberts and Lamp 53).

Is the Traditional View Wrong?

What if the traditional view is still wrong? What if, despite Ortiz-Ospina's data, the traditional approach still is not a satisfactory outcome in regards to trade? Economist Paul Krugman said in a 2019 *Bloomberg* article that the traditional view might be wrong, throwing globalization into question.

Inequality

In the 1990s, economists frequently questioned how the ongoing globalization efforts were affecting inequality in the United States and around the world. This eventually led to a surge of studies and models to answer the question; the general consensus of that research "concluded that trade contributed little to rising inequality" (Krugman). In the long run, Krugman admits, the 1990 consensus may be accurate. However, the short-run decline in certain communities and among a certain class of workers created harsh realities. The prophecy from Billy Joel's "Allentown" (1982) sang true in many manufacturing communities in the United States: manufacturing employees lost their jobs, unions struggled, pensions fell flat, structural unemployment threw people into poverty, and the weekend vacations to the Jersey Shore stopped. Krugman writes that those "large and persistent" effects were the consequence of "rapid import growth on local labor markets."

Krugman's overall position suggests the hyperglobalization in the mid-1990s caused rapid inequality. In the short term, Krugman is undeniably correct, and the data supports his thesis. While completing his doctorate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston University's Pascual Restrepo writes that "Structural change causes temporary but long-lasting unemployment" (3). Restrepo's research suggests that, without retraining, unskilled workers will suffer through extended unemployment or receive lower wages. This is the result of a skill mismatch for structurally unemployed workers, which is exacerbated in "recessions and in labor markets where the demand for goods and services is depressed" (1).

The long-term gain, however, must be emphasized and respected. Short-term losses are often necessary for long-term gains, even in an economic sense. Technological advances are frequent and benefit the masses overall in the long term. The long-term loss for blue-collar workers in the United States, for example, could be just as much or more an issue of domestic policy as it was an issue of foreign trade policy. An Our World in Data study tracked the share of pre-transfer and pre-tax total income for the top one percent of earners in two different country baskets (Ortiz-Opsina, "Is trade a major driver of income inequality?"). One basket was made up of five English-speaking countries (USA, United

Kingdom, Canada, Ireland, and Australia), and the other basket was made up of five non-English-speaking countries (France, Japan, Spain, Netherlands, and Denmark). The data showed diverging trends. The English-speaking countries follow a U-shaped path, eventually returning to the high income share of post-World War I and pre-World War II policy. However, "this did not happen in the continental[, non-English-speaking] European countries or Japan" (Ortiz-Opsina, "Is trade a major driver of income inequality?"). During that period, trade increased. These trends in inequality cannot be isolated to trade policy; the domestic policy — from personal income taxes and capital gains taxes to corporate regulation — of President Ronald Wilson Reagan, President George Herbert Walker Bush, or British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher also affected these trends in inequality. Too often do economists or politicians immediately blame trade policy for these shifts, likely because it is politically convenient to do so (see: President Donald Trump's 2016 suggestion that his proposed wall bordering Mexico could be paid via a border tax) (Horsley). However, these problems are often more complex and deserve a more complex analysis. Short-term concerns in inequality can be solved through domestic policy — whether it be retraining programs for structurally unemployed workers or direct transfer payments for unemployed workers in recessions. The fundamental concept remains true that the increase in globalization and economic trade will eventually have a positive effect on economic growth in the long term.

How do we protect workers?

Of course, Krugman's point is not without merit: trade liberalization does mean that some workers will, in the short term, be forced out of work due to structural unemployment. But a full review of the record suggests protectionism just delays the inevitable — as was the case when General Motors pulled out of Australia "despites decades of subsidies" from the Australian government (Roberts and Lamp 53).

The best path toward solving this inequality is through domestic policy. The leaders of G20 countries agree. At a 2016 summit, they declared that trade liberalization and free trade "must be…accompanied by appropriate domestic policies to ensure that benefits are widely distributed" (Roberts and Lamp 53).

One example of those domestic policies include job retraining programs, some of which have found limited success in the United States. For example, the Appalachian Regional Commission — an economic development partnership between states and the federal government — holds a job retraining program to get former coal workers into high-tech jobs (Becker). That President Obama-era program garnered controversy from the conservative *Daily Signal* after not providing enough jobs for all of the individuals who enrolled in the program (Bolar). However, despite its faults, the template likely seems to be a strong path forward. Gregory Ferenstein, a Brookings Institution researcher, wrote in 2019 the United States needs to invest in "more experimentation to discover ways to update our workforce education system" before advancing that national reform.

Put simply, domestic policy is the path toward solving the inequality byproduct of the necessary free trade process.

The Pandemic Response

Opponents to globalization also point to the COVID-19 pandemic to suggest the establishment narrative is misguided; however, the argument leaves out how much better the world could have responded to COVID-19 had it *embraced* global governance. In addition to the deadly virus, the pandemic also imported a great deal of criticism of globalization and its economic value. Some commentators used the effects of the pandemic to suggest globalism poses a substantial threat to the United States economy and the world economy at large.

Wall Street Journal writer Greg Ip said the retreat from globalization can be attributed to the supply chain issues associated with the pandemic. Due to the "integration of production across and within borders, consumers have come to expect infinite variety, instantly available. That is now under siege. The supply-chain crisis of 2021 is fueling the retreat from globalization, much as the global financial crisis of 2008 did" (Ip). This wasn't unpredictable. In August 2020, professors Peter Enderwick and Peter J. Buckley suggested "the current globalization wave [would] transform into a stronger regional focus as a result of underlying weaknesses in globalization" (108).

The world could have benefited, however, from a global response to COVID-19. This was less an American problem than a Chinese one: if China had been upfront with the World Health Organization (WHO) — a major globally governing organization — about the origins of the pandemic, perhaps the international response to the virus would've been better (Miller et al.). Instead, China let other countries figure it out on their own, forcing everyone to lose.

Even so, there were also some positive effects of globalization to the pandemic. Many of the G7 countries used their vaccine supply to donate to less developed countries (Afesorgbor et al.). By June 2021, the G7 countries promised to donate one billion vaccines to poorer countries in an attempt to spur worldwide economic growth (Lee and Morton).

Is There Even a Choice?

The variety of economic failures, such as the rapid inflation in 2022 or the frequent shortages in the post-COVID-19 world suggested to some that globalization should be stripped away. But it begs the question: do we even have much of a choice about whether to embrace global market convergence? The reality exists that there are frequent situations in which there is no real choice but to trade.

Precious Metal Market

More than half of the world's rare earth mineral reserves are held in Russia or China, according to the U.S. Geological Survey (Chen). Those minerals are used in car motors, car batteries, computers, wind turbines, cell phones, and military equipment. Many of those items were either facing a shortage or facing high demand in 2022; many of them are also crucial to daily life. China's equipment also delivers "most of the world's processing capacity and supplied 80% of the rare [earth minerals] imported by the United States from 2014 to 2017." Additionally, the country produced 81% of the world's rare earth mineral supply in 2017 (Scheyder et al.).

Oil and Gas

Oil and gas is another sector where trade is a necessity for modern economies. The top five producers of oil are the United States, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Canada, and China. The top five consumers are the United States, China, India, Japan, and Russia (U.S. Energy and Information Administration). The

economy in the United States, however, is not driven by oil; the American Petroleum Institute, the petroleum industry's own trade association, says oil makes up eight percent of the United States' gross domestic product. To the contrary, Russia's oil industry makes up more than half its exports (Chon). Additionally, the United States' consumption outdoes its production by almost two million gallons each day, meaning the United States *needs* to trade in order to consume the country's market equilibrium of oil (the market efficient amount). Put simply, the United States needs market convergence and trade liberalization in order to effectively and efficiently run its economy. If the United States wishes to meet its consumer equilibrium at a given demand, there is a good shot that its own production will not be enough supply.

Prices Run The World

Finally, while global challenges can present threats to global prices, economic globalism and global governance help make products cheaper for American consumers. If every country produces to its best, "they raise output…, raise productivity, create more jobs, raise wages, and *lower prices of products in the world economy*" (Gopinath and Parker). The general decrease in prices of products is a crucial factor in decision making for Americans. A PhD candidate and a researcher at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business tested how much more Americans would be willing to pay for products produced domestically rather than overseas. They concluded that American consumers will indeed spend more money on products manufactured in the United States, but "the amount they're willing to pay is not enough to get companies to invest in domestic production" (Nelson). The findings suggest price is a very important piece of the decision making equation for consumers, implying that market convergence and trade liberalization should be expanded and developed.

Harmonious Policy

The creation and preservation of treaties and organizations promote consequential, harmonious, and peaceful foreign policy. Multinational organizations are critical to global governance. They create the framework for productive conversation and problem solving. For the last 80 years, in particular, these

organizations have played a major role in peacemaking efforts and arguably have prevented the breakout of a third full-scale international military conflict.

The United Nations

In the aftermath of World War II, the global community's response to the destruction reflected a call for history to never again repeat itself; it was a call for peace that still somewhat exists today. The global community decided — and rightfully so — to reject genocide and protect human rights, for example: Holocaust survivors, recently liberated by American soldiers, left the Buchenwald concentration camp and "displayed signs stating 'never again' in the various languages they spoke" (Popescu and Shult 135). In April 1945, those survivors pledged that "Building a new world of peace and freedom is our goal" (Buchenwald and Mittelbau-Dora Memorials Foundation).

Meanwhile, world leaders clamored over how to reconstruct Europe, whose decimated economy was a result of "Large amounts of physical capital [being] destroyed through six years of ground battles and bombing" (Kesternich et al. 103). The United States responded in 1948 with the Marshall Plan, an economic outreach program that sent "over $12 billion for the rebuilding of Western Europe" (U.S. Department of State, "Marshall Plan, 1948"). The plan was fairly limited, "amounting to a modest 2 percent of GDP of recipient countries" (Rohac 26).

Years before that, however, came the greatest feat in post-World War II foreign policy: the creation of the United Nations, the successor to the failed League of Nations. The United Nations' directive was based on the tenets outlined in the Atlantic Charter, a 1941 joint declaration between the United States' Franklin D. Roosevelt and the United Kingdom's Winston Churchill. The document specified goals for a post-war world, some of which included the "liberalization of international trade" and "international labor, economic, and welfare standards" (U.S. Department of State, ""The Atlantic Conference & Charter, 1941")

What Roosevelt and Churchill proposed is a form of global governance — a set of standards and rules that the world would play by. In turn, those rules, they hoped, would promote peace and democracy.

Peacekeeping Operations

The United Nations became the representation of that international governing system. Since its founding in 1945, the UN has played an active, decisive role in peacekeeping across the globe. The United Nations Department of Peace Operations manages the UN's peacekeeping operations, whose goal is to "assist host countries navigate the difficult path from conflict to peace." The peacekeeping operations are also a global partnership, a "combined effort to maintain international peace and security" (United Nations, "What is Peacekeeping").

The UN's peacekeeping operations have expanded as well. According to the DPO, there are 12 active peacekeeping missions across the world currently (United Nations, "Where we operate"); additionally, the number of forces increased 500% in the 30 years between 1981 and 2021 (Our World in Data, "Total size of United Nations peacekeeping forces").

Peacekeeping efforts show a path toward harmonious policy, and without global governance, it wouldn't be possible or effective. The DPO is a partnership between UN member countries via the General Assembly and the UN's Security Council, two governing groups in the UN.

Ironically, the UN is often criticized as being ineffective because its "system has never grown into a world government in any sense of the term," nor does it look as if it wishes to do so (Rohac 24). However, if you accept the "peacekeeping [program] has played a helpful role" in a system that is — at best — ineffective, just imagine how effective it would be in a system that *is* effective.

The World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund

The United Nations frequently engages in economic policy, which creates a set of standards for trade, for example. The World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund are both specialized agencies within the United Nations (United Nations, "UN System"). The World Trade Organization creates a "forum for governments to negotiate trade agreements" or "settle trade disputes." The WTO led to major changes in trade policy, its best contribution being "the idea of nondiscrimination, which has become a basic principle of trade policy applied globally" (Rohac 71). Nondiscrimination

prevents countries from applying different regulatory or legal standards to domestic and foreign goods; additionally, governments cannot “discriminate between importance from different countries” (Rohac 71).

The International Monetary Fund was “conceived as a watchdog of the monetary and exchange rate policies vital to global markets” (Masters et al). By 2022, nearly every country in the world is a member of the IMF, and it increased trade liberalization and removed transaction barriers and costs, such as price controls.

The European Union: A Global Superpower

In 2003, Arihant Jain and Russell Kizor of Stanford University said the European Union was an “emerging international superpower,” the policies of which would “change the global economic landscape forever one way or the other” (2). Nearly two decades later, the European Union is no longer an emerging superpower; they *are* an international superpower.

Like the United Nations, the European Union formed in the aftermath of World War II. The Treaty of Paris (1951) established the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which was later inserted as a part of the European Community (previously the European Economic Community). Future treaties — such as the Treaty of Rome (1958) and Treaty of Maastricht (1993) — formalized and further integrated the European Community into what the world now sees as the EU.

The EU created common policy in many areas including agriculture, fishing, production, and economic development; its most consequential policy area was trade. It standardized many regulations between member states so the products produced in France would be at the same standard as that of Italy. Before the EU, “each country in the European Union developed its own standards through its national standards body, leading to differing and conflicting standards, laws, and conformity assessment procedures” (International Trade Administration). Those policies have “greatly simplified technical regulations amongst” European countries, according to the United States’s International Trade Administration (International Trade Administration).

Those trade policies have led to overwhelming financial success in Europe. In 2020, the more than $17 trillion in gross domestic product generated by the European Union member states represented

18 percent of global GDP, despite the combined population of the member states only making up six percent of the global population (International Monetary Fund).

Cooperative Negotiations

Each European Union member state is relatively small compared to the world powers of the United States and China, economically speaking. Only four of the ten countries with the highest gross domestic product are European, and only three of them are in the European Union (the United Kingdom officially left the EU in 2020) (International Monetary Fund; The Government of Netherlands). Additionally, the economic output of Germany — the European country with the highest GDP — is dwarfed by the United States, the output which is six times larger. If each EU member state needed to negotiate trade agreements with every country across the world, each country would have substantially less bargaining power in negotiations. It would also be a hassle, with all 27 member states — many of which are economic forces — having to negotiate deals individually with the rest of the economic world.

Instead, they all negotiate together. European Union member states negotiate their trade policies with non-European countries as a group, strengthening their position (European Parliament). The EU takes a similar approach with the United Nations; the EU holds permanent observer status (and France holds a permanent seat on the Security Council) (EU Observer). When the G7 countries meet for its yearly conference, there are, in reality, eight representatives present; the European Union's Commission President and Council President are both present to represent the European Union (European Commission).

The EU's Real Success Story

The European Union's real success story lies not in the economic dominance of its collective, standardized trade policy but in the unity it brought to Europe. There has not been a major military conflict between the member nations of the European Union since its inception. In fact, it has increased the cooperation between countries, constantly formulating multinational alliances and agreements.

The EU also found a way to transcend the ubiquitous cultural differences across European countries, whether it be differences in language, domestic policy, racial demographics, or economic

prowess. Despite those differences, the EU's border policy — allowing the free flow of travel between member states — promotes an ideology of "one continent, one market force." It also improves and cultivates relations between member states, a constructive tool for stimulating peace.

Why Did Other Globally Governing Institutions Fail? Did They Even Fail?

In the grand scheme of world events, both the United Nations and the European Union are relatively new. They were both established in a post-World War II world order. There were, however, various treaties and organizations that predated the UN and the EU that did not find the same success as the two organizations.

Berlin Conference

Sometimes referred to as the beginning of globalization, the Berlin Conference saw European and western superpowers essentially carving up Africa into territories. The territories in Africa were targets for European powers because of the demand for raw materials and luxury resources, such as ivory, timber, diamonds, and rubber. Additionally, Africa's specific location was strategically important to Europeans; its proximity to the Middle East and Europe made it a valuable asset for international and domestic trade.

The Berlin Conference is controversial — and rightfully so. Intentionally, "Africa had no seat at the Berlin table" (Gwaambuka). The conference and subsequent treaties were the kickoff to a series of horrific violations of human rights and a colonial empire that nobody should be proud of. It's understandable why many would view the conference and negotiations as a complete failure of European foreign policy.

However, that view would discount its one success: it *did* prevent a military conflict between European powers in African territories. That conflict never happened, and it surely could have happened without defined borders (this is not to say that anyone should support the Berlin Conference's outcome; the motivations of the western powers and their subsequent human rights violations were intolerable).

The failure in the Berlin Conference really was in the desire to conquer over others and exploit people; the failure was not in its pure existence.

League of Nations

While the League of Nations failed in its mission to promote "collective security, disarmament, or a large worldwide membership," it is important to note its few successes. It did lay the groundwork for the United Nations. The League's structure looked similar to that of the UN, as "the League maintained bureaus, commissions, and bodies dedicated to specific missions such as disease eradication, campaigning against child labor, improving conditions for workers, curtailing human trafficking and the international drug trade, and arguing for women's rights" (National World War II Museum).

The League's failures were not in structure but in execution. While aggressors — like Germany in the 1930s — were violating the League's rules and its authority, the real failure came at the hands of the United Kingdom and France, who "were ignoring the League" (BBC). Instead, they aimed to appease Germany, voiding the already agreed-upon rules of the League.

Conclusions

The analysis of the pre-World War II multinational organizations suggests it was not a failure in globalism but a failure in structure or inaction. Modern examples of strong action and leadership prove that multinational organizations *can* work.

When Russian leader Vladamir Putin invaded Ukraine in 2022, the United States worked quickly with the European Union to snap incredibly harsh sanctions on Russia (The White House, "Fact Sheet"). Some of the more harsh sanctions included "a prohibition on new investment in Russia by U.S. persons wherever located, which will further isolate Russia from the global economy" (The White House, "Fact Sheet").

Additionally, in 2015, the United States worked with European Union leaders — as well as the leaders of China, Japan, Russia, and Germany — to sign the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, colloquially known as the Iran nuclear deal (White House, "Joint Statement")

Put simply, the structure works when the global leaders do exactly what they are meant to do: lead. When countries fall to inaction, that's when the foreign relations of globalism fall apart.

Why Does It Matter?

Multinational organizations — such as the United Nations or the European Union — play a serious role in promoting peace. Whether it be through collective problem solving, trade policy, or economic prowess, these organizations bring countries together and prevent major conflict.

Global Governance as a Tool for Problem Solving

The world faces very serious problems. It could be argued that we are at the juncture for many major policy debates: how are we going to deal with the climate change crisis? What is the right way to deal with rising inequality? How do we solve world hunger? How do we push through a pandemic that will likely become endemic?

The answers to these questions are not simple, and most of them are too complicated for a single country to solve. The climate crisis is a perfect example. Imagine an ideal scenario in which a veto-proof majority of the United States Congress wanted to take action on climate change. Even if that hypothetical pipe dream were true, it would likely not make the sizable dent needed to solve the climate crisis. The United States emits only 14 percent of the world's carbon emissions. While that is a considerable — even dominant — sum, offsetting all five billion tons of the United States' CO2 emissions would not do enough to solve the crisis (Worldometer).

China alone emits almost 30% of the world's emissions. India, Russia, Japan, and Germany combined make up another 17% (Worldometer). Because there are so many countries needed to solve the crisis, it *requires* a global solution. That global solution will have to come through global governance.

Case Study: A Global Price on Carbon

When Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Senator Ed Markey so much as suggested the acceptance of a Green New Deal in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, there were a few different reactions: some responded with ad hominem attacks, and some other politicians cited practical issues with the legislation (Friedman). The most interesting reaction, however, was a rejection of the policy *with* a recognition of the underlying problem.

There were a few congresspeople and commentators who saw the legislation and accepted that something needed to be done about climate change. In 2016, Congresspeople Carlos Curbelo (R) and Ted Deutch (D) created the bipartisan Climate Solutions Caucus (Citizens' Climate Lobby); the Senate version of that caucus followed a few years later (Beitsch). The House Climate Solution Caucus's signature piece of legislation was the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act of 2019, which would've created a carbon pricing and dividend system (United States Congress).

That system is supported by many conservative economists. American Enterprise Institute Senior Fellow Alex Brill wrote in 2019 that a carbon tax system "creates an unhampered incentive for innovation, which could dramatically lower the cost of reducing carbon emissions in the future" (Brill). It's a pro-market policy that would spur innovation and encourage more energy efficient options (Dews). It also means that "producers will pursue newer technologies to supply our electricity demand in a low-carbon fashion" (Brill).

The Worldwide Problem

The biggest barrier to establishing a carbon tax system in the United States is the concern that other countries will not play along and initiate a carbon tax system of their own. China — which emits more CO2 than any other country on the planet — recently created a carbon-pricing mechanism of its own. It "is the world's biggest" of its kind (Nogrady). However, it's been met with a variety of concerns. First, the United States is almost inherently reluctant to trust China if the country were to sign onto any global carbon tax policy. China's "heavy-handed interventions, poor statistics and corruption…will need years to build a market that substantially cuts emissions," according to the *New York Times* (Buckley). Additionally, China's internal carbon market is already drawing some criticism regarding its effectiveness, with experts saying "it might not be ambitious enough to enable China to meet its emissions-reduction goals" (Nogrady).

China isn't the only manufacturing-focused country, either. They also are not the country with the greatest carbon footprint per capita. That title belongs to a variety of primarily Middle Eastern countries that export oil, such as Qatar, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, and Oman (Worldometer).

The Climate Solution Caucus's legislation had a solution to this problem; their legislation would've created a border-adjustment tax that would have placed a tax on imports to make up for the lack of a carbon tax overseas (Pirlot). It also would not encourage domestic companies to produce overseas where they could avoid a carbon tax. The European Union also proposed such a policy in 2021 to "ensure that the price of imports reflect more accurately their carbon content" (European Commission).

The Need for a Global Response

Administering a carbon tax would require a multinational agreement or cooperation. Whether it be through the United Nations or a separate entity, it is the perfect opportunity to regulate commerce between nations in a democratic way.

Whether or not it is feasible, global climate change is going to require a global response. It will take the leadership of the world's major economies — like the United States, the European Union, or China — to bring the world to action. Right now, they are stalled with inaction — the same type of inaction that caused pre-World War II global governance to miserably fail.

American exceptionalism suggests the United States will be the ones to step up, because they are the moral and fiscal leaders of the world. A quickly heating world awaits for them to do so.

Conclusion

The world faces a variety of serious challenges. Climate change is just one of them, and it might be the most serious and threatening. Global governance and global convergence is the key to it all. Nothing is more effective at solving a problem than getting a group of stakeholders together to discuss and debate the issues. The debate of whether global governance is feasible or not must wait for another day; the first step is understanding that it's the best path forward and the most effective way to solve our issues.

In centuries past, our issues were more localized; today, an issue halfway around the world can have a significant effect on the lives of people at home. In an economy and a world that *needs* to be globalized in order to run effectively, we have global problems. Avoiding global solutions will only result

in more strife and conflict. Those global problems deserve a global solution; it’s high time world leaders live up to the challenge.

Bibliography

Afesorgbor, Sylvanus Kwaku, et al. "COVID-19 has shone a light on how globalization can tackle inequality." *The Conversation*, 16 June 2021, https://theconversation.com/covid-19-has-shone-a-light-on-how-globalization-can-tackle-inequality-162046

American Petroleum Institute. *Oil & Natural Gas: Supporting the Economy, Creating Jobs, Driving America Forward*. n.d. PDF file. https://www.api.org/-/media/Files/Policy/Taxes/DM2018-086_API_Fair_Share_OnePager_FIN3.pdf. Accessed 3 May 2022.

Becker, Benny. "High Profile Eastern Kentucky 'TechHire' Program Comes Under Fire." *WFPL*, 4 Aug. 2017. https://wfpl.org/80976-2/

Beitsch, Rebecca. "Bipartisan Senate climate caucus grows by six members." *The Hill*, 6 Nov. 2019. https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/469242-bipartisan-senate-climate-caucus-grows-by-six-members/

Billy Joel. "Allentown." *The Nylon Curtain*, Columbia Records, 1982. *Spotify*, https://open.spotify.com/track/59xhCcRskqyMtKzdvLZDfV

Brill, Alex. "Carbon tax most efficient in tackling climate change." *American Enterprise Institute*, 1 Mar. 2019. https://www.aei.org/articles/comment-carbon-tax-most-efficient-in-tackling-climate-change/

Brooks, David. "Globalization Is Over. The Global Culture Wars Have Begun." *New York Times*, 6 Apr. 2022. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/08/opinion/globalization-global-culture-war.html

Bolar, Kelsey. "EXCLUSIVE: $2 Million Obama-Era Program Gets 17 People Jobs." *Daily Signal*, 21 July 2017, https://www.dailysignal.com/2017/07/21/exclusive-2-million-government-program-gets-17-people-jobs/

Buchenwald and Mittelbau-Dora Memorials Foundation. Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, https://www.buchenwald.de/en/471/. Accessed 3 May 2022.

Buckley, Chris. "Enacting Cap-and-Trade Will Present Challenges Under China's System." *The New York Times*, 25 Sept. 2019, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/26/world/asia/china-emissions-xi-jinping-limit-cap-and-trade.html

Chen, Avery. "Russian invasion of Ukraine may drive EU back to China as source for rare earths." *S&P Global*, 15 Mar. 2022, https://www.spglobal.com/marketintelligence/en/news-insights/latest-news-headlines/russian-invasion-of-ukraine-may-drive-eu-back-to-china-as-source-for-rare-earths-69217025

Chon, Gina. "Russia punches economic hole above its weight." *Reuters*, 16 March 2022, https://www.reuters.com/breakingviews/russia-punches-economic-hole-above-its-weight-2022-03-16/

"Climate Solutions Caucus." *Citizens' Climate Lobby*, https://citizensclimatelobby.org/climate-solutions-caucus/. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"CO2 Emissions by Country." *Worldometer*, https://www.worldometers.info/co2-emissions/co2-emissions-by-country/. Accessed 3 May 2022.

Dews, Fred. "10 things you should know about the carbon tax." *Brookings*, 4 May 2016, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brookings-now/2016/05/04/9-things-you-should-know-about-the-carbon-tax-2/

Enderwick, Peter, and Peter J. Buckley. "Rising Regionalization: Will the Post-COVID-19 World See a Retreat from Globalization?" *Transnational Corporations Journal*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2020. pp. 99-112.

European Commission. *REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL*. European Commission, 14 July 2021, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0564.

"FACT SHEET: United States, G7 and EU Impose Severe and Immediate Costs on Russia." *The White House*, 6 Apr. 2022, https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/04/06/fact-sheet-united-states-g7-and-eu-impose-severe-and-immediate-costs-on-russia/

Ferenstein, Gregory. “Jobs training programs are rarely flexible enough to succeed.” *Brookings*, 16 Sept. 2019, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2019/09/16/jobs-training-programs-are-rarely-flexible-enough-to-succeed/

Friedman, Lisa. “What is the Green New Deal? A Climate Proposal, Explained.” *The New York Times*, 2 Feb. 2019, https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/21/climate/green-new-deal-questions-answers.html

Gwaambuka, Tatenda. “Dear African Leaders, Please Stop Embarrassing Us - Foreign Summits About Africa Should Go.” *African Exponent*, 15 December 2019, https://www.africanexponent.com/post/4819-african-leaders-should-stop-embarrassing-us-in-foreign-countries

Gopinath, Gita, and Ceri Parker. “An economist explains the pros and cons of globalization.” *World Economic Forum*, 11 Apr. 2019, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/04/an-economist-explains-the-pros-and-cons-of-globalization-b2f0f4ae76/

Horsley, Scott. “Trump's Suggested Import Tax Would Mean Americans Pay For That Wall.” *NPR*, 26 Jan. 2017, https://www.npr.org/2017/01/26/511861462/trumps-suggested-import-tax-would-mean-americans-pay-for-that-wall

Ip, Greg. “Supply-Chain Crisis Fuels Latest Retreat From Globalization.” *Wall Street Journal*, 20 Oct. 2021, https://www.wsj.com/articles/supply-chain-crisis-fuels-latest-retreat-from-globalization-11634741616

Jain, Arihant, and Russell Kizor. *European Union: The Emerging International Superpower*. 5 December 2003. PDF file.

“Joint Statement by the President of France Emmanuel Macron, Chancellor of Germany Angela Merkel, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland Boris Johnson, and President of the United States Joseph R. Biden, Jr. on Iran.” *The White House*, 30 Oct. 2021, https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/10/30/joint-statement-by-the-president-of-france-emmanuel-macron-chancellor-of-germany-angela-merkel-prime-

minister-of-the-united-kingdom-and-northern-ireland-boris-johnson-and-president-of-the-united-st/

Kesternich, Iris, et al. "The Effects of World War II on Economic and Health Outcomes across Europe." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 96, no. 1, 2014. pp. 103-118.

Krugman, Paul. "What Economists (Including Me) Got Wrong About Globalization." *Bloomberg*, 10 Oct. 2019, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-10-10/inequality-globalization-and-the-missteps-of-1990s-economics

Lee, Joseph, and Becky Morton. "G7: World leaders promise one billion Covid vaccine doses for poorer nations." *BBC*, 13 June 2021, https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-57461640

"Making the most of globalisation: EU trade policy explained." *European Parliament*, 3 June 2019, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/economy/20190528STO53303/making-the-most-of-globalisation-eu-trade-policy-explained

"Marshall Plan, 1948." *U.S. Department of State*, https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/marshall-plan. Accessed 3 May 2022.

Masters, Jonathan, et al. "The IMF: The World's Controversial Financial Firefighter." *Council on Foreign Relations*, 8 September 2021, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/imf-worlds-controversial-financial-firefighter#chapter-title-0-1

Miller, John, et al. "WHO official says can't force China to give more information on COVID-19 origins." *Reuters*, 7 June 2021, https://www.reuters.com/world/china/who-official-says-cant-force-china-give-more-information-covid-19-origins-2021-06-07/

Nogrady, Bianca. "China launches world's largest carbon market: but is it ambitious enough?" *Nature*, 20 July 2021, https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-01989-7

Nelson, Brett. "The 'Made-in-USA' Label Boosts Prices, but Just a Little." *Chicago Booth Review*, 22 June 2020, https://www.chicagobooth.edu/review/made-usa-label-boosts-prices-just-little

O'Rourke, Kevin, et al. *The Economy*. E-book, Core Economics Education, 2020.

Ortiz-Ospina, Esteban. "Does trade cause growth?" *Our World in Data*, 22 Oct. 2018, https://ourworldindata.org/trade-and-econ-growth

Ortiz-Ospina, Esteban. "Is trade a major driver of income inequality?" *Our World in Data,* 22 Oct. 2018. https://ourworldindata.org/trade-and-income-inequality

"Paris Peace Treaties and the League of Nations, to 1933." *BBC*, https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zbg4t39/revision/9. Accessed 3 May 2022.

Pirlot, Alice. "How and Why a Global Carbon Tax Could Revolutionize International Climate Change Law?" *Oxford University*, 19 Oct. 2021, https://oxfordtax.sbs.ox.ac.uk/article/how-and-why-a-global-carbon-tax-could-revolutionize-international-climate-change-law

Phillips, Leigh. "EU wins new powers at UN, transforming global body." *EU Observer*, 3 May 2011, https://euobserver.com/world/32262

Popescu, Diana I, and Tanja Schult. "Performative Holocaust commemoration in the 21st century." *Holocaust Studies: a Journal of Culture and History*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2019. pp. 135-151. https://doi.org/10.1080/17504902.2019.1578452

Restrepo, Pascual. *Skill Mismatch and Structural Unemployment*. 23 Dec. 2015. PDF file. https://pascual.scripts.mit.edu/research/01/PR_jmp.pdf

Roberts, Anthea, and Nicolas Lamp. *Six Faces of Globalization*. Harvard University Press, 2021.

Rohac, Dalibor. *In Defense of Globalism*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2019.

"Role of the G7." *European Commission*, https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/farming/international-cooperation/international-organisations/g7_en. Accessed 3 May 2022.

Scheyder, Ernest, et al. "Explainer: China's rare earth supplies could be vital bargaining chip in U.S. trade war." *Reuters*, 30 May 2019, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-china-rareearth-explainer/explainer-chinas-rare-earth-supplies-could-be-vital-bargaining-chip-in-u-s-trade-war-idUSKCN1T00EK

"Standards for Trade." *International Trade Administration*, 18 Oct. 2021, https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/eu-standards-trade

"Total size of United Nations peacekeeping forces." *Our World in Data*, https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/un-peacekeeping-forces?time=1985..latest. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"The Atlantic Conference & Charter, 1941." *U.S. Department of State*, https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/atlantic-conf. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"'The League is Dead. Long Live the United Nations.'" *National World War II Museum*, 19 April 2021, https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/league-of-nations

United States, Congress, House, Committee on House Ways and Means. *Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act of 2019*. United States Congress, 24 Jan. 2019, https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/763/committees. 116th Congress.

"UN System." *United Nations*, https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-system. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"What countries are the top producers and consumers of oil?" *U.S. Energy and Information Administration*, https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=709&t=6. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"What is Peacekeeping." *United Nations*, https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/what-is-peacekeeping. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"What is the WTO?" *World Trade Organization*, https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/whatis_e.htm. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"When did the United Kingdom leave the European Union?" *Government of Netherlands*, https://www.government.nl/topics/brexit/question-and-answer/when-will-the-united-kingdom-leave-the-european-union. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"Where we operate." *United Nations*, https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/where-we-operate. Accessed 3 May 2022.

"World Economic Outlook Database." *International Monetary Fund*, https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2022/April. Accessed 3 May 2022.