

Fashion Economics: FM 4339
Quiz #2: The Introduction
Dr. Adomaitis

Shana Cromwell-Ramnarain

Rosen, E. I. (2002). The Globalization of the U.S. Apparel Industry: Making Sweatshops. University of California Press.

Please answer to the best of your knowledge the following essay question. Use detail where appropriate. Remember grammar, punctuation & spelling count.

(Sent. = in reference to the specific sentence within the paragraph. Some paragraphs were lengthy and contained many long sentences.)

- a. Do past international theories of explaining international trade (classic theorists) facilitate an understanding of trade policies today? If yes, then why? If no, then why not? (2pts).

Past international trade theories *do* exhibit an understanding of today's trade policies. Rosen believes that American globalization today in the apparel industry has its origins in policies trade protection before the war (Rosen 2002, pg. 13 pp. 1, sent 2). During pre-World War II era, the trade policy was meant to help support the United states industrial markets. The trade policies today enforce a more international, collaborative trade lifestyle with other countries. Although this trade lifestyle that we embrace today is more diverse and international, it does have its origins in the trade policies before the war. Reducing tariffs and opening markets to more participants is mainly the biggest difference (Rosen 2002, pg. 13, pp.1, sent. 3).

Pre war priorities were keeping industrial markets afloat, as the United States had an industrial boom during the world wars, trade policies were set to protect American Interests domestically. As the chapter goes on, we see that the policies were changed in order to protect American interests in communism. terrorists were reduced in order to help anti communistic countries (Rosen 2002, pg. 15, pp. 2, sent 4).

- b. What is GATT? Explain in your own words. How has or would it ensure world peace? Has it worked? (2 pts).

The GATT (general agreement on tariffs and trade) served as a regulator of American global commerce and trade from 1947-1994 (Rosen 2002, pg. 14, pp. 2, sent. 1). Instead of enforcing trade barriers and leaving states to self-regulate international trade restrictions on their own, an overall “set of international rules” (Rosen 2002, pg. 14, pp 2, sent. 2) would be established over an entire country. This was said to guarantee a fair and equal playing field for all countries involved (Rosen 2002, pg. 14, pp. 2, sent.4)

This agreement was supposedly designed to make creating economic prosperity for these countries easier, and give them a chance to be associated with other economically well off countries. It’s believed that economic security is the backbone of world peace (Rosen 2002, pg. 14, pp. 2, sent. 6) these policies were also said to help rebuild Europe after WWII.

In my opinion, this plan didn’t work. The trade policies, ended up being construed into something entirely different. What was once an effort to maintain economic sustainability and assist European industrialized countries, because a fight/ winner-and-loser situation between American interests and the impending threat of communism (Rosen 2002, pg. 15, pp. 1, sent. 1). With the needs of the Cold War pressing on American politics, the objective changed from “create world peace” to “eradicate communism” (Rosen 2002, pg. 15, pp. 1, sent. 2). The United States began adjusting tariffs, lowering at a never before seen rate, in order to assist possible allied nations being threatened by communism (Rosen 2002, pg. 15, pp. 2, sent. 3). The policy’s goals were ultimately changed to protect American political interests.

- c. Rosen explains on page 20 paragraph (1) and on page 22 paragraph (1) that global trade does not always enrich developing countries but rather leaves them impoverished. Is this true? Is global trade beneficial to developing countries?

Defend your answer. (2 pts).

I do not believe that the development of global trade has stunted the enrichment of the developing countries involved. The argument stands that most of these countries who are impoverished, *need* the work that is given to them by the United States apparel industry. Rosen states (Rosen 2002, pg. 20, pp. 4) that these low-wage, developing countries have a comparative advantage against a very industrialized country like America. While American citizens specialize in more advanced technological services, like financial

services, these developing countries are abundant with a labor market looking for work. The labor-intensive nature of the apparel industry is perfect for these workers (Rosen 2002, pg. 20, pp. 4, sent. 2). This means of exchange is mutually beneficial for both the industrialized country and the developing country. It benefits the industrialized country to seek manufacturing in these developing countries, just as the developing country benefits by retaining work for its workers, jobs that otherwise would not be available to these people.

- d. Historically, why is the apparel industry considered a “woman’s field”? Is this conception of being a “woman’s field of labor” true today? How does Rosen describe women as they are thought of in the apparel industry? Is this a fair classification of women? (2 pts)

The Apparel industry is popular with women rather than men because women were traditionally the gender that were assigned tending to all the apparel needs of a family historically. Women were the ones who were in charge of dressing, creating clothing, washing the clothing and overall the ones who were in charge of the apparel care within a family. When this industry became industrialized, and more women from North America and Europe began seeking jobs outside of the home, the apparel industry was the first choice for women who were already very experienced in this skill (Rosen 2002, pg. 23, pp.2).

Whether the apparel industry is considered a woman's field of Labor today depends on your point of view, as Rosen states she takes up a feminist point of view (Rosen 2002, pg. 23, pp. 1, sent. 9). A more traditional point of view will say yes, women should be in charge of the apparel production within the family, and in general. This perspective is appropriate within a traditional household, but in an industrialized, specialized country like America, the apparel industry has no gender. Since industrialization, the apparel industry is much less dependent on human labor than it was before. Use of machinery can be assigned to either male or female workers. I believe nowadays, in an industrialized country like America, apparel is not necessarily a woman's field of Labor. In a country who operates from more *traditional* cultural values and expectations, women are the ones who are primarily in charge of the apparel procreation.

Although Rosen seems to have a negative outlook on females in the workforce, I believe she wants to highlight and elaborate the inequalities of pay between men and women for the same work. Rosen goes on to explain how women were “excluded” from higher paying wage jobs, which was an attempt to retain these jobs for men who demanded a wage to support their family. I believe this was in order to protect the workforce, and delegate complex, higher level industry work for men, while maintaining the home was the primary responsibility of the woman.

e. What is significant about export zoning? Defend your answer. (2 pts).

Export zoning is significant to the developing countries, as opposed to the *already* established, industrialized countries like the United States of America. Export zoning allows these developing countries a port, sort of like an invitation for other countries to do export related trade with them. Rosen states, “EPC investment is a quick way for developing countries to acquire the industrial skills and resources necessary to compete in a global economy” (Rosen 2002, pg. 26, pp. 2). This empowers these countries and makes them capable of participating in international trade by providing goods to export.