

SAMPLE EXAMINATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Please complete all three sections of the examination within 150 minutes.

SECTION 1

*Please read the following article and answer **all** of the questions below.*

When did Globalization Start?

“GLOBALIZATION” has become *the* buzzword of the last two decades. The concept of globalization refers to the sudden increase in the exchange of knowledge, trade and capital around the world, driven by technological innovation.

Some see globalization as a good thing. According to Amartya Sen, a Nobel-Prize winning economist, globalization “has enriched the world scientifically and culturally, and benefited many people economically as well”. The United Nations has predicted that globalization may have the power to end poverty in the twenty first century.

Others disagree. Globalization has been attacked by critics of free market economics, like the economists Joseph Stiglitz and Ha-Joon Chang, for maintaining inequality in the world rather than reducing it. Some agree that they may have a point. The International Monetary Fund admitted in 2007 that inequality levels might have been increased by the introduction of new technology and the investment of foreign capital in developing countries. Others, in developed nations, distrust globalization as well. They fear that it often allows employers to move jobs away to cheaper places in other countries. In France, “*globalisation*” and “*délocalisation*” have become negative terms for free market policies. An April 2012 survey found that only 22% of French people thought globalization a “good thing” for their country.

However, most economic historians believe that the question of whether the benefits of globalization outweigh the downsides is more complicated than this. For them, the answer depends on when you say the process of globalization started. But why does it matter whether globalization started 20, 200, or even 2,000 years ago? Their answer is that it is impossible to say how much of a “good thing” a process is in history without first defining for how long it has been going on.

Early economists would certainly have been familiar with the general concept that markets and people around the world were becoming more integrated over time. Although the eighteenth century Scottish philosopher Adam Smith himself never used the word, globalization is a key theme in his most famous book the *Wealth of Nations*. His description of economic development has as its underlying principle the integration of markets over time. As the division of labor enables output to increase, the search for specialization expands trade, and gradually, brings communities from disparate parts of the world together. The trend is nearly as old as civilization. Primitive divisions of labor, between “hunters” and “shepherds”, grew as villages and trading networks expanded to include wider specializations. Eventually armorers to craft bows and arrows, carpenters to build houses, and seamstress to make clothing all appeared as specialist artisans, trading their wares for food produced by the hunters and shepherds. As villages, towns, countries and continents started trading goods that they were efficient at making for ones they were not, markets became more integrated, as specialization and trade increased. This process that Smith describes starts to sound rather like “globalization”, even if it was more limited in geographical area than what most people think of the term today.

Smith had a particular example in mind when he talked about market integration between continents: Europe and America. The discovery of Native Americans by European traders enabled a new division

of labor between the two continents. He mentions as an example, that the native Americans, who specialized in hunting, traded animal skins for “blankets, fire-arms, and brandy” made thousands of miles away in the old world.

Some modern economic historians dispute Smith’s argument that the discovery of the Americas, by Christopher Columbus in 1492, accelerated the process of globalization. Kevin O’Rourke and Jeffrey Williamson argued in a 2002 paper that globalization only really began in the nineteenth century when a sudden drop in transport costs allowed the prices of commodities in Europe and Asia to converge.

Moreover, globalization has not always been a one-way process. There is evidence that there was also market disintegration (or de-globalization) in periods as varied as the Dark Ages, the seventeenth century, and the interwar period in the twentieth. But it is clear that globalization is not simply a process that started in the last two decades or even the last two centuries. It has a history that stretches thousands of years, starting with Smith’s primitive hunter-gatherers trading with the next village, and eventually developing into the globally interconnected societies of today. Whether you think globalization is a “good thing” or not, it appears to be an essential element of the economic history of mankind.

QUESTIONS

1.1. *Are the following sentences 'Right' or 'Wrong'? If there is not enough information to answer 'Right' or 'Wrong', choose 'Doesn't Say'.*

1.1.1. Globalization is a good thing.

Right Wrong Doesn't Say

1.1.2. Adam Smith believed that division of labor causes market integration.

Right Wrong Doesn't Say

1.1.3. Identifying when globalization started allows us to better understand the effects of globalization.

Right Wrong Doesn't Say

1.1.4.

1.1.5.

1.2. Please answer the following questions in English. In answering these questions, please refer to the article as well as giving your own opinion.

1.2.1. What are the main criticisms of globalization?

1.2.2. How does Adam Smith explain market integration in the *Wealth of Nations*?

1.2.3. When did the process of globalization begin?

SECTION 2

*Please read the following article and answer **all** of the questions below.*

TWO YEARS IS PLENTY

“THIS is probably controversial to say” said Barack Obama on August 23 2013. “But law schools would be wise to think about having a two years course instead of three years.” Mr Obama once taught constitutional law at US law school; his idea could put many of his former colleagues out of work. Yet he has a point.

For most of the 1800s, would-be lawyers (such as Abraham Lincoln) learned the trade as apprentices. Law schools emerged late in the nineteenth century, in two main types. Elite universities set up legal departments for rich students; night schools catered to the sons of immigrants. The rich institutions convinced the American Bar Association (ABA) to accredit only schools that required an expensive three years’ worth of courses for a degree. It still does.

Most of the basic principles of legal analysis can be learned in one year. Law schools have made little effort to teach practical skills, since firms have historically trained new lawyers themselves. So law school students fill their final year with classes on curious or obscure topics.

Over the past decade, however, fees have increased, requiring students to borrow ever-greater sums: the average 2013 graduate will be \$140,000 in debt, by one estimate. Meanwhile, law firms have cut back on hiring, leaving many debt-laden young lawyers unemployed. That has led critics—now including Mr Obama—to suggest that law schools cut their coursework down to two years, letting students save money and start earning sooner. Cutting costs would also allow more graduates to take lower-paying jobs in public-interest law.

Such a change would benefit students, but not law schools. Already suffering from a declining number of applications, law schools would have to reduce their spending if they lost a third of their tuition revenue. So some schools are trying to reinvent the final year: New York University is placing students in foreign universities or in government internships, while Stanford Law School has emphasized interdisciplinary classes and clinical courses. Since first-year lawyers at big firms now earn \$160,000 a year, their time has become too valuable to waste on workplace training. “We can use that time to prepare them for practice better and cheaper than firms can,” says Larry Kramer, the former dean of Stanford Law School.

But despite Mr Obama’s words, even law schools that make no such effort to change are still protected by the three-year requirement. The ABA has set up a task force on legal education to investigate, but since ten of the committee’s 21 members come from the legal academy, which wants to maintain the current situation, change seems unlikely.

QUESTIONS

2.1. Are the following sentences 'Right' or 'Wrong'? If there is not enough information to answer 'Right' or 'Wrong', choose 'Doesn't Say'.

2.1.1. Most law schools support the idea of a *two*-year program.

Right Wrong Doesn't Say

2.1.2. Since the majority of the members of the ABA committee investigating the issue are representatives from the law schools, reform seems improbable.

Right Wrong Doesn't Say

2.1.3. High levels of debt affect the career choice of law school graduates.

Right Wrong Doesn't Say

2.1.4.

2.1.5. . . .

2.2. Please answer the following questions in English. In answering these questions, please refer to the article as well as giving your own opinion.

2.2.1. What are the main disadvantages of studying law for *three* – rather than only two - years in law school before joining a law firm?

2.2.2. What are the main innovations that law schools have introduced in order to make the third year of law school more attractive to potential students?

2.2.3. Why does Barak Obama think that supporting *two*-years of law school is “probably a controversial thing to say”?

SECTION 3

Please answer the following question in Japanese within 800 letters.

Question

3. In what way has globalization changed education?