**Question 1**

**Thomas Friedman and Immanuel Kant**

One of the great ironies of Thomas Friedman's theory is most of the modern wars, and even wars going back centuries have occurred between nations which were most active in economic trade, and to a lesser extent competing for resources and markets.  It is nations that have no economic interests in one another that never go to war.

Of course the latter is a silly argument, as examples I could use Switzerland never going to war with Mozambique, or Canada going to war with Uruguay, or Togo warring with Burma.

The U.S. had not gone to war with Canada since the war of 1812, and has not threatened war since James Polk negotiated a treaty with Canada over the Maine and Washington borders in the mid 1840s.   The Soviet Union/Russia has not gone to war with the U.S., though the trade has seen ups and downs.

Yet, Japan and the U.S. were major trading partners prior to WWII, but the two were also heavily competing for the same resources and markets.   Germany was a major economic player with France, Germany, and the Soviet Union, and that did not stop England and France from going to war, a war that nearly destroyed France and the Benelux.

While one can make arguments about the role economics played in specific conflicts, there is simply no pattern that can encompass all conflict or war, either in the past, or in the future.

**P.S: Please give your Thoughts? (Half page single space)**

**Question 2:**

3. Comment on the short video. **(Half page single space)**

Three Minute Philosophy  [**Immanuel Kant's YouTube video**:](%20Immanuel%20Kant's%20youtube%20video:%20http://youtu.be/xwOCmJevigw)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xwOCmJevigw&feature=youtu.be>