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# Politics DA Uniqueness Updates

### The Presidential debate was meaningless

#### The debate means nothing for the election

Josh Voorhees, Senior Staff Writer, September 27, 2016, “Hillary Won the Debate. What Does That Mean for Hillary?,” Slate, http://www.slate.com/blogs/the\_slatest/2016/09/27/hillary\_won\_the\_debate\_what\_s\_that\_mean\_for\_the\_polls.html, Accessed 9-30-2016

Talking heads and the cable news networks that employ them have an incentive to overhype the importance of a presidential debate. Historically, however, there’s just not a lot of evidence that one good debate—or one bad one—can irrevocably change a candidate’s fortunes. In 2012, for example, Mitt Romney was widely considered to have shellacked President Obama in the first head-to-head contest. But while Romney erased Obama’s four-point lead in the national polls shortly thereafter, the president would eventually go on to pull away again. [Political](http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/T/bo13948250.html) [scientists](http://www.amazon.com/Tides-Consent-Opinion-American-Politics/dp/0521601177), meanwhile, have taken a closer look at those alleged debate game-changers—Richard Nixon’s sweating; Al Gore’s sighing—and have failed to find evidence that they mattered all that much. In fact, only two of the past seven “winners” of the opening debates have gone on to win the election.

### Polls are Meaningless

#### Online polls are useless & manipulated

Nico Lang, Staff Writer, September 27, 2016, “#TrumpWon is bogus: A reminder that online polls are mostly meaningless,” Salon.com, http://www.salon.com/2016/09/27/trumpwon-is-bogus-a-reminder-that-online-polls-are-mostly-meaningless/, Accessed 9-30-2016

In truth, online polls mean almost nothing. With the Time poll, there’s nothing stopping you from voting multiple times on different browsers. I was able to vote for Clinton three times — once using Google Chrome, another time on Safari, and yet a third time on Firefox. If I were truly passionate about my vote, I could also use my cellphone, iPad or Kindle to add another tally for behind former senator’s name. It was easy to do the exact same thing on the [Drudge Report](http://drudgereport.com/flashnyd.htm), [Fox San Diego](http://fox5sandiego.com/2016/09/26/who-won-the-first-presidential-debate/), [Breitbart](http://www.breitbart.com/2016-presidential-race/2016/09/26/poll-won-first-presidential-debate/),[The Hill](http://thehill.com/homenews/news/297924-poll-who-won-the-debate), [Shelby Star](http://www.shelbystar.com/zz/elections/20160926/poll-who-won-first-clinton-trump-debate), and [NewJersey.com](http://www.nj.com/politics/index.ssf/2016/09/who_won_debate_trump_clinton_poll_live_presidential.html) surveys, all of which went handily for Mr. Trump.

### Third Party Spoilers

#### A 3rd party could easily play the spoiler. There’s a long history of independent election spoilers

Salena Zito, Staff Writer, September 29, 2016, “Third-Party Candidates Could Play 'Spoiler' to Trump and Clinton,” Newsmax, <http://www.newsmax.com/Politics/third-party-candidates-spoiler/2016/09/29/id/750953/>, Accessed 9-30-2016

Third-party candidates in presidential elections throughout history have consistently played "the spoiler" since the late 1800s, when the two-party system took hold in the United States. In 1912, former Republican President Teddy Roosevelt — dissatisfied with his hand-picked successor, William Howard Taft — split from an already fractured Republican Party, pulled together a renegade run and became the last third-party candidate to win more electoral votes than a major party contender.

Democrat Woodrow Wilson won. Taft finished third, behind Roosevelt. In 1968, Democrat George Wallace mounted an independent run.

The Alabama governor, a segregationist who ran in the same year that Republican Richard Nixon and Democrat Hubert Humphrey faced off, won five states and 46 Electoral College votes. Texas-born billionaire Ross Perot mounted a chart-happy campaign in 1992. A former business executive, Perot successfully captured enough voter dissatisfaction with incumbent Republican President George H.W. Bush for reneging on promises not to raise taxes — coupled with the long slog of the recession — that he earned a spot in the debates with Bush and the Democratic governor from Arkansas, Bill Clinton. He ultimately won 19 percent of the popular vote but no electoral votes — but convincingly had an impact on Bush re-election chances, ushering Clinton into the White House. The last third-party candidate to "spoil" their party of origin's victory was Ralph Nader. In 2000, the longtime consumer advocate ran on the Green Party ticket — receiving only 2.7 percent of the popular vote but nearly 100,000 votes in Florida, which George W. Bush eventually won in a squeaker by just 537 votes in a case that ultimately reached the Supreme Court. This year's contest between Clinton and Trump has two third-party candidates who have developed a loyal following especially among young people. Gary Johnson, the former governor of New Mexico, is running on the Libertarian ticket, and Dr. Jill Stein is on the Green Party ticket. "Johnson may only be able to carry 2 or 3 percent of the vote nationally — but in states like New Mexico, Colorado and New Hampshire, he may take away Republican votes that are unhappy with Trump from Clinton," said David Pietrusza, a New York-based presidential historian. "They could also impact the much-sought-after youth vote that Clinton needs to meet the turnout of the Obama campaigns in 2008 and 2012," he said. However, Pietrusza said, one or both outside candidates could play the role of the spoiler this year.

### Hillary Winning Now

#### Clinton is ahead in key swing states & nationally

[Janie Velencia,](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/author/janie-velencia) Associate Polling Editor, September 30, 2016, “Clinton Sees Post-Debate Bounce In State Polls,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/clinton-leading-swing-states-post-debate\_us\_57ee4d61e4b024a52d2e57a6, Accessed 9-30-2016

Voters may have taken note of Democratic presidential nominee [Hillary Clinton](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/news/hillary-clinton/)’s strong debate performance on Monday. She is ahead of rival [Donald Trump](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/news/donald-trump/) in three key swing states ― Michigan, New Hampshire and Florida ― according to polls conducted after the debate. Clinton has taken a [7-point lead against Trump in Michigan](http://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2016/09/29/clinton-leads-michigan-poll-trump/91304744/), with 42 percent of the vote to his 35 percent, according to a Detroit News/WDIV poll. In a two-way match-up that excludes third-party candidates, Clinton still maintains her 7-point advantage. She’s[ahead by the same margin in New Hampshire](http://www.wbur.org/politicker/2016/09/30/poll-clinton-trump-new-hampshire), taking 42 percent of the vote to Trump’s 35 percent, according to a WBUR poll. And in Florida, Clinton leads Trump by 4 points, 46 percent to 42 percent, according to a Mason-Dixon poll. National polls released earlier in the week also signal good news for Clinton. The first set of post-debate polls found [Clinton holding a 3- to 5-point advantage](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/election-update-even-a-small-post-debate-bounce-could-make-a-big-difference-for-clinton/) over Trump.

#### Clinton is winning the key battleground states. There’s no chance for Trump

David K. Li and Bob Fredericks, Staff Writers, September 29, 2016, “[Clinton is now beating Trump in 5 must-win battleground states](http://nypost.com/2016/09/29/clinton-is-now-beating-trump-in-5-must-win-battleground-states/),” New York Post, <http://nypost.com/2016/09/29/clinton-is-now-beating-trump-in-5-must-win-battleground-states/>, Accessed 9-29-2016

Hillary Clinton took the lead in five key battleground states following [the first presidential debate](http://nypost.com/tag/2016-presidential-debates/), giving her a solid boost with just over five weeks until Election Day, according to a poll released Thursday. Voters in the five states — Colorado, Florida, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Virginia — also declared Clinton the winner of the much-anticipated slugfest with Donald Trump, [according to Public Policy Polling](http://www.publicpolicypolling.com/main/2016/09/clinton-leads-in-key-battlegrounds-seen-as-big-debate-winner.html). “Clinton has solid leads in Colorado, Pennsylvania, and Virginia — states seen as important to her path to 270 electoral votes — and modest leads in Florida and North Carolina, where wins would be indicative of a dominant overall victory in the Electoral College,” said pollster Tom Jensen. “If these results hold up, Donald Trump has no path to victory.”

#### Polling consensus shows the public is swinging in Clinton’s direction

Sean Colarossi, Staff Writer, September 29, 2016, “Another New Poll Shows Clinton Expanding Her National Lead Over Trump,” Politicus USA, http://www.politicususa.com/2016/09/29/national-poll-shows-clinton-opening-five-point-lead-trump.html, Accessed 9-30-2016

Another national poll shows Hillary Clinton expanding her lead over Donald Trump as the Republican nominee continues to unravel days after imploding on the debate stage. The [Times-Picayune/Lucid presidential tracking poll](https://luc.id/2016-presidential-tracker/) released Thursday shows the former Secretary of State with a five-point lead over Trump, the largest margin she’s had in the survey in several weeks. What’s even more troubling for the Republican nominee is that he only clocked in at a dismal 37 percent in the poll – his worst showing in weeks, according to this particular survey. But it’s not just this poll that has shows the numbers moving in Clinton’s direction. Public Policy Polling’s [national poll](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/docs/2016/PPP_National.pdf) released yesterday shows Clinton ahead by four points, and the latest [Rasmussen poll](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/elections/election_2016/white_house_watch_sep29) – which has been a Trump-leaning survey throughout the campaign – released on Thursday showed a six-point swing in Clinton’s direction in just a week.

### Hillary Winning Now

#### Clinton is ahead now. The debate was a big win

[Allan Smith](http://www.businessinsider.com/author/allan-smith), Staff Writer, September 29, 2016, “The results are in: Actual scientific polls show a big win for Hillary Clinton in the first debate,” Business Insider, http://www.businessinsider.com/who-won-first-hillary-trump-debate-2016-9, Accessed 9-30-2016

The consensus is in: Voters overwhelmingly thought Hillary Clinton was the winner of the first presidential debate. Four polls — [from CNN/ORC](http://www.businessinsider.com/poll-who-won-clinton-trump-debate-2016-9),[Politico/Morning Consult](http://www.businessinsider.com/hillary-clinton-poll-winning-after-debate-2016-9),[NBC/SurveyMonkey](http://nbcnews.to/2dlRLJF), and [Public Policy Polling](http://www.publicpolicypolling.com/main/2016/09/clinton-leads-by-4-nationally-trump-hurt-himself-in-debate.html) — all showed that respondents felt Clinton bested Donald Trump on Monday night at the Hofstra University presidential debate.

In the CNN/ORC instant poll, conducted in the hours after the debate, 62% of respondents said Clinton won, compared with just 27% who said Trump came out on top. Subsequent polls corroborated the results from CNN/ORC's immediate survey. In Tuesday's Politico/Morning Consult poll, 49% of registered voters thought Clinton won the debate, compared with just 26% who felt Trump came out on top.  A Wednesday NBC/SurveyMonkey poll found that 52% of likely voters thought Clinton won on Monday versus only 21% who thought Trump did, a smaller total than the portion selecting neither (26%). And a Thursday poll from the left-leaning Public Policy Polling showed Clinton to have been declared the winner over Trump by a 23-point margin, 54% to 31%. Clinton has experienced a slight bump from her well-received performance. [In a head-to-head matchup](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/president/us/general_election_trump_vs_clinton-5491.html), Clinton expanded her RealClearPolitics average polling lead over Trump from 2.3 points on Monday to 3 points by Thursday.

#### Clinton has a slight edge but the race is tight

Mona Chalabi, Staff Writer, September 28, 2016, “Trump is four percentage points ahead of Clinton – but the poll is an outlier,” The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/datablog/2016/sep/28/donald-trump-poll-la-times-usc-clinton, Accessed 9-30-2016

For the past two months, most national polls have put Democrat Hillary Clinton ahead of Republican Donald Trump. The size of that lead can vary significantly from poll to poll - she was [seven percentage points](http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/poll-clinton-leads-trump-ahead-first-debate-n652141) ahead according to an NBC poll, then only [one percentage point](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/docs/2016/SEPT_26_NAT_PRES_+_BP.pdf) ahead, according to Quinnipiac University – but they still suggest Clinton is winning the majority of support.

### Trump Winning Now

#### Trump is closing the gap in Florida

Tom Bevan, RCP cofounder and publisher, September 30, 2016, “Tom Bevan: Trump Closes The Gap In Key States,” Real Clear Politics, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2016/09/30/tom\_bevan\_trump\_closes\_the\_gap\_in\_key\_states.html, Accessed 9-30-2016

It is, particularly for Donald Trump. If you look at the map, he can't get there unless he wins Florida's 29 electoral votes. He would really have to run the table, it would take something of a miracle. So, that is critical for Donald Trump. Obama won Florida by less than a point in 2012, it is now within one point in our RealClearPolitics average. It has been really close for the entire month of September.  Trump is going to try to run up his numbers in the North, in the Panhandle. Clinton will run up her numbers in South Florida. And then the battle will be fought, as it always is in Florida, in that I-4 corridor around Tampa. That is where this state will be decided.

#### State-by-state polling is better – Trump is winning battleground states

[Robert Eno](https://www.conservativereview.com/authors/rob-eno), Staff Writer, September 29, 2016, “With less than 6 weeks to go, Trump gains in swing states,” Conservative Review, https://www.conservativereview.com/commentary/2016/09/with-less-than-6-weeks-left-trump-gains-in-swing-states, Accessed 9-30-2016

The national polling has remained static over the past week. However, Trump is still maintaining his momentum in the state-by-state polling that will determine the outcome of this election. Trump has gained ground or extended his lead in 10 of the 14 battleground states I have been tracking. As I explained earlier this week, Donald Trump is outperforming where Mitt Romney was at this point in 2012 in state-by-state polls. -

#### Trump will hijack Democrat issues to maintain momentum—trade proves

Rex Nutting, Staff Writer, September 30, 2016, “Opinion: How Donald Trump hijacked the Democrats’ best issue,” Market Watch, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/how-hillary-clinton-could-beat-donald-trump-on-his-strongest-issue-2016-09-30, Accessed 9-30-2016

Globalization has enriched the already wealthy and the professional classes who serve them. It’s lowered prices for most manufactured goods, helping consumers at every level. And the brand of globalization that is enshrined in unfair trade deals is [one of the factors](read:Why%20U.S.%20companies%20pay%20headhunters%20$15,000%20to%20fill%20manufacturing%20jobs)that contributed to the decline of the middle class and the demise of the American dream that our children will have a better life than we had. Trump has tapped into this reality, even though it’s far from the whole story. He’s within striking distance of Hillary Clinton because he was smart enough to hijack an issue that the Democrats had the advantage on for decades. Although voters have rallied to him for many reasons (including many “deplorable” reasons), his popularity is due to one thing above all: He listened to the complaints of millions of people, and he gave them a megaphone so all the world could hear: “Trade is stealing our jobs!”

#### Third party voters will be the spoiler—Trump wins

Paul Smalera, Ideas Editor, September 29, 2016, “Voting for a third party candidate in this election is the worst thing you can do for American democracy,” http://qz.com/796047/dear-millennials-voting-for-a-third-party-candidate-in-this-election-is-the-worst-thing-you-can-do-for-american-democracy/, Accessed 9-30-2016

Dear Millennials and other well-intentioned citizens: Let’s leave aside the fact that Gary Johnson [couldn’t name](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/us/politics/gary-johnson-aleppo-moment.html) a single foreign leader on TV yesterday. And let’s forget that Jill Stein is squirrely about [her feelings](http://www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2016/07/27/jill_stein_is_not_the_savior_the_left_is_looking_for.html) on vaccination science. Any vote for a third party candidate this election–whether Johnson, Stein or Mickey Mouse–will be doing a horrible disservice to American democracy. Allow me to explain. I was in college during the 2000 election cycle. In Washington, DC, no less. It felt like tough times for America. We were coming off a government shutdown, the Lewinsky affair, and a sense that the dot com bubble was creating a strange phenomenon in our society: inequality. How quaint that all sounds in 2016. At the time, many of us young voters viewed Al Gore as the antidote to both the problems of the late-era Clinton administration and the Republican-led Congress. He wasn’t slippery like Bill Clinton. Rather, he seemed to be a paragon of moral virtue—and smart to boot. His personality was a bit wooden, but, he was, well, likable enough. Al Gore didn’t do himself many favors in his campaign or during the debates, nor could he really call on the then-toxic Bill Clinton to rally Americans to his side. But he was probably the most prepared candidate for the presidency we had ever had. He won the popular vote. But he lost the election after losing Florida in the electoral college. The state’s contentious recount was halted by the Supreme Court, leaving George. W. Bush ahead by just 537 votes. Meanwhile, almost 100,000 people voted for Ralph Nader in Florida. You’ll hear many people, including Nader, dispute the claim that those votes tilted the election for Bush. But the votes for Nader were undeniably consequential. They put George W. Bush over the top, and into the White House. Voting for a third party candidate in this election will similarly put Donald Trump one vote closer to the White House. Enough of those votes could put Trump into the White House. As president. Of the United States of America.

# DA Protectionism DA

## Disad Overview

#### This is an economic protectionism disadvantage. The premise is as follows. The United States is locked in various levels on conflict with China—from political, to military, to economic. One key point of contention is the amount of raw materials (particularly steel) that China produces and subsequently sells around the world. US manufacturers (and other companies/ industries) tend to fear competition from China in this area because China can afford to produce these materials for much cheaper than the United States can.

#### Uniqueness—Despite all the elevated rhetoric in the status quo, there is no trade war between the US and China. There is tension and competition, certainly, but there is no declared economic war and there is no plan to launch massive retaliatory tariffs between the two nations.

#### On the unique debate, it is important to remember that the Aff will much further ahead on uniqueness debate if you allow it to be framed merely in terms of protectionism “yes/no”. There are lots of things that count as protectionism, but this disad is mainly concerned with tariffs. Non-tariff trade barriers exist everywhere and are high all around the globe right now. I suggest narrowing this uniqueness debate to a question of tariffs instead of protectionism.

#### Link—US industries don’t want closer diplomatic and economic relations between the US and China. The plan does just that, which upsets domestic industries. They will hate the plan because it will send the signal that the US is going to prioritize relations with China over protecting domestic markets.

#### Internal Link—These domestic industries have powerful lobbies that hold sway in Congress. They will force Congress to levy massive tariffs against China in order to protect these industry’s abilities to compete.

#### Internal Link—When the US places massive tariffs on products from another nation, it risks sparking a retaliatory trade war where nations model each other’s protectionist behaviors. These trade wars risk escalating into shooting wars.

#### Impact— A war between the United States and China will escalate to nuclear extinction.

## 1NC

### 1NC Uniqueness

#### There’s no trade war between US and China now—Even China knows it’s all political saber rattling

The Guardian, British news organization, May 5, 2016, “Be rational and objective, China cautions US, after Trump trade tirades,” The Guardian, <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/may/05/be-rational-and-objective-china-cautions-us-after-trump-trade-tirades> (accessed June 7, 2016)

China urged people in the United States to take a rational and objective view of the relationship between the two countries after [Donald Trump became the Republican party’s presumptive presidential nominee](http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/may/04/republican-nomination-party-unity-trump). Trump has proposed that tariffs on imported Chinese goods be increased to up to 45% and asserted that [China](http://www.theguardian.com/world/china) had waged “economic war” against the United States, taking American jobs. China is the United States’ largest trading partner. Asked whether China was worried at the prospect of a Trump presidency, after his commanding win in Indiana and as rivals Ted Cruz and John Kasich bowed out of the race, Chinese foreign ministry spokesman Hong Lei said the election was an internal affair he could not comment on. “What needs to be pointed out is that the essence of Sino-US trade and business cooperation is mutually beneficial and win-win, and accords with the interests of both sides,” Hong said at a daily news briefing. “We hope people in all fields can rationally and objectively view this relationship.” The official Xinhua news agency said Trump “gets them wrong, from trade balance to basic economics”, citing western media and academics dismissing his criticisms of trade with China. “Trump attacks China to woo voters,” it said.

### 1NC Link

#### Engagement with China won’t change Chinese behavior, instead causes domestic protectionist backlash

[Robert D. Atkinson](http://www.theglobalist.com/author/ratkinson/), President of the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, April 9, 2012, “What Should America Do About China?,” <http://www.theglobalist.com/what-should-america-do-about-china/> (accessed June 6, 2016)

As such, conflict now exists not just between American and Chinese workers, but between American companies and Chinese companies, just as it did between Japanese companies and American companies in the 1980s and early 1990s. This fundamentally changes the dynamics and the politics of U.S. trade policy toward China. If the United States is to effectively address this challenge, it is critical that policymakers and experts have an accurate view of Chinese economic policy and China-U.S. trade. Unfortunately the two prevailing views are misguided. The “free trade” view holds that efforts to press China to end its mercantilism will only backfire and limit what is largely a mutually beneficial trading relationship. The “protectionist” view, in contrast, holds that trade with China is fundamentally bad for U.S. economic interests. There is no way, the view goes, that U.S. workers can compete with Chinese workers who are paid less than 10% of American wages. Better we impose protective tariffs, “Buy American” provisions, and other protectionist measures and build our own autarkic economy. Both views miss the mark. Free traders are right that it is in the economic interests of the United States for China to be an integral part of the global trading system. But they are wrong in thinking that these benefits can accrue if China’s policies undermine that trading system and China continues its strategy of absolute advantage implemented through mercantilist policies. Protectionists are right in that it is important to ramp up the pressure on China to get it to start playing by the rules. But the notion that the United States can’t be competitive against China, even if the latter plays by the rules, is wrong. So is the notion that global integration with China can’t be in America’s and the world’s interests. The United States doesn’t need to close its borders to be a vibrant competitor. It must, however, require that other nations, especially large ones like China, play by the rules. Yet there is no evidence that China intends to voluntarily abandon its innovation mercantilism. Despite ongoing efforts by successive U.S. administrations to engage the Chinese in dialogue, there is little evidence that this process is doing anything more than helping to manage particular issues that come up.

### 1NC Internal Link

#### Domestic protectionist backlash sparks a US/ China trade war

David Lawder and Roberta Rampton, Staff writers for Reuters,March 24, 2016, “Trump's tariff plan could boomerang, spark trade wars with China, Mexico,” Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-trump-trade-idUSKCN0WQ0WG> (accessed June 7, 2016)

Donald Trump's threats to slap steep tariffs on Chinese and Mexican imports may have won him votes in Republican primaries but they would likely backfire, severely disrupting U.S. manufacturers that increasingly depend on global supply chains. The Republican presidential front-runner's campaign pledges to impose 45 percent tariffs on all imports from China and 35 percent on many goods from Mexico would spark financial market turmoil and possibly even a recession, former trade negotiators, trade lawyers, economists and business executives told Reuters. "I don't mind trade wars when we're losing $58 billion a year," Trump said in a Feb. 25 debate, referring to the 2015 U.S. goods trade deficit with Mexico. Economists dispute the idea the United States is "losing" money as the trade deficit is simply the difference between what the United States imports and what it exports to a country. "Imposing tariffs or putting up trade barriers may sound good, but it will hurt our economy and credibility," said Wendy Cutler, the former acting deputy U.S. Trade Representative who helped lead U.S. negotiations in the 12-nation Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal last year. Among those hardest hit would be the U.S. auto industry, which has fully integrated Mexico into its production network. Some $118 billion worth of vehicles and parts flowed north and south across the border tariff-free last year, according to U.S. Commerce Department data. A 35 percent tariff would raise costs for Ford Motor Co's U.S.-assembled F-series and medium-duty pickup trucks that use Mexican-made diesel engines, one of its most profitable vehicle lines. (Graphic on U.S.-Mexico auto and parts trade: [tmsnrt.rs/1UN3wun](http://tmsnrt.rs/1UN3wun)) Ford CEO Mark Fields on Wednesday defended the company's investment strategy, which includes $9 billion for U.S. plants over the next four years, saying, "We will do what makes sense for the business." Buyers of Fiat Chrysler Automobiles NV's popular Ram 1500 pickup trucks assembled in Saltillo, Mexico, could see their $26,000 base price pushed up by $9,000 if the tariff is fully passed on to consumers. A Chrysler spokesman declined to comment on Trump's statements. Trump's campaign said in a statement that U.S. trade policy constitutes "unilateral economic surrender" and needs complete change because it allows foreign competitors to shut out U.S imports, devalue their currencies and unfairly target U.S. industries. "I don't think he does our issue any favors by making it so incredibly jingoistic and bombastic," said Scott Paul, president of the Alliance for American Manufacturing, a group that allies domestic steelmakers and other manufacturers with the United Steelworkers union. "But I believe there’s widespread agreement ... that there is something amiss with our economic relationship with China and it’s past time that our government pushes back a little more forcefully." It would take years for U.S. industry to rebuild supply chains devastated by sudden tariff hikes on Chinese and Mexican goods and any retaliatory measures, said Peter Petri, a Brandeis University professor who has co-authored an influential study on the effects of the TPP trade deal on national income. Even if U.S. firms were able to make such a transition, Petri said this would likely result in a permanent annual reduction in U.S. national income of more than $100 billion, or 0.8 percent. Trump's tariff plans would effectively violate NAFTA and revoke U.S. commitments to the World Trade Organization, say trade lawyers. Beijing and Mexico City "are just going to retaliate on the things that are likely to hurt us most," said Susan Schwab, the U.S. Trade Representative from 2006 to 2009 in the George W. Bush administration. Schwab negotiated major portions of free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama. In 2009, Mexico slapped duties up to 25 percent on more than 90 different U.S. farm goods, from pork to frozen potatoes due to foot-dragging by U.S. lawmakers on allowing Mexican truckers on to U.S. roads, as specified under NAFTA. The National Potato Council estimates that U.S. growers lost about $70 million in revenue over 31 months, a 50 percent cut from their third-largest export market. Mexico's economy minister, Ildefonso Guajardo said last week that big tariffs on Mexico would return the United States to "an isolationist, xenophobic and protectionist vision." And a full-scale tariff war with China would likely expose the largest U.S. export sectors to steep duties, including aircraft, semiconductors, corn and soybeans, trade lawyers said. Retaliatory tariffs would also hurt growing U.S. vehicle exports to China - at 300,000 a year now equivalent to the annual output of a large assembly plant. General Motors Co is now planning to import a Buick sport-utility vehicle from a Chinese joint venture plant.

### 1NC Internal Link

#### A US/ China trade war escalates into a shooting war—strangles economies until war is the most practical option

Barry Brownstein, PhD, professor emeritus of economics and leadership at the University of Baltimore, March 30, 2016, Why Do the Candidates Want War with China? Fee—Foundation for Economic Freedom, <https://fee.org/articles/why-do-the-candidates-want-war-with-china/> (accessed June 7, 2016)

Will a Trade War Lead to a Shooting War? In his book [The Fair Trade Fraud](http://smile.amazon.com/Fair-Trade-Fraud-Decimates-Competitiveness-ebook/dp/B019CALT8K/?tag=foundationforeco), author James Bovard observes how US textile manufacturers “inflamed public hostility towards Japan” and helped poison relations before World War II. The 1930 Smoot-Hawley tariff [helped to create the Great Depression](http://fee.org/articles/the-smoot-hawley-tariff-and-the-great-depression/). [Financial analyst Robert Prechter](http://smile.amazon.com/Principle-Social-Behavior-Science-Socionomics-ebook/dp/B00EPGKVR2?tag=foundationforeco) points out that a common cause underlying wars and bear markets is a negative collective social mood. A negative social mood is based on fear. As fear increases, politicians seek to harness that fear for their personal advantage. They blame other countries for domestic problems. They threaten and then institute trade barriers. As trade barriers increase, the economic situation further deteriorates, both in their own country and around the world, further increasing fear. Eventually, demagogic politicians provoke wars. Writing in the Wall Street Journal, columnist [Andrew Browne explained the economic rift](http://www.wsj.com/articles/chinas-two-speed-economy-1457110331) growing between the old industrial part of China and its booming coast. China’s economic slow lane is choked with state-owned industrial firms in sectors linked to real estate — steel, cement, coal and construction equipment.… They are zombies in a phantom economy. Zipping along in the economic fast lane are private companies producing goods and services for a burgeoning consumer market that has taken over from manufacturing as the engine of China’s growth. The result of increasing tariffs on Chinese goods will be a declining Chinese economy. Chinese leaders will feel the pressure when “fast-lane” companies can’t absorb displaced workers from the state-owned firms. Increasing fear among Americans has already produced the Trump phenomenon. Imagine what countries with authoritarian traditions will produce if the global economy deteriorates due to trade wars. If trade wars begin, economic tensions will mount. To divert attention from the economy, Chinese politicians could escalate tensions over Taiwan or North Korea. Or, perhaps, they could direct their efforts farther abroad. Will American fears of a [cyberattack on our electrical grid](http://www.amazon.com/Lights-Out-Cyberattack-Unprepared-Surviving/dp/055341996X) prove prophetic? A prosperous world dramatically reduces the odds of such catastrophic events. Economically illiterate politicians who promote trade wars threaten human cooperation, international harmony, and general prosperity. They threaten peace. Good intentions are meaningless if your trade policies lead to war.

### 1NC Impact

#### US/ China war would escalate into nuclear extinction

Ching Cheong and Xiang Cheng, Political scientists and Chinese authors, 2001, “Will Taiwan Break Away: The Rise of Taiwanese Nationalism,” Book, Google Books (accessed June 7, 2016)

The high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else. Gen Ridgeway recalled that the biggest mistake the US made during the Korean War was to assess Chinese actions according to the American way of thinking.

## Uniqueness

### No Trade War Now

#### US China bashing hasn’t stunted US exports to China—no protectionist backlash

Daniel Wagner, Staff writer for the South China Morning Post, March 22, 2016, “With its China bashing, America risks breaking a profitable partnership,” South China Morning Post, <http://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1928704/its-china-bashing-america-risks-breaking-profitable> (accessed June 7, 2016)

China is not above criticism, and some American politicians do raise some valid points in criticising China, such as that the government controls large parts of the Chinese economy through state-owned enterprises, which distorts the domestic market and gives some Chinese companies unfair competitive advantages. But what they then fail to say is that China must also compete in the global marketplace, and that it pays a price for supporting companies that should otherwise fail as a result of being poorly run, inefficient or bloated. If the US does not like the way China does business, it is of course free to do business elsewhere, but that would be a really bad idea for America. Exports to China totalled US$120 billion in 2014, making it the third-largest export market for US goods (behind Canada and Mexico).

### No Trade War Now

#### No trade war now—US/China trade is mutually beneficial

[Javier E. David](http://www.cnbc.com/javier-david/), Staff writer for CNBC News, April 17, 2016, “Donald Trump 'irrational' for trade war talk: China's finance minister,” CNBC News, <http://www.cnbc.com/2016/04/17/donald-trump-irrational-for-trade-war-talk-chinas-finance-minister.html> (accessed June 10, 2016)

China's finance chief lambasted GOP frontrunner Donald Trump as "irrational," The Wall Street Journal reported on Sunday, adding that the world's largest economy would forfeit its global leadership role if it adopted Trump's controversial trade policies. Contending that America is being treated unfairly in its trade deals, the real estate billionaire has advocated slapping tariffs of up to 45 percent on Chinese goods. The U.S.'s trade deficit with China was more than $57 billion as of February 2016, according to U.S. Census bureau data, and totaled about $366 billion in 2015. Lou's blunt remarks were an uncharacteristic departure from the usual reticence of Chinese officials to comment on U.S. election cycles. Up until now, China has sidestepped direct criticism of the U.S. presidential contenders, yet finance minister Lou Jiwei told The Journal in an interview that Trump was an "irrational type." Lou added that tariffs would be a violation of the country's obligations under the World Trade Organization. Lou also stated that the U.S. and China are "mutually dependent on each other", and that both economies would falter in the event of a trade war. For years, U.S. politicians have railed against the country's currency policies, which they feel constitute an unfair trade advantage. "Our economic cycles are intertwined," Lou told the publication. "We have a lot more in common than sets us apart."

### No Trade War Now—Brink

#### No trade war now—tensions are on the brink but no mass wave of retaliation yet

Andy Home, Reuters political and economic staff writer, April 21, 2016, “Is the world sliding toward a steel trade war?,” Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-steel-ahome-idUSKCN0XH19A> (accessed June 14, 2016)

TRADE WAR? The other countries taking part in that failed Brussels meeting have offered China a way back into the talks in the form of cooperation on information-sharing and policies to mitigate the social impact of restructuring the global steel industry. Whether China picks up that olive branch remains to be seen. The acrimonious language used by both sides doesn't bode well. The alternative is more trade sanctions. The U.S. statement pointedly added as a footnote that the administration last year started "an historic number of trade remedy proceedings", including $45.5 million of penalties on steel importers. Further "robust enforcement measures" will proceed in parallel with continued talks. The problem is that bilateral sanctions don't work in a commodity supply chain such as steel. Chinese exports hit not just the United States but other big Asian steel producers such as South Korea and Japan, which respond by stepping up exports. India and Japan have already clashed in the World Trade Organization over the former's move in February to set a floor price for steel imports. In Australia, where local steel maker Arrium has just gone into administration, the government has already applied 41 anti-dumping measures to imported steel products, including 13 for China and eight for South Korea. In the steel industry such a proliferation of trade sanctions is commonly known as "whack-a-mole", a reference to the popular game in which the player has to hit a mole that appears randomly from a series of holes. What it means is that one set of bilateral sanctions immediately causes a change in steel flows to affect another country, which in turn initiates its own penalties on cheap imports. This process has not only started but is gathering global momentum as every country seeks to protect its own steel sector. A global dialogue on steel restructuring is surely the right way to prevent a full-scale global trade war.

### No Trade War Now

#### US/China economic competition is exaggerated—no trade war now

Li Shengjiao, Senior Chinese diplomat, May 4, 2015, “U.S.-China Trade Rivalry in Asia Is Overhyped,” The Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/li-shengjiao/uschina-trade-rivalry-in-\_b\_6801320.html (June 10, 2016)

The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), the backbone of U.S. President Barack Obama’s Asia policy, is down to its final haggling. U.S. negotiators hope they could close out the TPP deal by the summer, despite opposition mounting from both sides of the nation’s partisan aisle. When opposition arises from within, exaggerating threats from the outside has practically become a usual practice adopted by some U.S. politicians to divert attention and win domestic support. There have been many [voices](http://www.ibtimes.com/china-gathers-support-asia-pacific-trade-pact-seen-rival-us-backed-tpp-1721789) in the U.S. that have described the TPP and the Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific (FTAAP) as two complete competing trade initiatives, and labeled the “competition” as a China-U.S. tug-of-war in the Asia-Pacific region. They fear that China is trying to gain dominance in Asia-Pacific trade agendas and displace the U.S.-led TPP by pushing for the FTAAP. Although the appearance of rivalry does exist, much of the hype is overblown.

### Protectionism Low Now (US)

#### Overall, US has some of the lowest tariffs in the world

Binyamin Appelbaum, Washington correspondent for The New York Times. He covers the Federal Reserve and other aspects of economic policy, May 2, 2016, “Experts Warn of Backlash in Donald Trump’s China Trade Policies,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/03/us/politics/donald-trump-trade-policy-china.html?_r=0> (accessed June 9, 2016)

Imposing sweeping tariffs would reverse a mainstay of United States foreign policy. Beginning after World War II, the United States gradually reduced its import taxes and pushed other nations to do the same, seeking not only to promote increased trade but to prevent conflict. The United States now imposes average weighted import tariffs of just 1.4 percent, [according to the World Bank](http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/TM.TAX.MRCH.WM.AR.ZS), among the lowest rates in the world.

### Protectionism Low Now (US)

#### The US has low tariff rates the squo—not reliant on protectionist strategies

[Jon Greenberg](http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/staff/jon-greenberg/), Staff writer with PolitiFact. Prior to that, he was executive editor at New Hampshire Public Radio and a Washington reporter for National Public Radio, March 30, 2016, “Trump miscasts impact on trade of Chinese taxes,” PolitiFact, <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2016/mar/30/donald-trump/trump-miscasts-impact-trade-chinese-taxes/> (accessed June 10, 2016)

"Industrialized countries generally have lower tariffs than developing countries," Qin said. "Hence, countries such as India, Turkey, Argentina have much higher average tariffs than the United States, the EU, Canada, Japan on industrial products. China is somewhere in between the two groups." Overall, while the United States and others have had trade disputes with China, they don’t hinge on tariffs or taxes. "Generally, they are not major problems even in most cases worldwide," said Stuart Malawer, professor of law and international trade at George Mason University. Malawer served on the Virginia governor’s trade mission to China. "The real problem are non-tariff barriers. China has a significant number of them. These are primarily regulatory."

### Protectionism Low Now (Global)

#### Framing issues—tariffs are low now even if non-tariff barriers are still in place

Kithmina Hewage, Research assistant at the Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka (IPS), April 07, 2016, “Has the US Turned Against Free Trade Agreements?,” The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2016/04/has-the-us-turned-against-free-trade-agreements/> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Trade agreements have become the embodiment of international trade, with proponents and opponents rallying around and against the passage of any particular trade deal. Unlike in previous decades, however, free trade agreements are no longer exclusively focused on tariff reductions. With the expansion of the [GATT/WTO trading regime](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/fact2_e.htm) and the general acceptance of free trade, tariff rates across the world have reduced exponentially. Consequently, [non-tariff barriers](https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/anrep_e/wtr12-2d_e.pdf) pose the most pertinent obstacles to trade.

### Protectionism Low Now (Global)

#### Despite individual tariffs, the global trend is in favor of trade liberalization

[Sofia Lotto Persio](http://projourno.org/author/sofialottopersio/), Masters degree in Journalism, Media, and Globalisation at Aarhus University, Danish School of Media and Journalism, November 24, 2015 ,“Five trends that will shape the future of trade,” Global Trade Review, <http://www.gtreview.com/news/global/five-trends-that-will-shape-the-future-of-trade/> (accessed June 10, 2016)

The pace of trade liberalisation will continue with the extension of free trade and the continuing harmonisation of standards and regulations to reduce barriers to trade, fostering the rise of “mega-regionals”. A more stable political and currency environment is anticipated, making trading easier for companies around the world. “By 2020 we will have the new rules and terms of organisation of trade and investment that should allow countries to go back to the multilateral trading system. We will see more and more plurilateral agreements within the multilateral system – it will become a club of clubs,” says Ricardo Melendez-Ortiz, co-founder, chief executives at the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD).

### Protectionism Low Now (China)

#### China lower import tariffs now—part of their strategy to combat black market

Kati Chitrakorn, Staff writer for the Business of Fashion, February 5, 2016, “Can China End the Illicit ‘Daigou’ Trade?,” Business of Fashion, <http://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/global-currents/can-china-put-an-end-to-the-illicit-daigou-trade> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Lowering import tariffs and tightening customs controls are among strategies for curbing "selling agents” who trade in luxury goods at lower prices. Will it work? Gao, who only wishes to give her family name, has good reason to be discreet. When she tried to shop at a prominent online luxury retailer based in the UK, she ran into an unexpected burden that prompted her to use an illicit trade instead. “I ordered two products,” she tells BoF, from Beijing, where she lives. “But when DHL received the parcels last week, they called me up to say that the parcel could not pass through China’s customs. I had to return my order and get a daigou to do it for me instead, [because] the daigou would deliver the parcel to me and not report the value inside.” Due to hefty import tariffs and consumption taxes, as well as higher pricing strategies, prices for luxury goods can be 20 to 30 percent higher in China when compared to abroad. The disparity has given rise to daigou, [a grey market trade](http://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/global-currents/daigou-agents-help-chinese-consumers-get-luxury-goods-less) where shopping agents purchase goods overseas and sell them back to customers in China, typically making a profit and saving the customer money at the same time, by avoiding import duties. But after years of watching the illegal trade grow, the Chinese government has recently stepped in to tackle it by lowering import tariffs and tightening customs controls. Unfortunately, what Gao’s experience highlights is that some of these new measures have inadvertently created barriers for Chinese consumers who want to use legitimate channels to buy online. “It’s ridiculous,” she says, describing how the frustration and confusion left her feeling “forced to use daigou.”

### Protectionism Low Now (China)

#### China’s tariffs are trending downward

Hong Kong Trade Development Council, Hong Kong based economic research outlet, August 27, 2015, “Trade Regulations of China,” Hong Kong Trade Development Council, <http://hong-kong-economy-research.hktdc.com/business-news/article/Small-Business-Resources/Trade-Regulations-of-China/sbr/en/1/1X000000/1X006MY8.htm> (accessed June 10, 2016)

China became a WTO Member on 11 December 2001. China has gradually liberalized its foreign trading system and has continued to reduce administrative barriers to trade. According to China’s amended Foreign Trade Law which went into effect from July 2004, all types of enterprises, including private enterprises, can register for the trading right. Individual Chinese are also allowed to conduct foreign trade under the amended Foreign Trade Law. According to WTO, China's average applied MFN tariff rate was 9.4% in 2013, progressively down from 15.3% in 2001. The average tariff was higher for agricultural products at 14.8% while the average tariff for non-agricultural products was 8.6%.

## Links

### Link—US/ China Relations

#### US/ China relations upset US businesses, previous support for relations has collapsed—laundry list of reasons

Nina Easton, Staff writer for Fortune magazine, September 9, 2015, “American businesses are growing wary of China—with good reason,” Fortune magazine, <http://fortune.com/2015/09/09/american-business-beijing/> (accessed June 9, 2016)

Last spring, five women in China were arrested for “picking quarrels and provoking trouble” because they planned a sticker campaign on buses and subways to call attention to groping and other forms of sexual harassment. Lurking inside this political incident were two warning signs for foreign business—the increasing reach of Beijing’s cyber-spying (the women were caught while only in the planning stage) and the regime’s growing hostility to civil society, however benign. As the White House prepares for President Xi Jinping’s visit later this month, U.S.-China relations are being rattled by a regime that is flexing its muscle militarily, in cyberspace, and against dissenters inside its own borders. Those may be political and security issues, but they are now bleeding into the operations of Fortune 1000 companies. In the most recent episode of our CSIS iTunes podcast “Smart Women, Smart Power,” I discussed these disturbing trends—as well as Beijing’s military buildup in the South China sea—with Bonnie Glaser, CSIS’s senior adviser for Asia, and Sophie Richardson, China director at Human Rights Watch. You can hear the full conversation, recorded at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, [here](http://c72710c35a98c0e0a42d-2df07eb466c3361e3d607b0dca5aa8b3.r79.cf2.rackcdn.com/150826_swsp_china_02.mp3). “The American business community is very unhappy about the regulations and policies China is pursuing that favor Chinese companies and seek to give advantages to its own national champions at the expense of foreign companies,” says Glaser. Until recently, she notes, U.S. business “was the greatest supporter of closer US-China relations.” Now, a reversal of political reforms is making companies nervous. Which brings us back to the five women—and the state of civil society in China. Since that episode, Beijing has issued a draft law to police foreign nongovernmental groups. The draft provoked sharp objections from American industries ranging from technology to agriculture. While NGOs may seem tangential to business operations, industry groups cite everything from chamber of commerce exchanges to scientific gatherings as central to the foundation of $600 billion in annual U.S.-China trade.

### Link—US/ China Engagement

#### China uses unfair business practices to out compete US companies—the plan is seen as selling out US industry which causes domestic protectionism

Nick Carey and James B. Kelleher, Staff writers for the Huffington Post, April 27, 2011, “Corporate America’s Relationship With China Worries Small Business,” The Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/27/china-us-american-companies-corporations_n_854294.html> (accessed June 9, 2016)

Given the savage nature of the competition you might expect Chesebro to vent mainly against Chinese-style capitalism. But like dozens of manufacturers and others across America interviewed for this story, his anger isn’t directed at China, which he and others say is doing what it deems as necessary to boost its own people’s prosperity. Instead, their ire is aimed at the U.S. government and American multinationals for not stepping up to the plate and defending long-term U.S. interests. “I don’t blame the Chinese, they’re just pursuing their national interest,” said Patrick Mulloy, a member of the Congressional U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission. “I blame us for not realizing what’s happening to us and for doing nothing about it.” Prior to China’s accession to the World Trade Organization almost a decade ago, free trade proponents argued that the move would create American jobs and eliminate the country’s trade deficit. Neither prediction has proven accurate. The U.S. trade shortfall with China hit a record high $273 billion last year and government data shows some 40 percent of factories with more than 250 employees closed down from 2001 to 2010. While it can’t all be laid at China’s door, it is not a coincidence that after decades of more gradual decline, U.S. manufacturing took a nose dive after China’s entry into the WTO. Cheap labor is one huge advantage for China, of course. But numerous academics, former trade officials and labor union officials say predatory trade practices, subsidized exports and other controversial economic policies also make Chinese companies tough to compete against. And they warn that unless the U.S. works out a way to bolster and promote the sector, future prosperity and America’s superpower status will eventually be at risk. This is only underlined by the U.S. economy’s fragile state, with the jobless rate at 8.8 percent, growth tepid, and a huge government budget deficit and debt burden. Even China’s rising production costs may present an increasing threat, they argue. It means that China will be less able to rely on being the cheap maker of textiles, toys, furniture and plastics to create jobs — some of that production is increasingly going to go to places like Bangladesh and Vietnam. Instead, Beijing is increasingly focused on moving up the chain to higher valued technology-based goods — which puts it in direct competition with the remaining power base of the U.S. manufacturing sector. And the technology-transfer terms that many big American companies are agreeing to when they do deals in China, and the research centers they are opening up there, means they could in some cases be signing their own death warrants. Peter Navarro, a professor of economics and public policy at the University of California, who correctly predicted the U.S. housing bust, predicts that the crash America faces if it neglects manufacturing for too long is “going to be far worse.” “Over time the problems Americans are seeing with their economy are only going to get worse as China rises,” he said. “We’re heading for a collision and the longer that collision is delayed the harder it’s going to be.” Still, free trade proponents have warned repeatedly that any protectionist measures would result in a costly trade war that neither side can win. They also argue that the United States has only itself to blame for its economic problems.

### Link Magnifier—Relations

#### US/ China relations determine domestic protectionism

Patrick Smith, Correspondent and independent journalist—previous lecturer in journalism and media studies, April 11, 2016, “China Is Buying Up US Companies — Does Anyone Care?,” The Fiscal Times, <http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2016/04/11/China-Buying-US-Companies-Does-Anyone-Care> (accessed June 9, 2016)

As it stands, CFIUS [Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S.] rules on an ad hoc, deal-to-deal basis. Those familiar with its review process say it’s a dense, opaque bureaucracy whose wheels grind slowly and whose decisions exhibit no pattern. Something close to confusion appears to reign as a result. Two months ago Fairchild Semiconductor walked away from a $2.5 billion Chinese acquisition bid because it feared CFIUS would block it. Syngenta’s U.S. subsidiary means that deal may be blocked. So might Zoomlion’s bid for Terex, because Zoomlion’s a supplier for the People’s Liberation Army. We’re talking about a maker of cranes, don’t forget. Two weeks ago, [Anbang Insurance abruptly withdrew a $14 billion bid](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/01/business/dealbook/starwood-hotels-chinese-suitor-backs-out-of-bidding.html?_r=0) for Starwood Hotels. Marriott won, and will now be the world’s No. 1 hotelier. Anbang isn’t saying why it withdrew its offer. But among the uncertainties hanging over the proposed deal: Starwood has hotels near the White House and the Treasury department. Think about it: CFIUS might have blocked a hotel acquisition on national security grounds. This is not an orderly, predictable process, and it’s too prone to special-interest pressure. “The committee responds to lobbyists and strong arguments,” Dilenschneider said in an interview. “It sounds like you mean protectionism and don’t want to use the word,” I replied. “That’s exactly what I mean,” he said. There are risks here, especially given the fragility of U.S.-China relations at the moment and the anti-Chinese grandstanding now common on the presidential campaign trail. U.S. businesses could get hurt if the Chinese decide retaliatory measures are justified. So could the trade relationship, to say nothing of bilateral ties.

### Link Magnifier—Economic Engagement

#### Increased US/ China economic engagement tanks US manufacturing sector—manufacturing sector knows the plan dooms them

Matthew McMullan, Communications manager for the Alliance for American Manufacturing (AAM), January 28, 2016, “Economists Realize Trade With China Has Hurt U.S. Workers,” AAM, <http://www.americanmanufacturing.org/blog/entry/economists-realize-trade-with-china-has-hurt-us-workers> (accessed June 9, 2016)

There’s a new report out this week, prepared by some of the [same academics](http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-06-18/after-doubting-economists-find-china-killing-u-s-factory-jobs) who a few years ago made note of the huge drop-off in U.S. manufacturing employment that came after Washington normalized trade relations with China and helped it join the World Trade Organization (WTO). This one’s about [“China shock.”](http://www.nber.org/papers/w21906) The researchers found that for workers in industries exposed to Chinese import competition, the hits came hard and they still haven’t recovered from them. Those workers experience lots of job churn and their earnings have been reduced, meaning: They haven’t been absorbed into other industries that pay wages comparable to those they once had. They’re going from low-wage job to low-wage job, and they’re more likely to be on welfare. Trade with China, for lots of our fellow Americans, has been a bum deal. Writes Noah Smith at [Bloomberg View](http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2016-01-26/free-trade-with-china-wasn-t-such-a-great-idea): So the economics profession is coming around to the reality that liberalizing trade with China has been, uh, problematic for many American workers? Whoa. So now what? What are we gonna do about this? What are we gonna do, man? We’ve got a couple of ideas. And more gifs! Crack down on currency. China has spent years keeping its currency artificially cheap in order to boost its own exports. That’s called currency manipulation. Twice a year, the Department of Treasury issues a report to Congress that looks at exchange rate shenanigans by foreign governments. But [not once](http://www.americanmanufacturing.org/press-releases/entry/treasury-again-fails-to-cite-china-as-a-currency-manipulator-aam-statement) in its 14 reports has the Obama administration’s Treasury named China a currency manipulator, which would make it sit down with its Chinese counterparts at the International Monetary Fund to negotiate over the issue. Simply naming China a currency manipulator would be a big step. But that’s not all: Congress should take up currency legislation that [passed the Senate](http://www.wsj.com/articles/senate-passes-bill-to-toughen-enforcement-of-trade-laws-1431622577) last summer. The provision would put currency manipulation on the list of illegal subsidies that could warrant imposing counter-vailing duties. Don't lock in a bad trade relationship. Back in 2000, when Washington lawmakers were normalizing trade relations with Beijing, the pro-trade crowd claimed that normalization would create a boom in American exports to China. But even back then, there were honest assessments sprinkled into the media coverage. “This deal is about investment, not exports,” [said an economist](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/11/17/AR2009111703138.html) with Morgan Stanley in May of that year. We’ve had a lot of manufacturing move to China since that time, and very little growth in exports, so that assessment has proven true.

### Link Magnifier – American Labor Movement

#### The American labor movement empirically opposes free trade

Richard A. Epstein, Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow, March 14, 2016, “The Rise of American Protectionism,” <http://www.hoover.org/research/rise-american-protectionism> (Accessed 6/14/16)

This point explains why the American labor movement has historically opposed free trade. The essence of unionism is, and always will be, the acquisition of monopoly power. There is no way for a union to obtain that monopoly power in the marketplace. It can only secure it through legislation. The first step in that process was the exemption of unions from the antitrust laws under Section 6 of the Clayton Act of 1914. The second major step was the legitimation of collective bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which gave the union the exclusive bargaining rights against the firm once it was successful in a union election. These major statutory benefits strengthened private sector unions and imposed inefficiencies on unionized firms. This, in turn, opened the field for new firms, like the Japanese automobile companies, to organize outside the union envelope. In response, labor’s strategy went one step further. It pushed hard on trade and tariff barriers to keep out foreign imports, and exerted political influence to encourage local zoning boards to exclude new businesses that do not use union labor. Add to these issues the aggressive rise of minimum wage laws and other mandates like Obamacare and family leave statutes, and you construct a regulatory fortress that defeats the corrective forces of free trade and renders the nation less economically resilient and productive than before.

### Int. Link—Companies Favor Protectionism

#### US companies will lobby Congress for stiff tariffs when threatened by Chinese competition

[Kenneth Rapoza](http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/), Journalist writing about investing, business, and emerging markets, April 30, 2016, “China Threatens To Challenge U.S. Tariffs In WTO,” Forbes magazine, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2016/04/30/steel-wars-china-threatens-to-challenge-u-s-tariffs-in-wto/#8e3a8a937e6c> (accessed June 9, 2016)

The Ministry of Commerce of China said on Saturday that it was gearing up for a legal challenge, most likely by opening an arbitration panel in the World Trade Organization. The U.S. steel industry is reeling from cheaper Chinese imports. They say that China’s government is funding and subsidizing an industry that is faced with oversupply issues. To get rid of the steel, China is selling more of it to buyers worldwide and pricing out the competition. “China will encourage and support its steel companies to defend themselves according to law, and China will safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of its steel companies using World Trade Organization rules,” the Ministry said in a statement today, less than 24 hours after Washington announced further investigations into China’s steel industry. The U.S. hit seven countries with temporary steel tariffs in March. It’s likely they’ll be made more permanent come July, with China being the chief villain among the seven. U.S. steel manufacturers are lobbying congress to go after the Chinese. They want the tariffs to stick. On April 14, steel company executives and United Steelworkers president Leo Gerard met with members of congress’s steel caucus to deride China. They argued that cheaper Chinese imports was cutting into local steel-town economies and tried selling them on the fact that reliance on foreign steel might even be bad for national security because defense contractors rely on steel. The Department of Commerce already imposed preliminary duties on cold-rolled steel but industry leaders want even more types of steel added to the list. The duties went into effect the first week of March and were [set at 265.79%](http://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-imposes-266-duty-on-some-chinese-steel-imports-1456878180) over the price of imported steel. They will remain temporary unless congress makes them stick in a hearing this summer. [This is what United Steelworkers are counting on.](http://www.americanmanufacturing.org/blog/entry/message-to-congress-its-time-for-action-on-steel-imports) [On March 1, the WSJ noted that Lakshmi Mittal](http://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-imposes-266-duty-on-some-chinese-steel-imports-1456878180), the Indian CEO behind the world’s top steelmaker, Arcelormittal, said deeper tariff protection was needed to help save his U.S. steel operations in Indiana. “Tariffs will help prices. The Chinese steel industry lost $10 billion last year,” he said. “They’re dumping because of it.”

### Int. Link—Companies Favor Protectionism

#### US companies want stiff tariffs on Chinese imports so they can better compete

Jim Geraghty, Senior political correspondent for National Review, March 8, 2016, “The Problem with Trump’s Protectionist Tariffs,” National Review, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/432462/donald-trump-protectionist-tariffs-hurt-working-class> (accessed June 8, 2016)

Trump’s proposals would recreate the same results on a larger scale. His across-the-board tariff on Chinese goods would bring retaliatory tariffs on U.S. exports to China, the third-largest market for American companies behind Canada and Mexico. U.S. producers of soybeans, civilian aircraft, cotton, copper, corn, and recycled materials would all take a big hit. Trump is touting his tariff idea as a way of boosting U.S. economic production, instead of increasing non-U.S. imports. He’s pledging to bring back jobs lost to foreign competitors who undercut American companies. But protectionist tariffs can accomplish that only if they are uniformly applied. A tariff on Chinese products would immediately make Japanese, Mexican, and other foreign companies better able to compete in the American market, necessitating another round of tariffs on those countries. And it’s safe to assume each new tariff would bring retaliatory tariffs against U.S. exports, until there was no one left with whom we could profitably trade. Like Trump’s pledge to build a border wall, the tariffs’ intended effect sounds good, but there’s no acknowledgement of their exorbitant costs. There’s no doubt that many Trump supporters are hurting, and want desperately to gain a foothold in an economy they feel has passed them by. A unionized manufacturing job must sound nice to them. But it wouldn’t be nearly as nice if their cost of living shot through the roof overnight.

### Int. Link—Companies Favor Protectionism

#### Instead of innovating, cutting costs, or selling a better product, US companies seek tariffs on Chinese imports to compete

Jeff Jacoby, Columnist for the Boston Globe and winner of the Breindel Prize and Thomas Paine Awards, May 22, 2016, “Welcome cheap Chinese steel, dump tariffs,” The Boston Globe, <https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/editorials/2016/05/21/welcome-cheap-chinese-steel-dump-tariffs/VAeBAyRi4ewRFwdsQbcU3N/story.html> (accessed June 8, 2016)

CHINA PRODUCES MORE than 820 million tons of steel per year, of which about 100 million tons are exported and sold at a discount overseas. Only about [3 percent of those exports](http://www.economist.com/news/finance/21696325-throwing-up-tariffs-counterproductive-response-economic-weakness-why-no) go to the United States, but American steel producers bristle at the competition. So in keeping with the time-honored practice of the US steel industry — “[the backbone of American manufacturing](https://twitter.com/envirometal/status/653568400485154816),” as it proudly calls itself — domestic producers are rising to the challenge. Are they doing so by making their operations more efficient? By improving the quality of the steel they sell? By cutting their prices to maintain market share in the face of a tough competitor? Not exactly. They’re getting the federal government to punish American consumers. “The United States on Tuesday said it would impose duties of more than 500 percent on Chinese cold-rolled flat steel, widely used for car body panels, appliances, and in construction,” [reported Reuters](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-china-steel-idUSKCN0Y82ER). “The Commerce Department said the new duties effectively increase more than five-fold the import prices on Chinese-made . . . steel products.” American steel producers complain that their counterparts in China are dumping cheap steel on the US market, benefiting from Chinese tax subsidies to undercut other companies’ prices. Because of these “unfairly traded imports,” [lament](http://www.cnn.com/2016/03/23/opinions/american-steel-industry-gibson-schmitt/) Thomas Gibson and Chuck Schmitt of the American Iron and Steel Institute, some US steel mills have had to be shuttered, and 12,000 steel-making jobs were lost during the past year. It is always painful when workers are laid off and once-thriving facilities have to be closed. But the steel industry is far from unique. The US economy creates and destroys millions of jobs every year. No industry is exempt from the upheaval, retrenchment, or losses caused by changes in technology, trade, and consumer demand. The digital revolution has decimated once-formidable companies and careers in fields as different as journalism, photography, tax accountancy, and recorded music. Would anyone argue that the government should have suppressed the Internet in order to preserve the employment and production patterns of the 1980s? Should the Commerce Department have imposed taxes of 500 percent on e-mail services and word-processing software to preserve the viability of typewriters and stenographers? For that matter, [as economist Don Boudreaux has remarked](http://cafehayek.com/2004/04/polio_vaccinati.html), should the polio vaccine have been taxed into unaffordability for the sake of all the jobs that were once linked to the care of polio victims? Sooner or later, competition and disruption challenge every industry and market. The pain they can inflict is real, but far greater and more enduring are the benefits and prosperity they generate. American steel mills are understandably chagrined that competitors from China are beating them on price. But cheaper steel also means more affordable cars, homes, and appliances for tens of millions of Americans. It means more employment at General Motors, Boeing, and John Deere. Jacking up steel prices through “antidumping” tariffs and other protectionist measures makes life more expensive for all of us and jeopardizes far more jobs than it saves. There is nothing nefarious about Chinese mills selling steel at bargain prices in the United States and other foreign countries. Companies routinely mark down the price of their merchandise — in clearance sales, as loss-leaders, for promotional purposes, or simply in response to local conditions. The Commerce Department and the US producers clamoring for punitive tariffs, claim that Beijing is subsidizing Chinese steel exports. Even if that’s true, why should Americans object? We aren’t being harmed by China’s gift — we’re being enriched. It is the federal government and its tariffs that harm us, by deliberately making steel more expensive and thereby making US consumers poorer. For years, American steel companies have bellyached about foreign competition, and for years Washington has responded with quotas, tariffs, “voluntary-restraint” agreements, and other restrictions on free trade. The Obama administration, like the [Bush 43, Bush 41, Reagan, Carter, Ford, and Johnson administrations](http://fff.org/explore-freedom/article/protectionist-welfare-steel/) before it, has yielded to the industry’s unreasonable demand for more trade barriers and corporate welfare. It’s a pity. Nucor, Steel Dynamics, United States Steel, and other American producers should be told to step up and face their competition in the marketplace. They shouldn’t be rewarded for hiring lobbyists and publicists to wangle special-interest privileges that no business has a right to claim.

### Int. Link—Companies Fear Chinese Competition

#### US companies fear Chinese competition—they rely on tariffs and other protectionist strategies to compete

[David Autor](http://economics.mit.edu/faculty/dautor), PhD—Associate Department Head, MIT Department of Economics, [David Dorn](http://www.ddorn.net/), PhD—Professor of International Trade and Labor Markets, University of Zurich Affiliated Professor, UBS International Center for Economics in Society, and [Gordon H. Hanson](http://irps.ucsd.edu/faculty/faculty-directory/gordon-hanson.htm), PhD—Professor of Economics at UC San Diego, March 12, 2015, “Why Obama’s key trade deal with Asia would actually be good for American workers,” Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/03/12/why-obamas-key-trade-deal-with-asia-would-actually-be-good-for-american-workers/> (accessed June 8, 2016)

[Opponents](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2015/03/10/afl-cio-boss-on-obamas-trade-push-we-are-going-all-out-to-oppose-it/) of giving President Obama [fast-track authority](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-new-congress-should-revive-a-bill-on-fast-track-trade-authority/2014/11/06/e2b4feae-638a-11e4-836c-83bc4f26eb67_story.html) to negotiate [the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trans-Pacific_Partnership) — the pending trade pact between the United States and 11 countries in Asia and the Americas — cite the job-killing impacts of globalization as a prime reason for their objection. The free-trade agreement would lower tariffs and remove other barriers to imports from member countries, which opponents fear would create steep competition for U.S. industries domestically. There is indeed substantial evidence that import competition from low-wage countries has contributed to [the momentous decline in U.S. manufacturing employment](http://www.usitc.gov/research_and_analysis/documents/Pierce%20and%20Schott%20-%20The%20Surprisingly%20Swift%20Decline%20of%20U.S.%20Manufacturing%20Employment_0.pdf) in the last two decades. We even [researched and published](http://www.nber.org/papers/w20395) some of that empirical evidence. Still, we believe blocking the TPP on fears of globalization would be a mistake.

### Int. Link—Companies Fear Chinese Competition

#### Companies lobby the USFG for protections against Chinese competition

[Lee Drutman](https://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/author/ldrutman/), PhD—Senior fellow at New America, and teaches in the Center for Advanced Governmental Studies at The John Hopkins University, March 3, 2014, “[How Big Pharma (and others) began lobbying on the Trans-Pacific Partnership before you ever heard of it](https://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2014/03/13/tpp-lobby/),” Sunlight Foundation, <https://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2014/03/13/tpp-lobby/> (accessed June 8, 2016)

But the pharmaceutical industry is not alone in lobbying to shape the trade agreement (see Figure 1below). Next on the list are auto manufacturers (101 reports), followed by clothing & accessories (89 reports), milk and dairy products (82 reports), and textiles and fabrics (82 reports). Figure 1 visualizes the top 20 most active industries, measured by lobbying reports that mention the Trans-Pacific Partnership or TPP by name. Looking at the top 20 organizations (Figure 2 below) tells a similar picture: PhRMA, the pharmaceutical industry’s trade association, tops the list at 44 reports mentioning the trade agreement, followed closely by drug giant Pfizer at 42. The Chamber of Commerce comes in third, with 34 reports, followed by the Dairy Farmers of America, the Generic Pharmaceutical Association and Yahoo!, all at 29 reports. The requisite caveat is these counts are based on voluntary disclosures, and they rely on the organization to specifically mention the trade agreement by name in its lobbying disclosure forms (as opposed to something like "trade issues"). Still, the lobbying patterns shouldn’t come as a surprise: They largely reflect the interests that are most likely to be affected by the trade agreement. Additionally, we can use [Docket Wrench](http://docketwrench.sunlightfoundation.com/) to see which organizations wrote the most public comment letters to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) regarding the TPP. Table 1 below lists these organizations, and each organization is linked to a list of its comments on Docket Wrench. For those seeking to better understand these organizations’ positions and arguments — and the ways in which they tried to shape the TPP in its early stages — these documents are an incredible source. More broadly, all this early-stage involvement demonstrates just how dedicated these industries and organizations have been to trying to shape the agreement. Our analysis of lobbying reports shows who was working on the issue back in 2009, when the number of players involved was small enough and public scrutiny was so minimal that it was easier to shape priorities and language. Figures 3 and 4below show which companies and industries were most active when. The general pattern is one of increasing involvement over time, though the charts also make clear which industries were involved right from the very start. Hollywood has been involved in shaping this agreement from the start, and the movie industry has [largely gotten what it wanted](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2013/11/15/five-key-questions-and-answers-about-the-leaked-tpp-text/) — provisions that bring back some of the pieces of [SOPA](http://www.opencongress.org/bill/hr3261-112/show)/[PIPA](http://www.opencongress.org/bill/s968-112/show) that could not pass Congress, as well as extending corporate-owned copyrights to life plus 95 years. The [International Intellectual Property Alliance](http://www.iipa.com/), a trade group that represents the film and music industry, has submitted seven different comment letters to the USTR regarding TPP. Here’s an example of one demand from [a Nov. 10, 2010 comment letter](http://docketwrench.sunlightfoundation.com/document/USTR-2010-0031-0005): [C]oncrete obligations for strengthening copyright enforcement, including: measures to address online and other infringements generally, and specifically, including criminal remedies for significant wilful (sic) infringements of copyright regardless of whether such acts are undertaken with any direct or indirect motivation of financial gain, as well as willful infringements for purposes of commercial advantage or private financial gain. Automakers (the second most active sector as measured by number of mentions in lobbying reports) are seeking [broader protections](http://www.businessweek.com/news/2014-02-06/ford-to-oppose-trans-pacific-trade-pact-without-currency-limits) against Japanese imports, and have major concerns about currency exchange rates. Ford Motor Company, for example, has recently stated that it will oppose the TPP unless it deals with [issues of currency manipulation](http://www.businessweek.com/news/2014-02-06/ford-to-oppose-trans-pacific-trade-pact-without-currency-limits). It has won some [key support in Congress](http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/01/09/us-usa-trade-currencies-idUSBREA080TL20140109) for its position. Back in 2009, Ford listed 10 specific guiding policies for the TPP [in a comment letter](http://docketwrench.sunlightfoundation.com/document/USTR-2009-0041-0089). Here were its top three demands: Dismantle non-tariff barriers (NTBs), as well as tariffs. Promote an accelerated tariff reduction mechanism or sectoral agreement for trade for environmental goods. Require our partners to pursue market-based currency policies. The textile industry has also been extremely active. As requested by the industry, [U.S. negotiators are putting forward](http://www.textileworld.com/Issues/2013/May-June/Executive_Forum/The_TPP-High_Stakes_For_U.S._Textiles) something called [a “yarn-forward” rule](http://www.textileworld.com/Issues/2013/July-August/From_The_Editor/TPP_Effect_Hinges_On_Yarn-Forward_Rule), which would require that all important production steps take place in [a TPP country](http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/press-releases/2014/February/Statement-of-Ministers-and-Heads-of-Delegation-for-TPP-countries) — one way to prevent China from supplying cheap textile components to other Asian countries. The textile lobbying appears to have paid off in garnering [support for the industry position in Washington](http://www.forbes.com/sites/danikenson/2013/07/23/textile-protectionism-in-the-trans-pacific-partnership/). Back in 2009, the American Apparel & Footwear association was laying out the case for strict Rules of Origin in [a comment letter to the USTR.](http://docketwrench.sunlightfoundation.com/document/USTR-2009-0041-0108)

### Int. Link—Companies Influence Congress

#### Corporate lobbyists control the flow of information in Washington—major influence in Congress

[Jeff Madrick](http://www.nybooks.com/contributors/jeff-madrick/), Director of the Bernard L. Schwartz Rediscovering Government Initiative at the Century Foundation and Editor of Challenge Magazine. He teaches at Lang College, the New School, April 7, 2016, “How the Lobbyists Win in Washington,” NY Review of Books, <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2016/04/07/how-lobbyists-win-in-washington/> (accessed June 8, 2016)

On President Obama’s first day in office in 2009, he issued an executive order to close “the revolving door” between government and the private sector by restricting the hiring of any registered lobbyists for positions in his administration. But Obama himself eventually hired at least seventy lobbyists, many of whom then returned to lobbying after a stint in his administration. So much for Obama’s campaign pledge that he would “tell the corporate lobbyists that their days of setting the agenda in Washington are over.” The executive order has since been dropped, and the number of business lobbyists in Washington has continued rising rapidly. Taking jabs at the profession remains a popular sport, even among Republicans. Donald Trump claimed at one of the Republican debates this fall that he would not talk to lobbyists once elected. Jeb Bush said that he would not let any more into Washington’s halls of power. The question remains: How much influence on Washington’s agenda do business lobbyists have? A book titled The Business of America Is Lobbying by a highly regarded Washington watchdog, Lee Drutman, is therefore welcome, especially during a new presidential season. It takes some wading through Drutman’s disorganized prose and his sometimes ambivalent feelings about lobbying to find his main messages. But there are two crucial points that are disturbing. The first is that business spends $34 on lobbying for every dollar spent by likely opponents such as labor unions and other interest groups. The second point is, I think, Drutman’s most important. It may once have been adequate for lobbyists to provide business clients access to the right people. Today, however, they also must develop expertise on major political issues, so that they can provide policymakers with research, draft legislation, and pass on up-to-the-minute information. Lobbyists, not staffers, concludes Drutman, are now the major source of information for Congress and the executive branch on major legislative issues. In one survey, two thirds of congressional staffers said they depend on lobbyists for the information they need to make legislative decisions and pass bills. Thus lobbying grows because Congress, and often the executive branch, needs lobbyists. To sum up Drutman’s main theme, there is a large imbalance of both lobbying money and expertise that enables lobbyists to influence much of the Washington agenda today. Drutman believes this influence must be trimmed, and he proposes a number of reforms to address the asymmetry of money and expertise—including a new public lobby—that I believe may be effective and will discuss below. But none of Drutman’s proposals has been discussed in the presidential campaigns thus far.

### Int. Link—Companies Influence Congress

#### Lobbyists control the “connective tissue” between politicians and legislation in Washington

Tina Nguyen, VanityFair.com political reporter, September 15, 2015, “Donald Trump Says He Doesn’t Need Lobbyists. He’s Probably Wrong,” Vanity Fair, <http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2015/09/donald-trump-lobbying-super-pac> (accessed June 8, 2016)

But these days, thanks to looser restrictions on campaign-finance laws, “‘lobbying’ has become a shorthand for wealthy financial interests” trying to push their agenda through the government, says Meredith McGehee, policy director at the Campaign Legal Center, a nonprofit organization focused on combating the influence of money in politics. (The group’s founder, Trevor Potter, served as legal counsel to Stephen Colbert’s satirical super-PAC.) “Well-heeled interests can hire talented lobbyists to make their case,” McGehee noted. “But they’re not representing the consumers themselves.” Reviewing Trump’s history, he’s benefitted from just that kind of lobbying: a recent [Politico article](http://www.politico.com/story/2015/09/donald-trump-lobbyists-washington-insider-213466) recapped his decades of influence in Washington, not only by donating hundreds of thousands of dollars to political candidates on both sides of the aisle, but by getting several bills passed that would benefit his large casino operations, and occasionally brushing into serious trouble with the law. (In 2000, the New York state lobbying commission imposed a $250,000 fine—the largest civil penalty in the state’s history at the time—against Trump and his associates for attempting to undercut a rival Native American gambling operation by funding a campaign against them, using secret, unregistered lobbyist money.) Although Trump has forsworn his past—mostly by saying that because he is a financial player, he cannot be played—several Washington lobbyists are sure he’ll have to rely on their industry just to get things done in Washington. That is, if he gets elected at all. “Everyone thinks it’s too early,” said lobbyist Dale Snape, vice chairman at Wexler and Walker Associates, acknowledging that Trump has definitely “tapped into the frustration of voters,” and that Washington was paying attention. But so far, no one’s been “losing sleep.” “I do not get the sense from my colleagues on either side that Donald Trump is going to carry a majority,” Snape said. “He may move the goalpost in a different way than we thought, though.” At the same time, a Republican director of government affairs at a large tech company said there was “chaos” within “traditional D.C.” over why Trump had gained appeal. “People can’t explain it,” this person, who asked to remain anonymous to speak candidly about the situation, said. (He added that initially, there was suspicion that Trump “may have been playing the political field for attention” after he announced plans to build a hotel in D.C.: "But somehow he stumbled across a serious anti-establishment mood [and] thought to himself, holy cow, this could actually work!”) But if Trump gets elected, those within the lobbying industry believe he will crash into the reality of the political system, leaving him with no other choice but to play along—even with his self-proclaimed network of successful people and experts who can advise him. “He may make attempts to reach out to friends and business associates, but it’s impossible for him to rely solely on his social circles,” the tech director said. “Many of the people he’ll have to reach out to will be the traditional voices in D.C.”—including lobbyists working on behalf of interest groups, nonprofits, think tanks, and yes, large corporations. And it won’t be as easy for the real-estate developer to exert his will in government. “In business, people make singular decisions and it will stick,” Snape observed. “In government, it’s a shared decision. There’s a limit on what you can do.” McGehee, a registered lobbyist herself, noted that the constant push to shrink the size of government has left it staffed largely by people willing to work for smaller salaries, i.e. “25-year-old staffers with no knowledge or experience” to draft legislation. Hence, government’s reliance on lobbyists, who are often political veterans with years of experience in federal agencies or Congress, and who work on behalf of the players who can finance them. And that, McGehee warned, is not something Trump has said publicly he could fix. “Trump will likely meet with people from large corporations, employers, bundlers—yes, it’s expected. But nothing ensures that the constituent side gets heard.” Some have compared Trump with another famous outsider who promised significant campaign-finance reform but, once elected, couldn’t shake the influence of lobbyists, either. “I don’t know of anyone who was more of an outsider than Barack Obama,” said Snape. “He promised he would shake up Washington. After he was sworn in, it was business as usual.”

## Impacts

### Free Trade Good—Data

#### The aff’s “free trade bad” impacts are all rhetoric—economists nearly unanimously vote Neg

[Bryan Riley](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/r/bryan-riley), Jay Van Andel Senior Analyst in Trade Policy, and [Anthony B. Kim](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/k/anthony-kim), Research Manager of the Index of Economic Freedom and Senior Policy Analyst for Economic Freedom, in the Center for Trade and Economics, of the Institute for Economic Freedom and Opportunity, at The Heritage Foundation, October 20, 2015, “Freedom to Trade: A Guide for Policymakers,” The Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/10/freedom-to-trade-a-guide-for-policymakers> (accessed June 10, 2016)

What Is Better for the U.S.: Free Trade or Protection from Imports? According to data in the annual Index of Economic Freedom, countries with low trade barriers are more prosperous than those that restrict trade. What Do Economists Say About Free Trade? Polls consistently show near-unanimous support for free trade from economists. According to a panel of economic experts questioned by the University of Chicago’s Booth School of International Business, “free trade improves productive efficiency and offers consumers better choices.” (See Table 1.) What Do Americans Believe About Free Trade? According to a 2014 survey from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 65 percent of Americans believe that “globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good for the United States.”[[1]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/10/freedom-to-trade-a-guide-for-policymakers#_ftn1) A 2014 Pew Research Center survey found that 68 percent of Americans believe growing trade and business ties with other countries is “a good thing.”[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/10/freedom-to-trade-a-guide-for-policymakers#_ftn2) A 2015 Pew survey found that 58 percent of Americans believe that trade agreements have been “a good thing” for the United States.[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/10/freedom-to-trade-a-guide-for-policymakers#_ftn3) What Does “Fair Trade” Mean? Politicians often talk about the need to support trade that is “free but fair.” Seldom, however, does anyone explain what fair trade is, or—even more to the point—for whom trade should be fair. In the name of fairness, different special interest groups advocate different protections for their specific industries and call the comparative advantage of other countries unfair. In reality, fair trade occurs whenever there is a voluntary transaction between a willing buyer and a willing seller. Do Imports Destroy American Jobs? No credible economic study has ever documented net U.S. job losses resulting from imports. Trade—like technology—destroys some jobs but creates others. According to Heritage Foundation research, over half a million American jobs—in fields such as transportation, wholesale, retail, construction, and finance—are supported by imports of clothes and toys from China alone. The dollars that Americans save by importing products are spent and invested elsewhere in the U.S. economy, creating new jobs; the dollars that foreign businesses earn from selling their goods to Americans are spent on U.S. exports or invested in the U.S. economy, also creating new American jobs. What About Critics Who Claim the U.S. Has Lost Millions of Jobs Due to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and Chinese Imports? The United States has gained millions of new jobs since NAFTA was created and since China joined the World Trade Organization (WTO) in December 2001. (See Chart 2.)

### Free Trade Good—Long Term Economics

#### Now is a key time to bolster America’s commitment to free trade—despite short term losses from trade liberalization, long term economic benefits outweigh

David Shipley, Senior editor for Bloomberg View’s economic review, March 28, 2016, “The Case for Free Trade Is as Strong as Ever,” Bloomberg, <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2016-03-28/the-case-for-free-trade-is-as-strong-as-ever> (accessed June 11, 2016)

It wasn't so long ago that America's commitment to free trade could be taken for granted. Now it's in doubt -- even though support for open markets remains vital for the nation's future prosperity, and the world's. In this presidential election year, the mood is decidedly anti-trade. Democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton, under pressure from the left of her party, [refuses to back](http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2015/oct/08/hillary-clinton/hillary-clinton-now-opposes-trans-pacific-partners/) the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a new trade pact she once called the gold standard for such agreements. Donald Trump, her Republican counterpart, is more direct: He advocates [punitive tariffs](http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2016/01/07/donald-trump-says-he-favors-big-tariffs-on-chinese-exports/) and all-out trade war. The idea that import barriers will strengthen the economy is brainless populism -- and one might expect economists to say so. If only. Many experts say, or seem to say, that [it's all very complicated](http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2015-10-11/the-trouble-with-economics), that the benefits of free trade have [often been overstated](http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2015-10-07/free-trade-is-no-longer-a-no-brainer-for-economists), and even that it [might not matter too much](http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/03/04/the-mitt-hawley-fallacy/) if the U.S. retreated from the global economy. Economists don't want to be thought simple-minded -- or, worse, market-fundamentalist. But the result is that some aggressively dumb economics is arousing only the most feeble pushback. The case for free trade, correctly understood, is as powerful as ever. It deserves much stronger support. The basic case is robust, and the economic record of the world's richest economies -- including that of the U.S. -- attests to it: Free trade makes economies more productive by forcing producers to innovate, specialize and compete. There are exceptions to the argument that openness promotes growth, mostly concerning the need to shelter infant industries in developing economies. It's also true that more trade involves winners and losers, and that gains for the overall economy aren't much use to the people who lose their jobs because of cheap imports. You could say the same of people who lose their jobs because of automation. Yet presidential candidates don't oppose technology because it creates losers as well as winners. Perhaps that's next. [Recent research](http://www.nber.org/papers/w21906) suggests that the short-term losses from trade liberalization are bigger and more protracted than previous work showed. This careful, detailed work underlines the need to help the workers harmed by trade. Yet these new studies don't show that short-term adjustment costs entirely outweigh the short-term gains -- much less contradict the essential point that trade, over time, gives the economy as a whole a substantial boost. Forgive the market fundamentalism, but a policy that delivers small net gains in the short term and substantial net gains in the long term still seems like a good idea.

### Trade War—Key to Global Stability / Poverty

#### A trade war crushes free trade and jeopardizes global stability and causes mass poverty

Binyamin Appelbaum, Washington correspondent for The New York Times. He covers the Federal Reserve and other aspects of economic policy, May 2, 2016, “Experts Warn of Backlash in Donald Trump’s China Trade Policies,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/03/us/politics/donald-trump-trade-policy-china.html?_r=0> (accessed June 9, 2016)

He added: “It doesn’t have to be 45; it could be less. But it has to be something because our country and our trade and our deals and most importantly our jobs are going to hell.” As president, Mr. Trump would have some latitude to reverse a course that the nation has pursued for decades. But the results could be troublesome on multiple fronts. The removal of trade barriers has played a significant role in reducing global poverty and encouraging peace between nations, achievements that could be eroded by tit-for-tat backsliding. “The basic principle is that a sovereign state enters trade agreements of its free will, and it can get back out,” said Robert Howse, the Lloyd C. Nelson professor of international law at N.Y.U. School of Law. “But that’s the easy part.”

### Trade War—Kills Jobs

#### Trade war has no winners—tariffs spark retaliatory policies killing millions of American jobs

[Jim Tankersley](http://www.washingtonpost.com/people/jim-tankersley), Journalist covering economic policy for the Washington Post, March 25, 2016, “Donald Trump’s trade war could kill millions of U.S. jobs,” The Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/03/25/donald-trumps-trade-war-could-kill-millions-of-u-s-jobs/> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Trade has been one of Donald Trump's [great selling points](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/03/21/how-republicans-helped-create-donald-trump-more-than-15-years-ago/) on the campaign trail. China and Mexico are killing us, he has told crowds on his way to the lead position for the Republican presidential nomination, and if Trump wins the White House, he will fight back. The implication is that getting tough with our trading partners -- by taxing their exports as they cross America's borders -- will bring jobs and prosperity to the United States. An economic model of Trump's proposals, prepared by Moody's Analytics at the request of The Washington Post, suggests Trump is half-right about his plans. They would, in fact, sock it to China and Mexico. Both would fall into recession, the model suggests, if Trump levied his proposed tariffs and those countries retaliated with tariffs of their own. Unfortunately, the United States would fall into recession, too. Up to 4 million American workers would lose their jobs. Another 3 million jobs would not be created that otherwise would have been, had the country not fallen into a trade-induced downturn.

### Trade War— Causes Shooting War

#### Protectionism is a recipe for war—creates conditions and a slippery slope to armed conflict

[Jeff Carter](http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/jeffcarter/), Independent market speculator, former member of the CME Board of Directors, and commentator for various cable news networks, , December 30, 2011, “Isolationism, Protectionism Lead to War,” Town Hall, <http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/jeffcarter/2011/12/30/isolationism_protectionism_lead_to_war/page/full> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Read an article I [linked to in the breakfast links](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/12/29/thursday-breakfast-links-12/) this morning that said a lot if you read between the lines a little. The sentiment is very unsettling to me with regard to growth and the future of the world economy. IMF Chair Christine Lagarde came out yesterday with guns blazing. It looks like even she has had enough of bureaucratic doublespeak for the last two years in Europe and wants something accomplished other than throwing more money at the debt crisis. She compared the current situation to the period between the two World Wars. “The period we are living in is like the 1930s in certain respects. At that time, countries turned inwards, and multilateralism declined. Today, we see some countries raising tariffs, and erecting non-tariff barriers and sometimes blocking capital flows.” According to Lagarde, rising national self-interest is the main obstacle to overcoming the current crisis. “It is difficult to put in place strategies for international cooperation against the crisis. National parliaments are reluctant to put at risk their public finances or their government guarantees to support other countries.” She added that around the world there was growing support for protectionist policies, and that the idea of “everyone for themselves” was gaining ground. The US [response](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/06/26/john-maynard-keynes-rip/) to the crisis in 2008 was not unlike the 1930's. It didn’t work in 1930, and [it didn’t work](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/06/02/beware-the-bear-hint-he-lives-at-1600-pennsylvania-avenue/) in 2008. This theme of discontent started back in 2006 in the US, and now is picking up steam across the world. It’s manifested in many different ways, but I believe there is a great disconnect between what we experience [locally](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/08/28/big-government-destroys-family-farmers/) in our daily lives and what we see in our governments. Locally, we see people being able to target services to individual [needs](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/12/10/three-24-year-olds-do-what-gao-says-is-impossible/). New tools change one size fits all to on demand, cost effective, how I want it, production. Nationally and internationally, we see big generic, big spending, over reaching government programs. It’s causing consternation. People aren’t stupid. You know when you are being snookered. In 2006, the Democrats ran on a platform of fiscal conservatism and fighting for the little guy. Once ensconsed in power, they did the [opposite](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/01/24/money-multipliers-macroeconomics-government-spending-and-obamas-sotu-proposals/). Their budgets [blew up the debt](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/11/22/more-taxes-will-not-help/) and they passed huge government [programs](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/12/05/re-doing-obamacare-2/) that only benefit the biggest guys. In 2009, the [Tea Party](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/09/22/numbers-are-stubborn-things/) formed when Obama passed the stimulus, and gained momentum after [Obamacare](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/03/21/my-sad-healthcare-story/) was passed. In 2010, they swung legislative power back to the Republicans that have pledged to follow Tea Party tenants, shrink the size and scope of government and cut spending. 2012 becomes a pivotal year for that movement because if they can get control of the Senate and White House, we might actually see some [progress](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/09/07/where-is-the-compromise/) on their goals. Worldwide though we are seeing people rise up against [central planning](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/10/17/free-markets-vs-central-planning/). It’s the millions versus the monolith. The Arab spring was something that could not have been fathomed 10 years ago. Some say its the result of social media, others the Iraq War, and some say a little of both. In China, people are becoming discontented with their government. In [Russia](http://streetwiseprofessor.com/?p=5893), Putin looks to be in trouble. Closer to home we have seen a secondary movement in [Occupy Wall Street](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/10/07/occupy-wall-street-is-a-fraud/) that might have started with good intentions, but was [co-opted](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/10/03/dissecting-occupy-wall-street/) by the hard left. Republican voters have tried almost every declared candidate on for size. In Iowa, we now see the rise of [Ron Paul](http://streetwiseprofessor.com/?p=5898). Paul’s increasing Iowa poll numbers are not because people believe in his platform. It’s a sign of how discontented voters are with the establishment. Paul would be dangerous as a President because he is an isolationist. With rising tides of isolationism world wide, this is precisely the wrong strategy to take in the US. Free trade and free capital flows among markets are some of the best tonics for an ailing economy. Home grown businesses have a chance to penetrate other markets, and can increase competition to make goods and services cheaper at home. [Immigration](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/05/03/immigration/) goes hand in hand with free trade. We want a lot of immigration to the US because it establishes all kinds of world wide networks that are impossible to establish with centrally planned negotiation. We need all kinds of high level talent in the US, and immigration is a good way of getting it here. Instead, we are setting up [barriers](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/04/19/is-the-us-a-sort-of-roach-motel/). The isolationist logic seems so simple. It’s easy to explain. However, when you hear it, gird yourself. It’s a fool’s path to prosperity. The internet is changing our economies and societies in ways that people never envisioned fifteen years ago. The internet makes the world flat. It takes vertical chains of distribution and blows them up, putting producers closer to end users. Producers can now manufacturer products [directly](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/08/31/investment-in-growth/) for your need, instead of being generic. [Central planning](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/10/26/more-on-central-planning-versus-free-markets/) for the masses doesn’t work. The world used to be this. Now it’s this, [Protectionism](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/10/05/free-trade-and-tasty-donuts/) and isolationism lead to [war](http://www.nationalww2museum.org/). All government programs treat you as if you are a random number variable in an endless chain. Bad fiscal policy, as the US has had, leads to desperation, which leads to class warfare. This is not about the have and have nots. It’s about making the pie larger. As we have seen over and over again across the entire world, big government isn’t about [making pies bigger](http://pointsandfigures.com/2011/07/25/demand-curves-slope-down-and-why-this-is-important-to-you/). It’s only about dividing pie. Because government is unproductive, reliance on it keeps giving you smaller and smaller [slices of pie](http://pointsandfigures.com/2010/06/08/why-government-jobs-dont-work/). Pretty soon we are fighting over crumbs.

### Trade War— Causes Shooting War

#### Protectionism sparks escalating trade wars that turn into shooting and nuclear wars

Michael Panzner, Teacher and faculty member at the New York Institute of Finance, 2008, “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse,” Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138, Google Books (accessed June 10, 2016)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster, But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange, foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the (heap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more healed sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an "intense confrontation" between the United States and China is "inevitable" at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

### Free Trade Good—Key to Global Stability

#### Free trade creates and environment of peace and stability

Arthur Foulkes, Journalist and writer for various Indiana based news outlets, October 22, 2012, “The Magic of Free Trade,” FEE—Foundation of Economic Education, <https://fee.org/articles/the-magic-of-free-trade/> (accessed June 10, 2016)

What’s more, free trade among nations is a way to promote peaceful international relations. When individuals are free to trade across political boundaries, they are more likely to view “foreigners” positively. The mutual benefits of trade, in other words, can promote peace. Ricardo, one of the most influential economists of all time, was among the first to understand the great value of free trade. In his Principles of Political Economy and Taxation (1817) he summed up the benefits of free international trade nicely: Under a system of perfectly free commerce, each country naturally devotes its capital and labor to such employments as are most beneficial to each. This pursuit of individual advantage is admirably connected with the universal good of the whole. . . . [It] distributes labor most effectively and most economically; while, by increasing the general mass of productions, it diffuses general benefit, and binds together, by one common tie of interest and intercourse, the universal society of nations throughout the civilized world. Free trade gets a bad rap from domestic producers and protectionists of all sorts. But nothing is more important to a growing, dynamic economy than allowing the basic human right to freely and peacefully exchange with others.

### Free Trade Good—Key to Hegemony

#### Free trade creates financial conditions key to maintain US hegemony

Mireya Solís, Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies/senior fellow at the Brookings Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies/ associate professor at American University, and Justin Vaïsse, Director of the policy planning staff at French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 17, 2013, “Free Trade Game Changer,” The Brookings Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/free-trade-game-changer> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Free trade was not a priority in your first administration. It is, however, an indispensable component of a long-term growth strategy to rebound from the 2008-2012 recession. It is also a necessary part of the response to the significant redistribution of power in the international system. The pivot to Asia and to the emerging world in general cannot be based on political and military initiatives alone. It needs to be backed by rejuvenated American leadership in trade and investment.

### Protectionism Hurts Economy—Prices

#### Despite problems with free trade, protectionism costs Americans more money

Michael Schuman, Beijing-based journalist who writes on the global economy, April 7, 2016, “How a Tariff on Chinese Imports Would Ripple Through American Life,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/08/upshot/how-a-tariff-on-chinese-imports-would-ripple-through-american-life.html> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Donald Trump has proposed [a 45 percent tariff](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/fact-check.html?_r=0#/factcheck-64) on imports from China, on the theory that this would protect American jobs and promote American business. What’s more likely, though, is that the new tariffs would set off a cascade of global economic consequences, mostly negative. Trade between China and the United States — [which reached $598 billion in 2015](https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/balance/c5700.html) — has generated large economic benefits for Americans. Manufacturing many goods in China, whether sneakers or smartphones, has kept their prices lower than they would be if made here. That’s been a boon to American consumers, especially those with less money. But more and more, economists are also recognizing a downside to free trade. Competition from China and other low-wage emerging economies has severely hurt some American workers. [One study figures](http://economics.mit.edu/files/9811) that the United States lost at least two million jobs between 1999 and 2011 because of Chinese imports. To many people, Mr. Trump’s solution may seem to make sense: Restrict those imports, save jobs and support American business. But if there were a 45 percent tariff on Chinese goods, at least part of that would probably be passed onto consumers in the form of higher prices. Americans would end up buying fewer Chinese things, and fewer things from anywhere else. Shrinking sales of Chinese products would generally hurt American businesses and workers. A product labeled “Made in China” is not necessarily 100 percent Chinese, since many goods are assembled in China with parts from the United States and elsewhere. Sluggish purchases of these so-called Chinese products would reduce the sales of their American components, too. For this reason and others, quite a lot of the money spent on Chinese goods actually ends up in the wallets of Americans. A [study by the Federal Reserve](http://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/publications/economic-letter/2011/august/us-made-in-china/)Bank of San Francisco figured that 55 cents of every $1 spent by an American shopper on a “Made in China” product goes to the Americans selling, transporting and marketing that product. Suppressing Chinese imports would harm shopkeepers and truck drivers.

### Protectionism Hurts Economy—Global Econ

#### Protectionism crushes the global economy—world economy is too fragile to survive a US/ China trade war

Nick Sargen, PhD and chief economist at Fort Washington Investment Advisors Inc., March 16, 2016, “Is Globalization the Enemy? Free Trade and the U.S. Election,” Nick Sargen Blog, <http://www.nicksargen.com/index.php/1683/is-globalization-the-enemy-free-trade-and-the-u-s-election/> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Among the key issues to be decided in the U.S. presidential election is the future of U.S. trade policy. Free trade has been the guiding principle of both Republican and Democratic administrations throughout the post W.W.II era, but none of the contenders today has campaigned in support of it. What’s at stake is much more than the fate of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). More worrisome is whether the U.S. will threaten trade sanctions against China, a stance favored by Donald Trump, who has asserted China is a currency manipulator. Even if the threat of a U.S.-China trade war is mere rhetoric, it risks unsettling global markets when the global economy is fragile. Politicians instead should be focusing on policies to ensure our workers have the requisite skills to compete in a world where technological advances will render existing techniques obsolete.

### Protectionism Causes Retaliation

#### Protectionism causes other nations to model American tariffs causing global recession

[Everett Rosenfeld](http://www.cnbc.com/everett-rosenfeld/), Staff writer for CNBC.com covering international macroeconomics, politics and financial technologies, March 10, 2016, “Trump trade plans could cause global recession: Experts,” CNBC, <http://www.cnbc.com/2016/03/10/trump-trade-plans-could-cause-global-recession-experts.html> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Even if the welfare of the rest of the globe is excepted, such a tax on goods imported from China would "tremendously" hurt the poor by jacking up the prices on many of the products they most frequently use, said Caroline Freund, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics. But extreme tariffs would also hurt American manufacturing — the very sector that Trump says he seeks to bolster — by raising the prices on production inputs sourced from abroad. Steel from China, for example, would become significantly more expensive for more U.S. firms, Freund said. "So many U.S. companies are deeply involved in global supply chains: I can't even imagine what that would look like with high tariffs," she said. Expanding the economic view to the global level, experts said Trump's strong measures would likely start an international trade war that cripples everyone involved. One argument economists make is that high tariffs on goods from a country like China will lead to an oversupply of products unable to be sold in the U.S., so those goods will go for even cheaper than normal in other countries, and those countries will then respond with tariffs of their own. The end result is high prices around the world, and a slowdown in international growth — or even an outright recession. Some countries might raise taxes on American goods just as a reaction to a more isolationist economic policy, experts said. "If you take (Trump's) position as real, that we would do this, then it would take the world down the road that we saw in the 1930s that we saw with the Smoot–Hawley Tariff," Freund said. "The world would definitely fall into a recession."

### Protectionism Causes Retaliation

#### Protectionism causes retaliatory tariffs that kills millions of US jobs

[Catherine Rampell](http://www.washingtonpost.com/people/catherine-rampell), Columnist for the Washington Post, May 23, 2016, “Donald Trump’s trade policies are dangerous,” The Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-dangers-of-a-trade-war/2016/05/23/ac977b80-2120-11e6-9e7f-57890b612299_story.html> (accessed June 10, 2016)

Usually, when making reckless threats about the economic furor he’ll unleash upon China, Mexico and other major U.S. trading partners, Donald Trump claims they’ll all cower helplessly in terror in response. Such a skilled negotiator is he that no country would dare retaliate. Hence, in the battle to Make America Great Again, no trade war will ever materialize. But at his [first campaign rally](http://www.c-span.org/video/?409721-1/donald-trump-addresses-supporters-lawrenceville-new-jersey&start=1271) in almost two weeks, Trump also offered another, slightly different justification for his hot-headed comments. A hedge, if you will. As usual, he savaged our current trade deals, calling them “disgusting, the absolute worst ever negotiated by any country in the world.” As usual, he said that China and other countries are “killing us,” that we are “viewed as the stupid country.” And, as usual, he pledged to slap gigantic tariffs on products manufactured abroad. Such measures, he promised, would deter further offshoring, bring jobs back and make the rest of the world “behave” and “respect” us. But he added one additional argument. Rather than just assuming away the possibility of a trade war, he suggested it would be no big deal if one erupted. “These dummies say, ‘Oh, that’s a trade war.’ Trade war? We’re losing $500 billion in trade with China. Who the hell cares if there’s a trade war?” Let’s take his question at face value. What’s so terrible about a trade war? Plenty, for both us and our trading partners. As my Post colleague Jim Tankersley [reported in March](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/03/25/donald-trumps-trade-war-could-kill-millions-of-u-s-jobs/), Moody’s Analytics has modeled the consequences of the specific trade policies Trump advocates. These include a 45 percent tariff on Chinese imports and a 35 percent tariff on Mexican imports. Trump is right that China and Mexico should fear tariffs of this magnitude: They would indeed throw both countries into recession, according to the Moody’s model. Unfortunately, the resulting damage would drag us down with them, and within a year the United States would probably tumble into recession. Here’s why. If other countries choose to retaliate — or “punch back,” in the Trumpian vernacular — by introducing tariffs of their own, our own exports will get more expensive to buyers abroad. If our exports get more expensive, the employment of [millions](http://www.trade.gov/mas/ian/build/groups/public/@tg_ian/documents/webcontent/tg_ian_005500.pdf) of workers in export-supporting industries becomes endangered, too. As export ­dependent businesses shed workers, those businesses and their newly laid-off workers will have less money to spend, causing knock-on effects throughout the economy. A downward spiral would result, leading to about 7 million fewer American jobs than there would be in the absence of Trump’s machismo-driven trade policy. Even if Mexico and China for some reason chose not to levy retaliatory tariffs, mind you, Trump’s policies would still batter the U.S. economy. That’s because tariffs here — just like any other taxes — are not costless.

### Impact Magnifier – Geopolitical Tensions

#### Potential trade war would escalate – geopolitical tensions

Jill Schlesinger, Tribune Content Agency Staff Writer, March 30, 2016, “Free Trade: Good or Bad for America?” <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/sns-201603301700--tms--retiresmctnrs-a20160330-20160330-story.html> (Accessed 6/14/2016)

Economists and politicians may have overstated the benefits of trade deals and minimized the potential pitfalls, but one thing is clear: Even the hint of ripping up existing agreements has raised warning flags around the world. A report from the Economist Intelligence Unit listed a Donald Trump presidency as the sixth biggest risk to the global economy (tied with the rising threat of jihadi terrorism), primarily due to his "exceptionally hostile" posture toward free trade, including notably NAFTA, and his repeated accusations about China being a "currency manipulator." Economists are concerned that a potential trade war would be devastating, because it would decimate U.S. exporters, raise prices for Americans and escalate geopolitical tensions. As proof, they cite the 1930 Smoot-Hawley legislation, which contributed to making the Great Depression even worse. So what is the solution? Economists Ed Dolan says: "It would be far more reasonable to employ direct forms of aid. Retraining, adjustment assistance to workers or employers, income support or wage subsidies are some of the possible remedies." Despite the anger and rhetoric, the campaign season has raised awareness that the country needs to do more to help displaced workers.

## Answers to 2AC Args

### A/T “Job Loss Worse Than Trade War for Econ”

#### No link turn—tariffs only hurt US manufacturing and the economy

[Meagan Parrish](http://www.manufacturing.net/staff-author/meagan-parrish-0), Senior reporter for manufacturing.net, March 2016, “Could Trump’s Tariff ‘Threat’ Hurt American Manufacturing?,” Manufacturing.net, <http://www.manufacturing.net/news/2016/03/could-trumps-tariff-threat-hurt-american-manufacturing> (accessed June 15, 2016)

In recent years, many economists and policy advisers [have trumpeted](https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33536.pdf) the idea that the U.S. needs to take more aggressive measures to reduce its trade deficit with China — which reached a record high of $365.7 billion in 2015. Yet, GOP presidential hopeful Donald Trump’s proposed idea to impose a 45 percent tariff on imports from China and 35 percent on many goods from Mexico have many analysts worried about the implications for U.S. manufacturers. [A recent Reuters report](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-trump-trade-idUSKCN0WQ0WG) highlighted the damaging impact it could have specifically on the auto industry. The U.S. Commerce Department estimates that about $118 billion worth of cars and parts traveled tariff-free between the U.S. and Mexico last year. Imposing a high tariff would raise costs for auto companies that use Mexican-made parts in their vehicles. For example, [Reuters estimates](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-trump-trade-idUSKCN0WQ0WG) that, “Buyers of Fiat Chrysler Automobiles NV's popular Ram 1500 pickup trucks assembled in Saltillo, Mexico, could see their $26,000 base price pushed up by $9,000 if the tariff is fully passed on to consumers.” In [a recent interview with Business Insider](http://www.businessinsider.com/ford-ceo-mark-fields-interview-2016-3), Ford Motor Co. CEO Mark Fields commented on the idea of higher tariffs and specifically on a shot Trump took at Ford early in his campaign when he said it was unpatriotic of the company to open a new plant in Mexico. “We are a multinational company going back to our founder,” Fields [said.](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-trump-trade-idUSKCN0WQ0WG) “Our approach is to ‘build where we sell.’” Fields pointed to the income and jobs Ford has created as evidence that the current trade situation was still creating value for the American economy. “Since 2011, we've invested over $10 billion in our facilities, we've hired more than 25,000 people — 80 percent of our capital expenditures in North America are done right here in the United States, and 97 percent of engineering is done here,” he said. Although Trump’s plan would initially raise prices on goods for American consumers, the idea is that it would help level the playing field with American manufacturers so that they would relocate operations to the U.S. However, a professor who has studied the effects of the Trans Pacific Partnership trade deal [said](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-trump-trade-idUSKCN0WQ0WG) it would take years for the U.S. industry to rebuild supply chains and make that kind of transition. Meanwhile, China and Mexico are likely to retaliate and impose high tariffs on goods that would be most damaging to the U.S. economy. [Reuters pointed](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-trump-trade-idUSKCN0WQ0WG) to 2009 when Mexico imposed duties up to 25 percent on more than 90 U.S. farm goods, while American lawmakers deliberated allowing Mexican truckers on U.S. roads. Ultimately, the row cost U.S. growers $70 million in revenue — a 50 percent cut — over 31 months, according to the National Potato Council. Trade tensions with China would expose a host of other industries to potential losses. Trade between China and the U.S. [was $591 billion](https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/balance/c5700.html) in 2014. Other industries that rely on trade with China include aircraft, corn and soybean and electronics.

### A/T “Manufacturing Not Key to Economy”

#### US manufacturing is key to the economy—key to jobs and is reverse causal to improving the economy

[Robert E. Scott](http://www.epi.org/people/robert-e-scott), Senior Economist and Director of Trade and Manufacturing Policy Research at EPI, January 22, 2015, “The Manufacturing Footprint and the Importance of U.S. Manufacturing Jobs,” Economic Policy Institute (EPI), <http://www.epi.org/publication/the-manufacturing-footprint-and-the-importance-of-u-s-manufacturing-jobs/> (accessed June 14, 2016)

This report examines the role manufacturing plays in employment at the national, state, and congressional district levels, including the number of jobs manufacturing supports, the wages those jobs pay, and manufacturing’s contribution to GDP. (This report updates an earlier EPI report but includes U.S. congressional district data for the first time.) The data show that manufacturing employment was stable for three decades until 1998, and has been on a largely downward trajectory since then, with traditional manufacturing states hit particularly hard. Given its size and importance, we cannot ignore the consequences of such a decline. Further, the policies that would help manufacturing the most are those that would help close the nation’s large trade deficit. Reducing this trade deficit would, in turn, provide a valuable macroeconomic boost to a U.S. economy that is still operating far below potential. The manufacturing sector has a large footprint in the U.S. economy. It employed 12.0 million workers in 2013, 8.8 percent of total U.S. employment. Manufacturing plays a particularly important role in supporting jobs in a core group of states in the upper Midwest (East North Central and selected West North Central) and South (East South Central) states. The top 10 states ranked by manufacturing’s share of total state employment in 2013 are Indiana (16.8 percent, 491,900 jobs), Wisconsin (16.3 percent, 458,400 jobs), Iowa (14.0 percent, 214,500 jobs), Michigan (13.5 percent, 555,300 jobs), Alabama (13.1 percent, 249,100 jobs), Arkansas (12.9 percent, 152,400 jobs), Ohio (12.6 percent, 662,100 jobs), Kentucky (12.4 percent, 228,600 jobs), Mississippi (12.3 percent, 136,700 jobs), and Kansas (11.9 percent, 162,900 jobs).

### A/T “China Won’t Retaliate”

#### China would certainly retaliate—they’ve done it before in response to tariffs

Keith Bradsher is the Hong Kong bureau chief of The New York Times, covering Asian business, economic, political and science news, September 13, 2009, “China Moves to Retaliate Against U.S. Tire Tariff,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/14/business/global/14trade.html?_r=0> (accessed June 14, 2016)

[China](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/china/index.html?inline=nyt-geo) unexpectedly increased pressure Sunday on the United States in a widening trade dispute, taking the first steps toward imposing tariffs on American exports of automotive products and chicken meat in retaliation for [President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per)’s decision late Friday to levy tariffs on tires from China. The Chinese government’s strong countermove followed a weekend of nationalistic vitriol against the United States on Chinese Web sites in response to the tire tariff. “The U.S. is shameless!” said one posting, while another called on the Chinese government to sell all of its huge holdings of[Treasury bonds](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/t/treasury_department/treasury_securities/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). The impact of the dispute extends well beyond tires, chickens and cars. Both governments are facing domestic pressure to take a tougher stand against the other on economic issues. But the trade battle increases political tensions between the two nations even as they try to work together to revive the global economy and combat mutual security threats, like the nuclear ambitions of Iran and North Korea. Mr. Obama’s decision to impose a tariff of up to 35 percent on Chinese tires is a signal that he plans to deliver on his promise to labor unions that he would more strictly enforce trade laws, especially against China, which has become the world’s factory while the United States has lost millions of manufacturing jobs. The trade deficit with China was a record $268 billion in 2008. China had initially issued a fairly formulaic criticism of the tire dispute Saturday. But rising nationalism in China is making it harder for Chinese officials to gloss over American criticism. “All kinds of policymaking, not just trade policy, is increasingly reactive to Internet opinion,” said Victor Shih, a Northwestern University specialist in economic policy formulation. Eswar Prasad, a former China division chief at the International Monetary Fund, said that rising trade tensions between the United States and China could become hard to control. They could cloud the Group of 20 meeting of leaders of industrialized and fast-growing emerging nations in Pittsburgh on Sept. 24 and 25, and perhaps affect Mr. Obama’s visit to Beijing in November. “This spat about tires and chickens could turn ugly very quickly,” Mr. Prasad said. China exported $1.3 billion in tires to the United States in the first seven months of 2009, while the United States shipped about $800 million in automotive products and $376 million in chicken meat to China, according to data from Global Trade Information Services in Columbia, S.C. For many years, American politicians have been able to take credit domestically for standing up to China by taking largely symbolic measures against Chinese exports in narrowly defined categories. In the last five years, the Commerce Department has restricted Chinese imports of goods as diverse as bras and oil well equipment. For the most part, Chinese officials have grumbled but done little, preferring to preserve a trade relationship in which the United States buys $4.46 worth of Chinese goods for every $1 worth of American goods sold to China. Now, the delicate equilibrium is being disturbed. China’s commerce ministry announced Sunday that it would investigate “certain imported automotive products and certain imported chicken meat products originating from the United States” to determine if they were being subsidized or “dumped” below cost in the Chinese market. A finding of subsidies or dumping would allow China to impose tariffs on these imports. The ministry did not mention the tire dispute in its announcement, portraying the investigations as “based on the laws of our country and on World Trade Organization rules.” But the timing of the announcement — on a weekend and just after the tire decision in Washington — sent an unmistakable message of retaliation. The official Xinhua news agency Web site prominently linked its reports on the tire dispute and the Chinese investigations.

### A/T “China Won’t Retaliate”

#### China would certainly retaliate—they have an economic incentive to strike back

Michael Schuman, Beijing-based journalist who writes on the global economy, April 7, 2016, “How a Tariff on Chinese Imports Would Ripple Through American Life,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/08/upshot/how-a-tariff-on-chinese-imports-would-ripple-through-american-life.html> (accessed June 14, 2016)

And the Chinese government’s response would probably be tariffs of its own on American goods and services rather than lowering barriers for American companies doing business in China. It [moved quickly to retaliate](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/14/business/global/14trade.html?_r=0) for the tariff on Chinese tires with punitive duties on American products. Because the Chinese market has become critical for many American companies — whether Apple, Starbucks or Boeing — any steps taken by the Chinese government to curtail their ability to operate in China would be bad news for them. Mr. Trump’s tariff proposal addresses a real and legitimate concern about the effect of competition from low-wage countries on American workers. But that doesn’t mean it’s going to solve the problem — and it could create even more.

### A/T “Global Economy Resilient”

#### The global economic is becoming increasingly fragile—big disrupts like the disad impact could collapse it

[Jack Rasmus](http://www.globalresearch.ca/author/jack-rasmus), PhD and professor of economics and politics at St. Marys College in California, Global Research, February 06, 2016, “Systemic Fragility in the Global Economy,” Global Research, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/systemic-fragility-in-the-global-economy/5505941> (accessed June 14, 2016)

Half way through the second decade of the 21st century, evidence is growing that the global economy is becoming increasingly fragile. Not just in fact, but in potential as well. And not just in the financial sector but in the non-financial sector—i.e. in the ‘real’ economy. The notion that the global crash of 2008-09 is over, and that the conditions that led to that severe bout of financial instability and epic contraction of the real economy, are somehow behind us is simply incorrect. The global economic crisis that erupted in 2008-09 is not over; it is merely morphing into new forms and shifting in terms of its primary locus. Initially centered in the USA-UK economies, it shifted to the weak links in the advanced economies between 2010-2014—the Eurozone and Japan. Beginning in 2014, it shifted again, a third time, to China and emerging markets where it has continued to deepen and evolve. It is true that the main sources of instability today are not located in the real estate sector—the subprime mortgage market—or the credit and derivatives markets that were deeply integrated with that market. Nor is the real economy in a rapid economic contraction. The problem in the real economy is the drift toward economic stagnation, with global trade and real investment slowing, deflation emerging, and more economies slipping in and out of recession—from Japan to Brazil to Russia, to South Asia and Europe’s periphery, even to Canada and beyond. On the financial side, it’s the continued rise of excess liquidity and debt—corporate, government, and household—that is fueling new financial bubbles—in stocks in China, corporate junk bonds, leveraged loans, and exchange traded funds in the US, government bonds in Europe, in currency exchange and financial derivatives everywhere. Financial instability events and crashes, and the real economic devastation that is typically wrought in their wake, do not necessarily occur in repeat fashion like some pre-recorded video rerun. The particulars and details are always different from one crisis to another. At times it’s real estate and property markets (USA 1980s, Japan 1990s, global 2007). Other times stock markets (tech bust of 2000, China 2015). Or currency markets (Asian Meltdown 1997-98) or government bonds (Europe 2012). But the fundamentals are almost always the same. What then are those fundamentals? How do they originate and develop, then interact and feed back on each other, creating the fragility in the global economic system that makes that system highly predisposed to the eruption of financial crises and subsequent contraction? What are the fundamentals that ensure, when some precipitating event occurs, that the financial instability and real contraction that follows occurs faster, descends deeper, and has a longer duration than some other more ‘normal’ financial event or normal recession? What are the transmission mechanisms that enable the feedbacks, intensify the instability, and exacerbate the crisis? And how do the fundamentals negate and limit the effectiveness of fiscal-monetary counter measures attempting to restore financial stability and real recovery? Indeed, what is meant by ‘systemic fragility’, why is it important, and why do most economists not address or consider it in their forecasts and analyses? The book will argue there are 9 key fundamental trends underlying the growing fragility in the global economy include: the decades-long massive infusion of liquidity by central banks worldwide, especially the US central bank, the Federal Reserve, along with the increasing availability of ‘inside credit’ from the private banking system; the corresponding increase in private sector debt as investors leverage that massive liquidity injection and credit for purposes of investment; the relative redirection of total investment, from real investment to more profitable financial asset investment; a resultant slowing of investment into the real economy, as a shift to financial securities investment diverts and distorts normal investment flows; growing volatility in financial asset prices as excess liquidity, debt, and the shift to financial asset investing produces asset bubbles, asset inflation, and then deflation; a long run drift from inflation to disinflation of goods and services prices, and subsequently to deflation, as real investment flows are disrupted and real growth slows; a basic change in the structure of financial markets as new global financial institutions and new financial markets and securities are created, and an emerging new global finance capital elite arises, to accommodate the rising liquidity, debt, and shift to financial asset investment; parallel basic changes in labor markets resulting in stagnation and decline of wage incomes and rising household debt; growing ineffectiveness of fiscal and monetary policies as debt and incomes from financial assets rise, incomes from wages and salaries stagnate and household debt rises, and debt on government balance sheets increases while government income (taxes) slows—which together reduce the elasticities of response of investment and consumption to interest rates and multiplier effects from government fiscal policies.

### A/T “Global Economy Resilient”

#### The global economy has lost its resiliency—it’s fragile now

Jethro Mullen, Staff writer for CNN Money, April 12, 2016, “IMF warns of 'increasingly fragile' global growth,” CNN Money, <http://money.cnn.com/2016/04/12/news/economy/imf-global-economy-slowdown/> (accessed June 14, 2016)

The prospects for the world economy this year are getting gloomier. The International Monetary Fund has taken a knife to its forecasts for global growth again, warning that momentum is "ever-slowing and increasingly fragile." For this year, the fund now expects worldwide growth of 3.2%, down from the 3.4% [it forecast just three months ago](http://money.cnn.com/2016/01/19/news/economy/imf-global-growth-china/?iid=EL), and only a hair above last year's 3.1%. The past few months have seen financial market turmoil, weakening momentum in advanced economies and more difficulties for emerging and lower-income economies, the IMF said Tuesday. If global market turbulence resumes or [China's slowing economy](http://money.cnn.com/2016/04/11/news/economy/china-first-quarter-2016-gdp-preview/index.html?iid=EL) throws out any nasty surprises, the picture could darken further, it warned.

### A/T “Job Loss Worse Than Trade War for Econ”

#### No link turn—Tariffs are a small help to the manufacturing sector but the economy loses much more in a trade war

[Tim Fernholz](http://qz.com/author/tfernholz/), Journalist covering state, business and society for Quartz news, January 15, 2016, “Trump is caught lying about his China tariff proposal—and it would hurt his supporters the most,” Quartz, <http://qz.com/595618/trump-is-caught-lying-about-his-china-tariff-proposal-and-it-would-hurt-his-supporters-the-most/> (accessed June 14, 2016)

Asked if about his plan to raise a tariff on imported Chinese goods to 45%, reported by the New York Times, Trump said, “That’s wrong. They were wrong. It’s the New York Times, they are always wrong.” The New York Times, always wrong or not, is equipped with audio recorders, and the paper quickly produced [this transcript](http://nyti.ms/1JNEJU8) of Trump’s meeting with the newspaper’s editorial board: I would tax China coming in—products coming in. I would do a tariff. And they do it to us. We have to be smart. I’m a free trader. I’m a free trader. And some of the people would say, ‘Oh, it’s terrible.’ I’m a free trader. I love free trade. But it’s got to be reasonably fair. I would do a tax, and the tax—let me tell you what the tax should be. The tax should be 45 percent. Trump concluded that if China continued what he sees as unfair trade practices, “I would certainly start taxing goods that come in from China.” What would that mean to his supporters, which include many middle-class Americans frustrated by their inability to get ahead in the economy? They certainly are feeling the affects of international trade, which appears to be one of the [main causes of stagnant wages](http://qz.com/127496/dont-blame-robots-for-americas-falling-wages-blame-trade/) in the US. China’s attempts to keep its currency at artificially low levels, Trump’s bogeyman here, was once part of the picture, but [that’s old news](http://piie.com/publications/testimony/testimony.cfm?ResearchID=2902)—China has been [doing the opposite](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/china-defends-yuan-says-betting-against-it-is-ridiculous-2016-01-11) lately. Ultimately, imposing a massive tariff on Chinese goods would not necessarily improve the US economy. Among the consequences economists would expect: Prices rising for consumers. If you shop at Wal-Mart, you’re getting a lot of cheap goods from China. Critics of China’s trade policy argue that the company’s imports—an estimated $49 billion in 2013—[cost the US 400,000 jobs over a twelve years](http://www.epi.org/publication/the-wal-mart-effect/), though they rely on labor cost estimates from 2001 which may inflate that figure. (For perspective, the US created 2.9 million jobs in 2015). But imagine if Wal-Mart suddenly had to pay an extra 45% on its imported goods: The company would have to raise prices and look for new cheaper sources of goods. But it wouldn’t go looking in the US, where labor costs are high—it would more likely opt for low-cost labor markets like Vietnam. Not that many new jobs. We have a natural experiment about the effect of Chinese tariffs. In 2009, the US slapped China with a tariff of 35% on tires after the World Trade Organization ruled that China was overwhelming US tire manufacturers with an influx of subsidized imports. After tariffs went up, [economists looked at the results](https://www.piie.com/publications/pb/pb12-9.pdf) (pdf), and found that while the US added 1,200 jobs, it cost US consumers $1.1 billion to purchase more expensive tires, for a cost per job of $900,000—little of which actually went to the workers themselves. China also retaliated by increasing duties on US chicken imports, which cost US exporters about $1 billion, and leading us to our next consequence: A trade war.

### A/T Free Trade Kills Jobs

#### Job loss is not a direct consequence of increased trade – larger shift

Gillian B. White, senior associate editor at The Atlantic, January 29, 2016, “What Economists Got Wrong About Free Trade,” <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/01/how-economists-were-wrong-about-free-trade/433818/> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

Considering how Chinese imports have affected American workers, the downsides of global exchange are much more intense and enduring than many make them out to be. As trade has become a more and more integral part of the global economy, accepted economic wisdom has asserted again and again that overall, free trade is a good thing. Because trade brings so much in the way of competitive pricing and opportunities to buy and sell goods on a more massive scale, the drawbacks that come with it—job losses and declining wages for instance—are often thought to be outweighed. Further, there’s a belief that some of these downsides aren’t even the direct consequences of trade. Proponents of free trade argue that the decline of American manufacturing jobs isn’t the result of increased trade, but of a larger shift in the nation’s economy toward higher-skilled jobs. They also point out that the growth of wage inequality hasn’t corresponded perfectly with the expansion of global trade. At any rate, whatever their cause, the drawbacks of trade are regarded as not so severe that they can’t be overcome; it’s assumed that workers who find themselves in a region whose jobs are vulnerable to foreign competition could simply move and find a job somewhere else.

### A/T “Free Trade Bad”

#### Be skeptical of their “free trade bad” turns, economic information is manipulated to distort the depiction of trade

Kithmina Hewage, Research assistant at the Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka (IPS), April 07, 2016, “Has the US Turned Against Free Trade Agreements?,” The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2016/04/has-the-us-turned-against-free-trade-agreements/> (accessed June 10, 2016)

However, in the absence of adequate information, interest groups have sought to trump up potential losses from trade to create a sense of skepticism and fear among the general public. Therefore, governments often find it difficult to gain adequate support for trade deals regardless of the benefit to the economy and citizens. It is vital that governments ensure an inclusive process with domestic stakeholders, where adequate information regarding the direction of a deal is disseminated to the electorate. In this regard, both policymakers and economists have failed in their role as educators. Historically, advocates of trade have solely focused on the benefits without informing citizens about the potential costs. Thus, citizens feel deceived when confronted with the challenges associated with international trade, allowing greater influence for interest groups to disseminate protectionist ideals – irrespective of accuracy. Trade agreements have become the embodiment of international trade, with proponents and opponents rallying around and against the passage of any particular trade deal. Unlike in previous decades, however, free trade agreements are no longer exclusively focused on tariff reductions. With the expansion of the [GATT/WTO trading regime](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/fact2_e.htm) and the general acceptance of free trade, tariff rates across the world have reduced exponentially. Consequently, [non-tariff barriers](https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/anrep_e/wtr12-2d_e.pdf) pose the most pertinent obstacles to trade. Modern trading agreements, therefore, are geared toward addressing issues beyond simple tariff reductions and attempt to address bottlenecks hindering the growth potential through trade due to non-tariff barriers – many of which may have been unaddressed in previous trade deals. In essence, trading agreements now attempt to standardize and harmonize practices in order to facilitate better trade. Since developing countries suffer most from non-tariff barriers, it is vital that nations update their existing trading arrangements in order to fully benefit from trade by addressing existing obstacles. The anger, frustration, and mistrust associated with bilateral and multilateral trade agreements threatens this process. These feelings are not exclusive to the United States. Any discussion on trade liberalization, especially in South Asia, evokes a strong response from certain interest groups promoting the continuation of protectionist policies. These groups are often well organized and consequently garner prominence in public discourse on policy matters. Just as in the United States, critics in Asia showcase a growing trade deficit as evidence of the asymmetric benefits of trade deals. However, as Neil Irwin [pointed out for the New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/28/upshot/the-trade-deficit-isnt-a-scorecard-and-cutting-it-wont-make-america-great-again.html?_r=0), “Trade deficits are not inherently good or bad; they can be either, depending on circumstances.” And in the United States in particular, circumstances indicate the trade deficit actually has positive effects. To overcome such misconceptions, it is the responsibility of policymakers to recognize the political-economy of trade and engage with citizens by providing a comprehensive picture of the objectives of a given trade deal and its implications (both good and bad), as well as establishing a transparent and inclusive process when drafting such documents. Failure to do so will only exacerbate the trust deficit between the government and its people, hindering the growth of the country in the process.

# DA Answers Protectionism DA

### Non-Unique—Trade War Now

#### US and China already fighting a trade war

Shawn Donnan, Staff writer for the Financial Times, May 10, 2016, “US and China skirmish as trade clash looms,” Financial Times, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/4bd8c6ec-16c5-11e6-b8d5-4c1fcdbe169f.html#axzz4BDoW9ftm> (accessed June 10, 2016)

[Donald Trump](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/4d4c7380-162e-11e6-9d98-00386a18e39d.html#axzz489lnhlN0) may be threatening to start a trade war with China, but it is becoming clear that the US and its [geopolitical rival](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/d4d06d54-1672-11e6-b197-a4af20d5575e.html#axzz489lnhlN0) are already skirmishing ahead of what could be a combative summer. The latest sign came on Tuesday when the US brought a new challenge in the World Trade Organisation against Chinese anti-dumping tariffs on US poultry products. It was the 12th time that the Obama administration has taken China to the WTO, more than any previous US administration. “American farmers deserve a fair shot to compete and win in the global economy and this administration will continue to hold China responsible when they attempt to disadvantage our farmers, businesses and workers,” said Mike Froman, US trade representative. The latest move is part of a broader effort by the administration and American industry to get tough on China that is seeing the trade rhetoric being dialled up even far away from the campaign trail. “This is war. This is not trade. China is waging economic war. We ought to recognise that and act accordingly,” Lourenco Goncalves, chief executive of iron ore producer Cliffs Natural Resources, told reporters last week on the sidelines of a US steel industry association meeting.

### Non-Unique – Trade War Now

#### US and China in a trade war now – economic implications inevitable

Robert Romano, senior editor of Americans for Limited Government, April 10, 2016, “China and the World’s Trade War Against the US – and Why We’re Losing” <https://www.conservativereview.com/commentary/2016/04/china-and-the-worlds-trade-war-against-the-us-and-why-were-loosing> (Accessed 6/14/16)

The U.S. has been in a trade war with the rest of the world for years. We just have not been fighting back. Foreign investors and governments currently hold about $6.2 trillion of U.S. treasuries, $872 billion of so-called agency debt (mostly Fannie and Freddie mortgage securities), $3.2 trillion of corporate debt and $6.2 trillion of corporate stocks in Dec. 2015, according to data compiled by the U.S. Department of Treasury. Overall it represents a massive $16.5 trillion foreign investment in U.S. dollar-denominated assets, including debt and equities. It actually peaked in 2014 closer to $17 trillion after experiencing increases averaging $1.4 trillion from 2012 through 2014. In 2015, the number actually dropped a few hundred billion dollars as emerging markets imploded. But where did the foreigners get so much money to invest in U.S. dollar assets? A large chunk of it comes from the trade deficits the U.S. experiences annually with the rest of the world, which has averaged $539 billion a year since 2000, totaling $8.7 trillion alone, and $10.6 trillion since 1974. Consider, if that $8.7 trillion had never been shifted overseas, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) would be nearly $27 trillion today. Consider that. 82 percent of trade deficits has been since 2000, right at the same time permanent normal trade relations with China was granted. Those dollars were then reinvested by foreigners into U.S. dollar assets. This in turn had the effect of devaluing foreign exporter currencies against the U.S. dollar, like the Chinese yuan, making their exports cheaper, and further exacerbating ever larger trade deficits here. This is the essential currency manipulation that made it all work — which U.S. policy makers simply never responded to with any real effect.

### Non-Unique – Trade War Now

#### US already in trade battle with China – steel exports

Jon Connars, investment risk analyst and researcher with an expertise in the ASEAN region, June 7, 2016, “The Trade War with China is Already Here,” <http://atimes.com/2016/06/the-trade-war-with-china-is-already-here/> (Accessed 6/13/16)

Donald Trump’s threats to hit China with protectionist tariffs of up to 45% on the goods it ships to the US go down well with his supporters on the campaign trail, despite ruffling feathers among free marketeers within his own party. Experts and commentators are less impressed, suggesting The Donald’s proposed trade war could cost US jobs and potentially trigger a global downturn. us-china-trade-war. What Trump and his opponents fail to acknowledge, however, is that the US is already engaged in a vicious trade battle with China centered on steel exports. China’s overproduction has decimated steel producers all over the world after the country upped its output from 128 million tons in 2000 to 822 million tons in 2014. American steel makers have already lost billions of dollars as a result of China dumping its steel exports on the US economy, while their counterparts in countries from Brazil to Britain have been left facing bankruptcy. Unsurprisingly, American and European steel mills are pushing their governments to take action. In the face of growing international pressure, Beijing has repeatedly promised to slow its steel output, but the numbers tell their own story. March saw the highest level of Chinese steel production in history. The China Iron & Steel Association revealed the country churned out 70.65 million tons in just that one month alone. Despite falling back in April overall, average daily production rose from 2.279 million tons to 2.314 million tons, another record high, according to Reuters.

### Non-Unique – Trade War Now

#### Mass trade war between US and China now—it’s here and escalating absent the plan

Robert Stevens, Staff writer for the World Socialist Website, April 20, 2016, “Steel producers summit threatens stepped-up trade war against China,” <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2016/04/20/stee-a20.html> (accessed June 14, 2016)

A meeting Monday in Brussels was billed as a “High-Level Symposium on Excess Capacity and Structural Adjustment in the Steel Sector,” organised by the Belgian government and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Instead of resolving tensions, it marked a further stepping up of an ongoing trade war. Ministers and other high-level government officials in charge of steel-related industrial and trade policies from 34 countries attended, including the United States, China and India, which collectively produce 93 percent of global steel output. Alongside these were representatives from the European Union (EU), World Trade Organisation, the World Steel Association, and delegates from various private sector steel corporations. The meeting was called in response to the massive global overcapacity in steel production. The OECD noted that global steelmaking capacity was 2.37 billion tonnes in 2015, but declining production meant only 67.5 percent of that was being used—down from 70.9 percent in 2014. New plants were set to add another 47 million metric tonnes by 2018. China, which has gone from producing a few percent of the world’s steel a few decades ago, produced half of all steel worldwide in 2015. It now has an overcapacity of 350 million tons, according to EU estimates. This is double the amount produced in one year in the entire EU. China’s attempt to export some of its surplus has led to a collapse in steel prices of up to 40 percent. In March, China announced that 500,000 jobs would go in its steel industry, with capacity to be drastically reduced. According to World Steel Association chairman Wolfgang Eder, “The problem in Europe is that there is too much capacity” and the industry would probably have to be reduced by half in the next 15 years to survive. Given that 330,000 workers are employed at more than 500 sites throughout Europe, the scale of job losses entailed would be staggering. The “overarching focus” of the Brussels meeting was “on promoting structural adjustment in the steel industry and reducing excess capacity by removing distortionary government policies and through industry restructuring.” It aimed to “agree on steps to reduce competition-distorting policies.” Behind such phrases, the real agenda of the meeting was for the major imperialist powers to confront China, not an OECD member, with threats of escalating sanctions. Belgian Deputy Prime Minister Kris Peeter, who chaired the meeting, acknowledged that “very frank” discussions took place. EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmstrom said, “It’s now life or death for many companies” as “the massive surge in steel imports from China is hitting Europe very hard and the price of steel in Europe has dropped by 40 percent in the last years.” Singling out China again, she said a “crucial problem here is of course the involvement of states and support, and not market needs, and this has created incentives to overproduce.” Malmstrom warned that the EU has begun to impose a series of tariffs against China and was now “examining a few other Chinese issues as well and we might bring them further later this year.” Following the meeting, US Secretary of Commerce Penny Pritzker and Trade Representative Michael Froman released a belligerent statement, warning: “Unless China starts to take timely and concrete actions to reduce its excess production and capacity in industries including steel ... the fundamental structural problems in the industry will remain and affected governments—including the United States—will have no alternatives other than trade action to avoid harm to their domestic industries and workers.” Li Xinchuang, the vice secretary general of the China Iron and Steel Association, was belligerent in his response, stating, “It is a totally pointless complaint from the US and it’s biased against China.” Speaking to Reuters, Li said, “China’s steel industry is market-based and Chinese steel products have good quality, low price and good service. The complaint on government subsidies is also crap.” Xinhua, China’s official state news agency, declared that assigning blame to the Chinese steel industry was “a lame and lazy excuse for protectionism. … Blaming other countries is always an easy, sure-fire way for politicians to whip up a storm over domestic economic woes, but finger-pointing and protectionism are counterproductive.” China's assistant commerce minister, Zhang Ji, told reporters that China had cut 90 million tonnes of capacity and would reduce it by a further 100-150 million tonnes. Asked what steps the government would take following the unsuccessful talks, Commerce Ministry spokesman Shen Danyang told reporters Tuesday, “China has already done more than enough. What more do you want us to do?” Even though any decisions reached at the meeting were to be nonbinding, nothing whatsoever could be agreed other than a “follow-up high-level discussion in September 2016.” For decades, the trade unions in every country have played a central role in dividing steel workers and sabotaging all struggles, as they facilitated the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs and attacks on wages, terms and conditions, and pension rights. Today they openly act as the nationalist cheerleaders for corporations and are the staunchest advocates of protectionism and trade war measures.

### Non Unique—Protectionism Inevitable

#### China’s economic rise makes protectionism inevitable

[Elena Holodny](http://www.businessinsider.com/author/elena-holodny), Staff writer for the Business Insider, May 14, 2016, “One of the central topics of Donald Trump's campaign is a terrible idea,” Business Insider, <http://www.businessinsider.com/protectionism-near-term-economic-problems-2016-5> (accessed June 10, 2016)

From the paper's meaty abstract (emphasis ours): China's emergence as a great economic power has induced an epochal shift in patterns of world trade. Simultaneously, it has challenged much of the received empirical wisdom about how labor markets adjust to trade shocks. Alongside the heralded consumer benefits of expanded trade are substantial adjustment costs and distributional consequences. ... Adjustment in local labor markets is remarkably slow, with wages and labor-force participation rates remaining depressed and unemployment rates remaining elevated for at least a full decade after the China trade shock commences. Exposed workers experience greater job churning and reduced lifetime income. At the national level, employment has fallen in U.S. industries more exposed to import competition, as expected, but offsetting employment gains in other industries have yet to materialize. Just to be clear, it's way too much of an exaggeration to say that free trade is not "good." After all, it's definitely easier on consumers' wallets to not pay 45% tariffs. Plus, one could argue that 15 years isn't enough for the global and US economies to adjust to the huge China shock. But it's still interesting to think about the split between what's "good" for the global and US economies versus what's "good" for your everyday American worker — and how these kinds of issues will be addressed going forward.

### Non-Unique—Protectionism Inevitable

#### Protectionism inevitable – economic populism

Jared Bernstein, senior fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, March 14, 2016, “The Era of Free Trade Might Be Over. That’s a Good Thing.” <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/14/opinion/the-era-of-free-trade-might-be-over-thats-a-good-thing.html> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

FOR decades, free-trade agreements, called F.T.A.s, have been one of the most solid planks in the platform of economic elites and establishment politicians. True, the occasional political candidate like Ross Perot argued against one deal or another and even President Obama ran on “renegotiating” the North American Free Trade Agreement, but once elected, presidents of both parties sought and ratified trade deals with a wide variety of countries. Those days may well be over. What changed? For one thing, the economic populism of the presidential campaign has forced the recognition that expanded trade is a double-edged sword. The defense of globalization rests on viewing Americans primarily as consumers, not workers, based on the assumption that we care more about low prices than about low wages.

### Non-Unique – Protectionism Inevitable

#### Protectionism on the rise – global trend

Greg Ip, Chief Economics Commentator at The Wall Street Journal, March 9, 2016, “Powerful Pair: Protectionism and the Presidency,” <http://www.wsj.com/articles/powerful-pair-protectionism-and-the-presidency-1457544702> (Accessed 6/15/16)

Protectionist actions are on the rise globally, according to a tally compiled by Global Trade Alert, a watchdog group, led by India and Russia. Britons will soon vote on whether to leave the European Union. In short, a protectionist president would suit the temper of the times. The Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930, which sharply raised import tariffs and worsened the Depression’s impact on trade, is often cited as a cautionary tale about protectionism. But in one respect the analogy is flawed. Smoot-Hawley was largely the product of horse trading between individual legislators to protect favored industries. As a result, in 1934, Congress decided to forgo “the business of tariff logrolling,” as trade historian Doug Irwin writes, and delegated most authority over tariff negotiations to the president. This division of power has insulated the world trading system from Congress’s parochial tendencies. By the same token, it puts the world more at the mercy of presidents whose latitude over trade has steadily expanded. Presidential appointees at the Commerce Department adjudicate complaints that foreign imports are being illegally sold at below cost, below home-country price or subsidized. They almost always find in favor of the domestic industry. Whether those findings actually merit penalties is up to the independent International Trade Commission, whose members are nominated by the president and confirmed by Congress.

### Non-Unique – Protectionism Inevitable

#### Increased trends show a rise in protectionism despite support for free trade

Josh Wingrove, Bloomberg Staff Writer, May 24, 2016, “Canada Concerned by Rising Global Waves of Protectionism,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-05-24/rising-protectionism-a-concern-to-canada-says-trade-minister> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

Rising global waves of protectionism are a concern to Canada and underscore the need not to rush ratification of the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade pact, Trade Minister Chrystia Freeland said in an interview in Tokyo on Tuesday. Freeland’s remarks came after she joined Prime Minister Justin Trudeau in meetings with Japanese auto executives. Trudeau will join other global leaders at a Group of Seven summit in central Japan later this week. “We are a trading nation. We really understand the importance of Canada being plugged into the global economy, and we are concerned by the rising waves of protectionism we see around the world,” Freeland said, declining to specify which countries are of most concern. Canada and Japan are each TPP signatories yet neither has ratified the trade agreement. Freeland said the TPP had not come up in talks so far that day, and that Canada is concerned by a rise in anti-trade sentiment globally. Speaking to reporters later Tuesday, Trudeau said that Canada is "very much" a pro-trade nation. "I am personally extremely pro-trade and we are consulting widely on that specific deal, the TPP," he said.

### Non-Unique – Trade War Inevitable

#### New administration will increase protectionism – rise inevitable

Choi Sung-Jin, Korea Times Staff Writer, May 8, 2016, “Whoever Becomes US Leader, Trade War Seems Inevitable,” <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/biz/2016/05/123_204090.html> (Accessed 6/14/16)

As Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are all but certain to clash in the U.S. presidential election in November, attention also is on their policies' effect on the world economy. Major pledges of the two contenders are poles apart, but whoever becomes U.S. president, they will likely strengthen protectionism in trade and foreign exchange policies compared with the Obama administration, experts here said Thursday. Both candidates, for instance, oppose the U.S.-led 12-nation free trade accord, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), threatening its successful launch, they said. If Trump slaps import duties of 45 percent on products made by major trading partners, including China and Mexico, it will be catastrophic for global trade, touching off trade and currency wars between the United States and the rest of the world. Korea, a major exporter enjoying a sizable trade surplus with the U.S., will be one of the biggest victims. According to the International Finance Center and other sources, behind the enhanced trade protectionism found in the two otherwise contrasting politicians is the economic polarization among Americans, which sharply eroded their support for free trade.

### No Link—No Influence

#### No link: any companies upset by the plan aren’t the politically connected companies that can influence Washington

Nick Carey and James B. Kelleher, Staff writers for the Huffington Post, April 27, 2011, “Corporate America’s Relationship With China Worries Small Business,” The Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/27/china-us-american-companies-corporations_n_854294.html> (accessed June 9, 2016)

Big American companies with investments in China are afraid to criticize Beijing because of the controls it has over just about any access to the Chinese market. They fear too strident a stance could mean they will lose contracts or even be ostracized as Google Inc was after a dispute with China over censorship and hacking. “The Chinese government controls all the levers of the economy, from import and export licenses on up,” said Victor Shih, an assistant professor of politics at Northwestern University. “There are so many ways for the Chinese government to retaliate it is no surprise businesses are so reluctant to criticize it.” But multinationals and their CEOs have a great deal of influence on debate in Washington and more widely in the country. They have often lobbied aggressively against any measures they deem protectionist, so their relative silence is seen by many smaller manufacturers and others as weakening the U.S. in its trade relationship with China. “The issue today is that the firms hurting the most are not as politically connected as the firms that are benefiting the most,” Mesirow’s Swonk said.

### No Link—Congress Won’t Act

#### No Link—Congress would never allow mass tariffs, they fear economic backlash

[Everett Rosenfeld](http://www.cnbc.com/everett-rosenfeld/), Staff writer for CNBC.com covering international macroeconomics, politics and financial technologies, March 10, 2016, “Trump trade plans could cause global recession: Experts,” CNBC, <http://www.cnbc.com/2016/03/10/trump-trade-plans-could-cause-global-recession-experts.html> (accessed June 10, 2016)

But many experts interviewed by CNBC dismissed Trump's calls for extreme tariffs — 35 percent [on Ford vehicles from Mexico](http://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/elections/2015/06/16/trump-press-ford-cancel-mexican-plant/28816173/) and [45 percent on Chinese goods](http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2016/01/07/donald-trump-says-he-favors-big-tariffs-on-chinese-exports/) — saying they strained credulity, even by campaign-promise standards. "I think in order to qualify as a coherent set of policies, the policies have to not be cartoonish and the policies have to stand some chance of being actually enacted, and I just don't think Mr. Trump's trade policies meet either of those criteria," said Michael Strain, resident scholar at the conservative American Enterprise Institute. A spokeswoman for Trump's campaign did not immediately return a request for comment on this article. Congress would never assent to such extreme measures, Strain said, because international trading partners and domestic businesses would immediately apply "enormous pressure." But beyond the political possibility of such a proposal, massive tariffs would also have significantly deleterious effects for the U.S. and world economy, several economists said.

### No Link—Companies Like the Plan

#### No link—US companies want strong relations with China to open up new trade and business opportunities

Bruce Kennedy, Staff writer for CBS Money Watch, September 2, 2014, “China and the U.S.: Ever-tighter economic ties,” CBS Money Watch, <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/china-and-the-u-s-ever-tighter-economic-ties/> (accessed June 14, 2016)

Relations between the U.S. and [China](http://www.cbsnews.com/changing-china/) have never been especially warm. But over the past several decades, as China has developed into the world's second-largest economy, the two nations' financial futures have become all the more intertwined. That's why many economic experts and analysts are carefully watching as China's economy slows down. On Monday, [two surveys showed](http://www.businessinsider.com/afp-china-manufacturing-growth-slows-in-august-surveys-show-2014-9) China's manufacturing growth slowed in August, which may mean authorities will have to inject stimulus to reach their 7.5 percent annual growth target. China is in the midst of an epic transition from a manufacturing and investment-driven economy to one based on services and consumption. Experts don't expect that transition to be seamless for either the Chinese people or their leadership. "There are a number of very difficult reforms ahead of them," said Elizabeth Economy, director for Asia Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. She expects challenges to arise as China deals with major changes in its banking, educational and legal systems, and has to grapple with such issues as the protection of intellectual property rights. But these reforms, and China's shift toward a consumer-led economy, could also end up benefiting the U.S. Economy said the long-time dream of some American export firms, "of 1 billion Chinese consumers," may finally become a reality. "As the Chinese middle class is growing and the upper-middle class is growing, they have demonstrated themselves to be real consumers, along the lines of Americans," she noted. "They like to try new products, which creates opportunities for U.S. companies." And as the government in Beijing complies with the World Trade Organization and other international regulatory guidelines, China might start making substantial investments, as well as mergers and acquisitions, linked to U.S. companies in the near future. "There are opportunities for China, really for the first time, to contribute to actual job-making on the ground in the United States," said Economy. "And that's a big shift. The numbers are still small, but nonetheless it's potentially a very positive trend."

### No Link—No Spillover

#### No link—there’s no spillover between US/China relations and business decisions

[Mark LaPedus](http://www.eetimes.com/document.asp?doc_id=1180416&), Staff writer for EE Times, April 10, 2001, “Companies in China worry about nationalistic policies--not spy plane incident,” EE Times, <http://www.eetimes.com/document.asp?doc_id=1180416> (accessed June 14, 2016)

The current standoff between China and the United States over the collision of an American surveillance plane and a Chinese jetfighter is clearly harming the delicate political relations between the two countries. But will this incident impact U.S.-Sino trade relations, especially in high-technology sectors? For now, most U.S. multinationals doing business in China claim that it's "business as usual" in the country, in spite of growing tensions between Beijing and Washington. In fact, one major U.S. company in China--Motorola Inc.--claims the U.S. surveillance plane incident will have no bearing on its current or future business in China. Relations between Motorola and the Chinese government remain on solid footing, insisted Stephen Tsao, senior marketing manager for the Asia-Pacific region at Motorola Semiconductors Hong Kong Ltd. "Motorola has been friends with the Chinese government for a long time, and we don't believe that will change," said Tsao in an interview with SBN in Hong Kong last week.

### Link Inevitable – China Buying US Companies

#### China increasing takeover on US companies – dominating the market

FLF, Forbes Leadership Forum Contributor, December 10, 2015, “Chinese Investment in the US Will Grow in 2016,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesleadershipforum/2015/12/10/chinese-investment-in-the-u-s-will-grow-in-2016/#7abdb571a8ab> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

China’s domestic economy may be slowing down relative to its impressive growth over the past decade, but foreign investment by the country’s government and businesses is at an all-time high. Chinese investors looking for higher and safer returns outside China recognize the value of Western involvement as a way to build their brands and compete globally. And as I learned at a recent seminar co-hosted by the Bank of Montreal and Hill & Knowlton Strategies and attended by high-level Chinese state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and private companies, their gaze is increasingly turning toward the United States. Even though the U.S. is a favorite nation, investments here have been significantly lower than in the rest of the world: China’s $90 billion invested in the world’s largest economy is less than 10% of its total outward investment of $1.1 trillion since 2005. This underweight position results partly from China’s earlier investment strategy and partly from to the political climate in the U.S. Until recently, three quarters of Chinese foreign investment was in energy, natural resources, and related transportation infrastructure. Those kinds of investments can be made elsewhere in the world at less cost and political risk than in the U.S., where natural resources are seen as vital to the national interest. The federal Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States traditionally takes a dim view of Chinese SOEs buying up strategic national resources and screens out investors—SOEs in particular—it feels do not meet the national security test. Now, with investment returns on commodities low, China has shifted its focus onto industries with higher rates of return, such as entertainment, real estate, insurance, and technology—industries where the U.S. is the dominant market. Some recent examples of this are Alibaba’s $200 million deal with Snapchat and the purchase of the iconic Waldorf Astoria hotel by the Anbang Insurance Group (the U.S. is particularly seen as a safe haven for real estate, which is now the fastest growing part of the Chinese portfolio).

### Internal Link Turn

#### Turn: the plan facilitates better relations with China which prevents US/ China war and creates jobs in the U.S.

Zachary Karabell, Head of global strategy at Envestnet, a financial services firm, April 1, 2016, “The Chinese want to buy more American companies — and we should let them,” The Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-chinese-want-to-buy-more-american-companies--and-we-should-let-them/2016/04/01/ce4f811c-ef72-11e5-85a6-2132cf446d0a_story.html> (accessed June 14, 2015)

Consider that the last crisis in U.S.-China relations occurred in 2001, when a U.S. spy plane [crashed](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/01/15/that-time-u-s-soldiers-were-detained-overseas-by-a-hostile-power-and-america-said-sorry-twice/) on Hainan Island and put tensions on high. It may be purely coincidental that nothing even remotely as incendiary has occurred since China joined the World Trade Organization in December of that year and began its foreign investment push. But it’s striking how the U.S.-China relationship — which has all the seeds of a serious and adversarial rivalry — has avoided any serious bouts of angry words, let alone retaliatory action. Economic ties may not guarantee peace and prosperity, but they do increase the incentives to negotiate differences and accommodate the needs and sensitivities of economic partners. That was the original intent, for instance, behind the creation of the European Union, which for all its many failures nonetheless helped end centuries of deadly conflict between the European powers. Somewhat surprisingly, in a presidential campaign season that’s been heavy on anti-China rhetoric, one person who seems to understand the benefits of Chinese investment is Republican candidate John Kasich. Speaking with ABC’s George Stephanopoulos last month, the Ohio governor extolled how a Chinese company has created jobs by setting up an auto-glass manufacturing operation in a previously shuttered General Motors plant. “I was just in a plant in Dayton, where we have a half-a-billion-dollar investment from the Chinese, and they’ve employed over 1,000 people there,” [Kasich said](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2016/03/13/kasich_touts_chinese_foreign_direct_investment_in_ohio_employed_over_1000_people.html), adding, “I was intimately involved in bringing that to Ohio.” We need to make it easier for China to invest in America. Not only would it help invigorate domestic industries, but it would also provide a path to greater security. If instead we let our fears lead us to greater isolationism, we will surely lose.

### Internal Link Turn

#### Turn: US/ China economic engagement boosts US businesses and economy—they’d like the plan

Tim Truman, Senior Advisor and Director of Public Affairs at ITA, June 12, 2016, “Economic Engagement with China Brings Benefits to U.S. Businesses,” International Trade Administration (ITA), <http://trade.gov/press/publications/newsletters/ita_1208/jcct_1208.asp> (accessed June 14, 2016)

Economic Engagement with China Brings Benefits to U.S. Businesses. The Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade and the Strategic Economic Dialogue steer the crucial economic relationship between the United States and China. Since China emerged on the world economic scene 30 years ago, the country has become a major player in the global economy. In 2007, China overtook Japan as the United States’s largest export market outside of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) partners, and it displaced Canada as the leading source of imports. In 2007, U.S. exports to China expanded by 18 percent to $65 billion, while U.S. imports from China increased by 12 percent to $322 billion. “In both our countries, there has been a rise of economic nationalism,” said Carlos M. Gutierrez, secretary of commerce. “It threatens the progress we’ve made in increasing commercial partnerships—partnerships that benefit our citizens and our economies.” The trade relationship between China and the United States will continue to grow through bilateral initiatives that will address market barriers when they arise. Those initiatives facilitate increased trade and help resolve problems. The U.S.–China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade (JCCT) is the primary trade dialogue between the two countries. On September 15, 2008, Gutierrez; Susan C. Schwab, U.S. trade representative; and Wang Qishan, vice premier of China, convened the 19th JCCT meeting in Yorba Linda, California. During the talks, both sides reached an agreement on steps that will promote increased trade flows. At the meeting, both sides discussed the importance of making progress on the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights. China reaffirmed its commitment to advance negotiations to join the World Trade Organization’s Government Procurement Agreement. Chinese officials also agreed to streamline the approval process for setting up new foreign retail outlets, to lower the minimum capitalization requirements for telecommunications services (although more needs to be done), to postpone regulations that bar U.S. information technology companies from selling in China, and to accept from certain U.S. states some poultry products that had previously been banned. This year marked the JCCT’s 25th anniversary. Since its inception in 1983, the JCCT has been a useful forum for engagement and has delivered meaningful results for U.S. businesses, workers, and farmers. Perhaps most important, the JCCT has ensured that U.S. and Chinese senior economic and trade officials continue to interact regularly, and those relationships have improved both countries’ abilities to address trade-related misunderstandings and problems. The JCCT has contributed to the dramatic trade growth between China and the United States. In addition to annual senior-level meetings, the JCCT comprises more than a dozen working groups and subgroups, which meet throughout the year to discuss a range of trade and investment issues. On October 24–28, 2008, David Spooner, assistant secretary of commerce for the Import Administration, led a team of Department of Commerce officials to Beijing. The team participated in three JCCT working groups: the Structural Issues Working Group (SIWG), the Trade Remedies Working Group (TRWG), and the Steel Dialogue. The Import Administration cochairs each of the three working groups with the office of the U.S. trade representative. The SIWG provides opportunities for discussing and sharing information on China’s market reforms, as well as the remaining structural impediments that China needs to complete to transition to market economy status. The October talks highlighted China’s recent economic reforms and pinpointed areas for future focus. The discussions within the TRWG featured healthy exchanges on numerous issues related to administering trade remedy laws. The Steel Dialogue is a unique working group that involves government and industry participation from China and the United States. During the meetings, industry representatives offered detailed overviews of their respective steel market situations and developments. Although the meeting did not result in any quick fixes for the concerns raised (for example, the United States is particularly concerned about continued government involvement in China’s steel industry), the dialogue represented a valuable opportunity to increase the understanding of different points of view. In addition, the U.S. delegation stressed the importance of market mechanisms for the health of the global steel market. On October 21, 2008, Jamie Estrada, deputy assistant secretary for manufacturing, convened the first U.S.–China Environmental Industries Forum in Beijing, China. The forum allowed U.S. government and industry representatives to meet with their Chinese counterparts to help develop policies, relationships, and projects that increase the deployment of environmental technologies while addressing environmental and sustainability concerns. Both countries have much to gain from this collaboration. China will become better suited to meet its goals to reduce air emissions, waste, and water consumption, while the United States can collectively address global environmental concerns and facilitate trade in the environmental sector. The JCCT’s Environment Working Group organized the event and will develop tangible action items to address the issues discussed. The U.S.–China Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED) is another important mechanism that guides the long-term development of the U.S.–China economic relationship. In 2006, presidents George W. Bush and Hu Jintao established the SED as a framework to address issues of mutual concern. The SED takes a long-term and strategic look at the economic relationship, while the JCCT focuses on specific trade issues. The SED has helped establish the 10-year Energy and Environment Cooperation Framework and has increased transparency in publishing trade-related rules and regulations. The fifth SED took place on December 4–5, 2008, in Beijing, and it focused on balanced growth, energy and environmental protection, challenges to trade, and investment. “Through the JCCT and SED, we continue to work with our Chinese counterparts to ensure we both pursue policies of openness that have helped drive our growth,” Gutierrez said. “I believe that in such an economic environment U.S. firms would welcome the opportunity to do even more business in—and with—China, thus expanding consumer choices and driving growth and job creation. This would be to the mutual advantage of both the United States and China.”

### No Internal Link – Overcapacity

#### Overcapacity prevents internal link – Alternative remedies check

Stefan M. Selig, Undersecretary of Commerce, May 26, 2016, “Moves Against Chinese Steel are not Protectionism,” <http://www.wsj.com/articles/moves-against-chinese-steel-are-not-protectionism-1464296968> (Accessed 6/14/16)

If Chinese steel companies have received unfair subsidies and dump their goods in the U.S., we impose duties to remedy this unfair conduct. I strongly disagree with your May 20 editorial “Obama Front-Runs Trump on China.” Applying U.S. duties on unfairly traded Chinese steel is not an example of protectionism. When the evidence establishes that China and Chinese steel companies have distorted the U.S. market by providing unfair subsidies and dumping their goods in the U.S., the Commerce Department calculates the amount of duties that are necessary to remedy this unfair conduct. This is the direct opposite of protectionism. China’s “wasteful policies” leading to excess capacity is not “good news for the U.S.” Chinese steel overcapacity has contributed to more than 13,000 jobs lost in the U.S. steel industry. U.S. steel consumers should not benefit unfairly from cheap steel on the backs of U.S. steelworkers.

### No Internal Link – Diverse Customers

#### Protectionism won’t hurt China – diversity of customers

Clyde Russell, Asia Commodities & Energy Columnist at Thomson Reuters, March 4, 2016, “Protectionism Overstated as Threat to China Steel Exports: Russell,” <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-column-russell-steel-china-idUSKCN0W40Y1> (Accessed 6/14/16)

The expectation is that China's exports will follow the pattern of January for the rest of the year, declining in year-on-year terms as global protectionism starts to gather momentum. But there is also a counter argument that the measures likely to be implemented won't make too much difference, as they are being imposed by countries that don't actually buy that much steel from China. A breakdown of China's steel exports, compiled by ANZ Banking Group's senior commodity strategist Daniel Hynes, shows the EU accounts for 4 percent of shipments, the same as India, while the United States takes 3 percent and Indonesia 5 percent. By far the biggest customer for Chinese steel is South Korea, taking 12 percent, with Vietnam and the Philippines receiving 5 percent each, and Malaysia, Singapore and Africa taking 3 percent each. What the numbers show is that China's steel customers are diverse and not all are contemplating protectionist measures. CHINESE STEEL WELCOME IN PLACES In fact some, especially those with no or limited domestic steel industries, will be quite pleased to buy Chinese steel, as it means they have access to lower prices than traditional suppliers, and there is more competition in the market. The risk to China's steel exports has been overstated and producers are likely to be able to find replacement markets for volumes they may lose in countries that put taxes and duties in place, according to ANZ's Hynes.

### Free Trade Bad – War

#### Free trade facilitates war – proxy for communism/exploitation

Monica Davis, News Columnist, July 6, 2013, “Will US and Germany go to War over Free Trade Spying?” <http://beforeitsnews.com/economics-and-politics/2013/07/will-us-and-germany-go-to-war-over-free-trade-spying-2454550.html> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

The US has been at war with Third World countries for more than 60 years. Used as proxies for wars with larger communist realms, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Nicaragua, El Salvador and countless stood as surrogates for larger communist regimes. Now, the ideologies have turned toward free trade, market manipulation and resource acquisition. China is making inroads on the Monroe Doctrine, setting up mining operations in South America. And the US is looking to acquire African resources via manipulating military might through AFRICOM. Where once Germany and Europe carved the African continent into fiefdoms, one has to wonder if the United States is travelling the same road. The high tech American economy is not possible without African raw materials. And, for sure, the so-called Green Economy is dead in the water without them. The race for information and resources has become critical, as the US fights to remain a first world power. Newswires say the US taps more than half a billion German phone calls monthly. They tap more German phone calls, emails and texts than another other countries except China or Iraq. European “trading partners” are outraged at alleged American spying–which is virtually unlimited.

### Free Trade Bad—Economy

#### Tariff penalties with China would benefit US economic growth – increased production

Howard Richman and Raymond Richman, The Richmans co-authored the 2014 book Balanced Trade: Ending the Unbearable Costs of America's Trade Deficits, published by Lexington Books, and the 2008 book Trading Away Our Future, published by Ideal Taxes Association., March 8, 2016, “Would Trump’s Trade Policy Really Cause a Recession?” <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/03/would_trumps_trade_policy_really_cause_a_recession.html> (Accessed 6/13/16)

It is true, as Romney claims, that Trump has called for tariff-like penalties to prevent American factories from moving abroad and also to bring currency-manipulating countries (including China, Japan, and Mexico) into trade-balancing negotiations. But would Trump's tariff threats slow U.S. economic growth? No! Exactly the opposite! Trade-surplus countries have a lot more to lose from a trade war, so Trump's negotiations would likely succeed. For example, in 1981, Congress threatened trade-balancing import restrictions against trade-surplus Japan, which resulted in President Reagan negotiating "voluntary restraints" on Japanese automobile exports. As a result, Japanese automobile companies built factories in the United States that continue to employ American workers and to buy American-made auto parts, greatly increasing American incomes. Positive Effects of Tariffs Even if Trump's negotiations did not succeed, the American economy would benefit if he imposed his tariff-like penalties. First, government revenues would increase, which would reduce the budget deficit. Second, American consumers would be encouraged to switch their purchases to American producers and to the products of those countries, such as Brazil and Canada, that buy more from us when we buy more from them. America would become more attractive to foreign manufacturers and to American manufacturers who had moved their factories abroad. American factory production would increase, and so would the employment and incomes of American workers. Romney's current attacks are ironic, because during the 2012 campaign, Romney talked tough on Chinese currency manipulation and other trade violations. Romney said that the U.S. should tell China, "You can't keep on holding down the value of your currency, stealing our intellectual property, counterfeiting our products, selling them around the world, even to the United States." But Romney's attack on Trump reveals Romney's stance as the sham that many of us suspected it was at the time. Trump is right to propose imposing significant tariffs on China precisely because of the litany of trade violations 2012 Romney claimed to be exercised about. But now Romney claims that if Trump does anything about China's rampant mercantilism, it will lead to a depression. Clearly he planned to go no farther in his China trade policy than another ineffectual round of asking China to stop its mercantilism.

### Free Trade Bad—Economy

#### Free trade is bad for the US economy – jobs

Greg Ip, Chief Economics Commentator, The Wall Street Journal, April 11, 2016, “The Case for Free Trade is Weaker than you Think,” <http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2016/04/11/the-case-for-free-trade-is-weaker-than-you-think/> (Accessed 6/14/2016)

If workers lose their jobs to imports and central banks can’t bolster domestic spending enough to re-employ them, a country may be worse off, Greg Ip explains. Economists disagree on plenty, but they’re pretty much unanimous that free trade is good and protectionism is bad. Elite opinion among noneconomists concurs: Editorial pages have roundly condemned Republican presidential front-runner Donald Trump for threatening to tear up trade agreements and slap steep tariffs on Mexico and China. But the case for free trade and against protectionism is not absolute. If workers lose their jobs to imports and central banks can’t bolster domestic spending enough to re-employ them, a country may be worse off, and keeping those imports out can make it better off. This occurs only in certain conditions, says a new paper by Harvard University’s Larry Summers and two co-authors, but those conditions may now be present. Mr. Summers, a former Treasury secretary, is no protectionist and no fan of Mr. Trump, whose election, he warns, could lead to recession in the U.S. and financial crisis abroad. But he does worry that chronically weak demand could make protectionism both respectable and irresistible. Others, such as New York Times columnist Paul Krugman and Michael Pettis at Peking University have already noted how in a world with too little demand, one country’s trade surplus inflicts unemployment on the country with a deficit.

#### Jobs create economic growth—sustainability

Paul Post, Saratogian News Staff Writer, January 11, 2013, “Experts: Economy Slowly Healing, but Jobs are Key to Recovery,” <http://www.saratogian.com/general-news/20130111/experts-economy-slowly-healing-but-jobs-are-key-to-recovery> (Accessed 6/14/16)

Jobs and consumer confidence are important keys to continued recovery, a pair of economic analysts told area business leaders Friday. Gary Keith, M&T Bank regional economist, and Bouchey Financial Group Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Martin Shields addressed 150 Capital Region business people at a luncheon hosted by Saratoga County Chamber of Commerce and Saratoga Economic Development Corp. at the Holiday Inn. Saratoga County leads upstate New York in economic vitality, but local officials must remain vigilant to keep the area on its path of success, they said. “What goes in one direction for a while isn’t inevitable,” Keith said. “There are others out there that are very envious and strategizing, as we speak, how they can get a piece of this action.” Shields added, “We can’t be complacent. We have to continually reinvent ourselves.” GlobalFoundries announced plans this week for a $2 billion research and development center at Luther Forest Technology Campus that will create another 1,000 jobs by the end of 2014. “The wages that are coming here are higher wages,” Shields said. In addition to $200 million in new payroll, Saratoga County home sales jumped 17.5 percent in 2012, Keith said. Also, the region outperforms many areas in exporting goods to so-called BRIC countries — Brazil, Russia, India, China — whose economies are flourishing, Shields said. However, there is still an overall lack of consumer household spending, which he said accounts for 70 percent of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product. Partially, this is because there are 3.7 million fewer jobs in America now than before the recession started. “If we can create jobs, we can create economic growth,” Keith said.

### Free Trade Bad – Workers

#### Free trade bad for US workers – wages and job security loss

Jeff Madrick, senior fellow at the Century Foundation, October 3, 2014, “Our Misplaced Faith in Free Trade,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/04/opinion/sunday/our-misplaced-faith-in-free-trade.html?_r=0> (Accessed 6/14/16)

Trade is one of the few areas on which mainstream economists firmly agree: More is better. But as the Obama administration pursues two huge new trade deals — one with countries in the Asia-Pacific region, the other with the European Union — Americans are skeptical. Only 17 percent believe that more trade leads to higher wages, according to a Pew Research Center survey released last month. Just 20 percent think trade creates jobs; 50 percent say it destroys them. The skeptics are on to something. Free trade creates winners and losers — and American workers have been among the losers. Free trade has been a major (but not the only) factor behind the erosion in wages and job security among American workers. It has created tremendous prosperity — but mostly for those at the top. Little wonder, then, that Americans, in another Pew survey, last winter, ranked protecting jobs as the second-most-important goal for foreign policy, barely below protecting us from terrorism. Many economists dismiss these attitudes as the griping of people on the losing end of globalization, but they would do better to look inward, at the flaws in their models and theories. Since the 1970s, economic orthodoxy has argued for low tariffs, free capital flows, elimination of industrial subsidies, deregulation of labor markets, balanced budgets and low inflation. This philosophy — later known as the Washington Consensus — was the basis of advice the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank gave to developing countries in return for financial help.

### Free Trade Bad— Trade Deficits

#### Trade deficits from surpluses harm US economy – protectionism key

Howard Richman and Raymond Richman, The Richmans co-authored the 2014 book Balanced Trade: Ending the Unbearable Costs of America's Trade Deficits, published by Lexington Books, and the 2008 book Trading Away Our Future, published by Ideal Taxes Association., March 8, 2016, “Would Trump’s Trade Policy Really Cause a Recession?” <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/03/would_trumps_trade_policy_really_cause_a_recession.html> (Accessed 6/13/16)

How Trade Deficits Have Been Hurting the U.S. When countries run trade surpluses with the United States, they give us trade deficits. Those trade deficits reduce aggregate demand for American products, American incomes, and investment in American factories. In his speeches, Trump has focused upon the three countries that have large trade surpluses with the United States: China, Japan, and Mexico. China. Despite running huge and growing trade surpluses with the United States, the Chinese government won't let its people buy American-made Boeing passenger jets, Cadillac SUVs, or Caterpillar tractors. Instead, the Chinese government forces Boeing, GM, and Caterpillar to build new factories to China in order to sell to the Chinese market. If Trump's negotiations force China to import as much from the United States as we import from them, American companies could locate new factories in the United States for shipment of their goods to China. Also, American farmers would export more meat to China. The benefit to American exporting industries and to American workers would be enormous.

### Free Trade Bad – Democracy

#### Free trade trades off with democracy – corporate dominance

Dave Johnson, contributing blogger for the Campaign for America's Future, March 14, 2016, “What’s the Problem with Free Trade,” <http://www.commondreams.org/views/2016/03/14/whats-problem-free-trade> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

Our country’s “free trade” agreements have followed a framework of trading away our democracy and middle-class prosperity in exchange for letting the biggest corporations dominate. There are those who say any increase in trade is good. But if you close a factory here and lay off the workers, open the factory “there” to make the same things the factory here used to make, bring those things into the country to sell in the same outlets, you have just “increased trade” because now those goods cross a border. Supporters of free trade are having a harder and harder time convincing American workers this is good for them. “Free Trade” Free trade is when goods and services are bought and sold between countries without tariffs, duties and quotas. The idea is that some countries “do things better” than other countries, which these days basically means they offer lower labor and environmental-protection costs. Allowing other countries to do things in ways that cost less “frees up resources” which can theoretically be used for investment at home.

### Free Trade Bad – Environment

#### Free trade deals threaten the environment – TTIP Proves

Hilke Fischer, Journalist and Richard Fuchs, Independent Correspondent, December 5, 2016, “TTIP: Free Trade at Expense of the Environment” <http://www.dw.com/en/ttip-free-trade-at-expense-of-the-environment/a-18773205> (Accessed 6/13/16)

Greenpeace is not the only environmental group that fears that TTIP could be bad news for the environment. Widespread resistance to TTIP in Europe. "We fear the treaty will result in more lax environmental protection standards, and will pave the way for methods that make it difficult to agree on good standards in the future," Karl Bär told DW. He works for the Munich Environmental Institute. Representatives of industry and commerce, on the other hand, argue that the treaty will lead to more economic growth and employment. "TTIP is an important element to ensure economic prosperity and Europe's leading role in a global economy," said Felix Neugart, now leading the German Chamber of Industry and Commerce Abroad. The conditions of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) have been under negotiation between the European Union and the United States since 2013. Talks are being held behind closed doors, with proposals made on the American side remaining top secret.

### Free Trade Bad – Exploitation/Mistreatment

#### Free trade facilitates abuse of workers and poor labor standards

Everett Rosenfield, staff writer for CNBC.com, March 11, 2016, “Here’s Why Everyone is Arguing about Free Trade,” <http://www.cnbc.com/2016/03/11/heres-why-everyone-is-arguing-about-free-trade.html> (Accessed 6/14/16)

Those critical of recent trade agreements also argue that labor standards are not enforced in other countries, so the U.S. is effectively rewarding those businesses abusing their workers. Those are arguments against free trade when it is practiced perfectly, with both countries firmly dedicated to maintaining low barriers to trade, but many argue these agreements are bad for the U.S. because its partners often seek to subvert the relationship. The most common charges of "cheating" on free trade involve a country's keeping its currency artificially low (so its products are cheaper, and therefore more competitive, in the U.S.), subsidizing its domestic firms so they have better margins, or even levying protective tariffs without regard for prior agreements. If the U.S. leaves its markets open to unfairly cheap foreign products while its own goods are stymied abroad, then the job-killing concerns about free trade are all the more pressing, "Trade deals are absolutely killing our country — the devaluations of their currencies by China and Japan and many, many other countries, and we don't do it because we don't play the game," GOP front-runner Donald Trump said at a Thursday night debate, reiterating his call to employ threats of retaliatory tariffs. "And the only way we're going to be able to do it is we're going to have to do taxes unless they behave."

### Free Trade Bad – Exploitation/Mistreatment

#### Free trade masks exploitation – back-channeling and hidden deals

PLP, Writer and Contributor for the Progressive Labor Party, October 3, 2012, “Free Trade Masks Intensifying Exploitation,” <http://www.plp.org/challenge/2012/10/3/free-trade-masks-intensifying-exploitation.html> (Accessed 6/12/16)

The term “free trade” is a lie, since it implies that it is only about buying and selling (trade) without hindrance (free). Actually, free trade agreements (FTAs) are a mask to cover exploitative relationships imposed by the more powerful economies on the less powerful — i.e., imperialism. Take, for example, the “United States–Dominican Republic–Central America Free Trade Agreement” (CAFTA-DR). This treaty, like other FTAs, contains malignant elements that are hidden under the benign-sounding title. CAFTA-DR prohibits any Central American country from opposing an attempt by a U.S. business to set up a subsidiary within its borders, so long as the business meets certain requirements. And if a member country objects that those requirements have not, in fact, been met, that country can be sued by the U.S. business at the World Bank. In 1965 the World Bank set up its International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) for just that purpose, with the participation of almost 150 countries from around the world. Thus Pacific Rim, a mining company, has staked a claim in El Salvador to extract gold. The company claims that its plan will preserve the environment, including the nearby river Rio Lempa. Rio Lempa is the source of livelihood for many Salvadorans, through farming and fishing. The workers in these industries have been fighting against Pacific Rim for some time now, knowing full well that the many poisonous chemicals used in mining will pollute and destroy their river. Indeed the workers have formed organizations and put so much pressure on the Salvadoran government that so far it has refused Pacific Rim’s permit to mine the gold. As a result of their resistance, a number of workers in these organizations have been threatened with death or actually murdered. Under capitalism the laws are designed to protect the bosses and their system. Thus, Pacific Rim and the U.S.-based Commerce Group are suing the El Salvadoran government in the ICSID for lost profit. Commerce Group has already polluted the San Sebastian River with aluminum, zinc, iron, manganese, and nickel, among other toxic metals. One study found that these toxic elements produce weakness, fatigue, rashes, and mental confusion in 60% of the local population, with women and children most affected. But Pacific Rim and Commerce Group are not in business to care about the health of the local working classes. Rather they are in business for one thing only — profit — and health problems are not their concern. Furthermore the rules of the ICSID do not even permit it to consider environmental or health problems, but rather only narrowly defined investment issues. It is likely therefore that it will grant Pacific Rim and Commerce Group the $100 million they each seek from the Salvadoran government, as compensation for their lost profits. Thus does imperialism illustrate the power of the strong over the weak, but only when the weak fight by themselves, separated from the rest of the world’s working class. When workers around the world unite in one powerful force under the leadership of PLP, such struggles can not only be won, but can be transformed into revolution by putting a complete end to capitalism and its current manifestation of imperialism. Join us.

### Free Trade Bad – Poverty

#### Free trade disproportionately impacts the poor – exploitation for “stability”

Anup Shah, Editor of Globalissues.org, March 2, 2013, “Free Trade and Globalization,” <http://www.globalissues.org/issue/38/free-trade-and-globalization> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

The world is becoming more globalized, there is no doubt about that. While that sounds promising, the current form of globalization, neoliberalism, free trade and open markets are coming under much criticism. The interests of powerful nations and corporations are shaping the terms of world trade. In democratic countries, they are shaping and affecting the ability of elected leaders to make decisions in the interests of their people. Elsewhere they are promoting narrow political discourse and even supporting dictatorships and the “stability” that it brings for their interests. This is to the detriment of most people in the world, while increasingly fewer people in proportion are prospering. The western mainstream media, hardly provides much debate, gladly allowing this economic liberalism (a largely, but not only, politically conservative stance) to be confused with the term political liberalism (to do with progressive and liberal social political issues). Margaret Thatcher's slogan of “there is no alternative” rings sharply. Perhaps there is no alternative for such prosperity for a few, but what about a more equitable and sustainable development for all?

### A/T Increased Trade with China Good

#### Increased China global trading is disruptive – lost jobs and financial crisis

Noah Smith, assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University, October 7, 2015, “Free Trade is No Longer a No-Brainer,” <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2015-10-07/free-trade-is-no-longer-a-no-brainer-for-economists> (Accessed 6/14/16)

As for the Trans-Pacific Partnership -- the most important trade deal in years -- support from the economics profession has been muted. However, some of that might be because of the intellectual-property protections in the treaty, which many consider a trade restriction rather than a liberalization. At any rate, for the first time in many decades, there are cracks in the edifice of the free-trade consensus. The reason is easy to see -- economic theory has been overtaken by macro events. The full-fledged entry of China into the global trading system since 2000 has been hugely disruptive. The lost jobs and vanishing industries have become impossible to ignore. Meanwhile, boom-bust cycles in global financial markets -- the Asian Crisis of 1997, the global financial crisis of 2008, and others -- have left economists bewildered. The simple logic of free trade, so familiar from Econ 101, is either failing or ceasing to be relevant. Some astute economists are now claiming that the old formulation was never watertight in the first place. These whispers of dissent don’t mean that free trade is dead, or even that the consensus is a thing of the past. But it isn't considered the no-brainer it once was. Economists are beginning to question one of their most celebrated points of agreement. The future is a more uncertain profession, and perhaps, a more uncertain world.

### A/T Free Trade Opens Markets

#### Free Trade does only opens markets for predatory corporations

Dave Johnson, contributing blogger for the Campaign for America's Future, March 14, 2016, “What’s the Problem with Free Trade,” <http://www.commondreams.org/views/2016/03/14/whats-problem-free-trade> (Accessed 6/13/2016)

It is a fact that only 5 percent of the world’s population lives in the United States. The problem is that the line of argument that opening up trade “opens markets” brings with it certain misleading assumptions. It assumes first that non-U.S. markets are not already being served by local companies. Second, it ignores that free trade also opens our own markets to others. Third, it ignores that U.S. companies already can and do sell to most of the world’s markets and vice versa. (For example, U.S. companies were already moving production to Mexico before NAFTA, the North American Free-Trade Agreement.) Suggesting that alternative approaches to trade would “close us off from trading” or “wall our economy off from the world” are ridiculous straw-man arguments. If local companies are already meeting the needs in U.S. and non-U.S. markets, what does a trade deal really enable? Trade deals indeed “open up new markets” – for giant, predatory multinational corporations. They enable large, predatory companies that have enormous economies of scale to come in and dominate those markets, putting smaller, local companies out of business. So trade deals mean the biggest multinational companies get bigger and more multinational – at the expense of all the other companies. This includes enabling non-U.S. corporations to come to the U.S. and take over markets already served by smaller companies here. The net result of allowing goods to cross borders without protecting local businesses is a “more efficient” manufacturing/distribution system powered by the biggest and best capitalized operations. The rest go away. Economists will tell you that these increased efficiencies allow an economy to best utilize its resources. But obviously one effect of this “increased efficiency” is fewer jobs, resulting in lowered wages on all sides of trade borders.

# Aff AfroAsian

### Inherency/Uniqueness

#### U.S. foreign policy towards China is a history of racist suppression and deliberate ignorance of the commonality of African-American and Chinese emancipation

Vijay Prashad, Chair in South Asian History and Professor of International Studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, Beacon Press, http://www.homeworkforyou.com/static/uploadedfiles/User\_506913122015[Vijay\_Prashad]\_Everybody\_Was\_Kung\_Fu\_Fighting.\_Af(BookZZ.org).pdf (accessed 8/13/2016)

However, U.S. black representatives failed to grasp the depth of struggle as they perversely defended the U.S. record on civil rights and attacked China’s communism. From the mid-1940s, the U.S. state department cultivated certain African American artists and writers to muddy the critiques of U.S. racism that mainly came from the USSR. Several black artists and writers colluded with the U.S. government out of fear or to gain access to the world stage. At Bandung, African Americans such as Congressman Adam Clayton Powell Jr. and Max Yergan vigorously praised the U.S. governmental system, perhaps to shore up their own political futures upon return. Even arch anti-Communists among the Asians, such as Sir John Kotelawla of Ceylon, held their tongues as Chou En-lai took a conciliatory position. But Powell and Yergan let loose much to the consternation of their Asian allies. Richard Wright, like Yergan, had been a Communist in his youth. In the 1950s he joined with the liberal anti-Communist wing (and contributed to their celebrated collection The God That Failed), but, unlike Yergan, Wright was always an unpredictable political writer. At Bandung he was not taken by Powell and Yergan, yet he too seemed to miss the point when he claimed that Sukarno was ‘‘appealing to race and religion’’ or when he wondered how Chou felt ‘‘amidst the ground swell of racial and religious feeling.’’ But by the Vietnam War, a conflict with no forseeable ending, black and Asian American activists would become more radical and more united than they had ever been, finally empowered by a sense of Third World solidarity.

### Inherency/Uniqueness

#### There is an urgent need to affirm Afro Asian solidarity for two reasons: It’s the key to understanding and preventing racialized intergroup violence and dehumanization; and prevents the cooptation and dilution of anti-racist discourse by elites

Bill V. Mullen, professor of English and American Studies at Purdue University, and Fred Ho, founder of Afro Asian Music Ensemble, 2008

Afro Asia: Revolutionary Political and Cultural Connections between African Americans and Asian Americans, https://books.google.com/books?id=SnF3hUgoIf0C&printsec=frontcover&dq=https://books.google.com/books?isbn%3D0822381176&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj-\_sjl877OAhVG2mMKHVF7AP4Q6AEIHjAA#v=onepage&q=https%3A%2F%2Fbooks.google.com%2Fbooks%3Fisbn%3D0822381176&f=false (accessed 8/13/2016)

The urgency for greater Afro Asia solidarity and the general elevation of radical, anti-imperialist leadership and political consciousness has become dire with the escalating tragedy of sensationalized racist violence between Asians and blacks. In recent years in New York City, there has been a series of killings of Chinese restaurant takeout-delivery workers—all with alleged and arrested black perpetrators. Four Chinese delivery workers in the last five years have been brutally murdered, all in predominantly black areas. The killings include Jian Lin Chun, killed in the lobby of a Bedford- Stuyvesant building on October 15, 2002; Golden Wok restaurant owner Jin-Sheng Liu, killed on Sept. 1, 2000, in St. Albans while making a delivery; Ng Cheung Cheung, beaten to death by a baseball bat in Jamaica on June 23, 1999; Li-Rong Lin, repeatedly stabbed to death on December 10, 1998, in Hollis while delivering from the China Buffet restaurant; and, most recently, Huang Chen, killed in South Jamaica on April 30, 2004, where an investigation resulted in the arrest of two African American teens. In the last example, the New York Post reported the incident as an example of ‘‘Chink-bashing’’ and characterized such violence as a new ‘‘urban sport’’ of premeditated assaults committed largely by black youth upon Chinese delivery ‘‘boys’’ (though in typical New York Post racism the majority of these ‘‘boys’’ are men over the age of forty, as Chinese men are still desexualized and belittled as perpetual adolescents incapable of being ‘‘real men’’ as compared to white men). This condition of narrowed and lowered consciousness has allowed for the rise of narrow nationalism and ethnic economic protectionism, paralleling the rise of religious fundamentalism and extreme protonationalism from the destruction and subversion by the United States of independent democratic and leftist movements and governments globally. The rise of black neoconservativism, masculinist black capitalism, black petty-bourgeois protectionism, etc. could only occur with the suppression and dismantling of the radical and revolutionary forces that emerged and held dominance during the late 1960s and early 1970s as well as U.S. governmental, corporate, and academic promotion of a reformist and reactionary elite.

### Coalitions Uniqueness

#### Strong alliances are growing now between Black and Chinese-American activists, challenging both racism and capitalism

Christina Twu, editor at Seattle Globalist, Dec 23, 2014

"Afro-Asian solidarity in Seattle and across the Pacific," Seattle Globalist, http://www.seattleglobalist.com/2014/12/23/afro-asian-solidarity-across-pacific/31626 (accessed 8/13/2016)

Seattle activist J.M. Wong and her colleagues will make that connection stronger in Asia — starting first with Hong Kong. Wong and former Black Panther Party leader and political prisoner Mark Cook will travel to Hong Kong on an exchange organized by Pacific Rim Solidarity Network. The organizing body sprouted from a group of young Chinese-American activists who brought Hong Kong dock workers on strike to Seattle in April on a speaking tour. “We want to facilitate grassroots exchange between resistance movements in Asia and the U.S.,” Wong said during a Dec. 5 book release event at Hillman City Collaboratory featuring author Dan Berger and his new book “Captive Nation: Black Prison Organizing in the Civil Rights Era.” Cook was a guest panelist along with Ed Mead, former political prisoner and artist. It’s about high time for this type of dialogue, Wong noted, particularly with the misconceptions that form as a result of limited exposure across the Pacific. “Many times, these conversations across the Pacific are dominated by the capitalists that are figuring out how to build coal terminals over here or extract tar sands in Canada, and we just want to push back and be like, ‘These Asian and specifically Chinese capitalists don’t represent the Chinese diaspora.’ There are people in China who are really resisting, and we want to facilitate that dialogue,” Wong said.

#### Coalitions are strong now and have been historically strong—Asian and Black communities are coming together against racist violence, for solidarity and a critical challenge to white supremacy

Fiona Teng, writer on race and social justice at Huffington Post, February 23, 2016

"Our Time is Now: The Case for and Imperative of the Afro-Asian Solidarity," Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/fiona-teng/the-case-for-afro-asian-solidarity\_b\_9265646.html (accessed 8/13/2016)

Even more compelling, though, is the unflinching act of persevering through and overcoming our racial differences and histories. In fact, black and Asian communities come from a powerful - even radical - history of building and resisting together. In the San Francisco Bay Area, there is recognition that though the two communities are divided, there remains a desire to overcome tensions by building trust and working together. Groups like Asian Americans for Civil Rights and Equality (AACRE) in the SF Bay Area, Committee Against Anti-Asian Violence (CAAAV) in NYC, and the digital community of #Asians4BlackLives, springing out of the national #BlackLivesMatter movement, build coalition across Asian communities around the narrative of anti-racism and solidarity with the black community. In this moment, where racial injustices against Black Americans have the unfortunate spotlight of a disturbing and prevalent reality, there is an important call to action for Asian Americans - that is to critically and emphatically challenge the history of anti-black ideas we have come to believe in, and then shed them.

### Coalitions Solvency

#### Afro-Asian coalitions challenge white supremacy, emancipate Asians from the “model minority” myth, and challenge state violence

Mark Lewis Taylor, professor of Theology and Culture at Princeton Theological Seminary, 2015

"A Solidarity Feared by U.S. White Capitalist Power: Afro-Asian Movements Rising!" The Executed God: The Way of the Cross in Lockdown America, http://marklewistaylor.net/blog/solidarity-feared-by-u-s-white-capitalist-power-afro-asian-movements-rising/ (accessed 8/13/2016)

I write here of this white fear of white power elites in order to challenge the white repression of emergent Afro-Asian coalitions and solidarity. All of us do well to welcome that solidarity as part of the liberation of all humanity. At this writing, Asian-Americans are the fastest-growing immigrant group in the U.S. even if still they are small in number compared to Latino and Latina immigant communities. In spite of a white supremacist milieu that still often constructs Asian-Americans as "the model minority" (at the same time often viewing them as “perpetual foreigner," and at other times as "threatening hoard"), the "model minority" myth often has not led to compliance and passivity (see "The Model Minority Mutiny"). There are groups acting up in solidarity with other communities of color to challenge U.S. militarized policing for both their own immigrant groups and for other communities, too.

#### Resistance to the narrative of vertical integration into white policymaking invokes the history of horizontal resistance, from rebel African escapees to Asians entering the Black community and Douglass’s solidarity with Chinese laborers to the Black Panthers and Brown Berets.

Vijay Prashad, Chair in South Asian History and Professor of International Studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, Beacon Press, http://www.homeworkforyou.com/static/uploadedfiles/User\_506913122015[Vijay\_Prashad]\_Everybody\_Was\_Kung\_Fu\_Fighting.\_Af(BookZZ.org).pdf (accessed 8/13/2016)

Yet all people who enter the United States do not strive to be accepted by the terms set by white supremacy. Some actively disregard them, finding them impossible to meet. Instead, they seek recognition, solidarity, and safety by embracing others also oppressed by white supremacy in something of a horizontal assimilation. Consider the rebel Africans, who fled the slave plantations in the Americas and took refuge among the Amerindians to create communities such as the Seminoles’; the South Asian workers who jumped ship in eighteenth-century Salem, Massachusetts, to enter the black community; Frederick Douglass’s defense of Chinese ‘‘coolie’’ laborers in the nineteenth century; the interactions of the Black Panther Party with the Red Guard and the Brown Berets in the mid-twentieth century; and finally the multiethnic working-class gathering in the new century. When people actively or tacitly refuse the terms of vertical integration they are derisively dismissed as either unassimilable or exclusionary. We hear ‘‘Why do the black kids sit together in the cafeteria,’’ instead of ‘‘Why do our institutions routinely uphold the privileges of whiteness?’’ There is little space in popular discourse for an examination of what goes on outside the realm of white America among people of color.

### Coalitions Solvency

#### Forging alliances between Asian and Black activism is critical to understanding the shared history of anti-racist struggle and overcoming the Black-White lens that makes anti-racist strategy shallow in the United States

Manan Desai, professor of culture and history at University of Michigan, January-February 2009

"Afro-Asian Collaborations," Solidarity, https://www.solidarity-us.org/node/2034 (accessed 8/13/2016)

How many know that Ho Chi Minh spoke in valiant terms of the Black struggle during the 1967 Detroit rebellion? That Mao had issued statements in solidarity with the Civil Rights movement? Or of the powerful collaboration between the Black Panthers and Richard Aoki? Or Malcolm X and Yuri Kochiyama? Ho and Mullen’s collection serves not only as a repository of these important Afro-Asian intersections; it charts out renewed possibilities of solidarity between oppressed nationalities in the United States, without resort to fanciful notions of a “post-racial” world where racial identity is evacuated of all meaning and history. Bill Mullen is Director of American Studies at Purdue and a contributor to ATC; Fred Ho is an activist, writer, and jazz musician. Threaded through this collection is a broader argument about the social history of race, complicating the simplistic Black-white lens that dominates racial discourse in American society. A central claim made by several of the contributors of this collection is that the distinct forms of racialization experienced by Asian and African Americans have led to a sort of invisibility of the former, and hypercritical visibility of the latter.

#### Linked by a shared tradition of resistance, Afro Asian solidarity deploys the power of both Asian and African liberation movements create an anti-racist global majority

Bill V. Mullen, professor of English and American Studies at Purdue University, and Fred Ho, founder of Afro Asian Music Ensemble, 2008

Afro Asia: Revolutionary Political and Cultural Connections between African Americans and Asian Americans, https://books.google.com/books?id=SnF3hUgoIf0C&printsec=frontcover&dq=https://books.google.com/books?isbn%3D0822381176&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj-\_sjl877OAhVG2mMKHVF7AP4Q6AEIHjAA#v=onepage&q=https%3A%2F%2Fbooks.google.com%2Fbooks%3Fisbn%3D0822381176&f=false (accessed 8/13/2016)

This discovery brought with it, however, a far larger challenge: namely, a way to enact, analyze, and catalyze a radical and revolutionary political and cultural stance grounded in anti-imperialism and anti-oppression and devoid of Eurocentric and white supremacist reference and ideals. For Ho, and for other authors in this book, Afro Asia is a strategic intersection for thinking through an internationalist, global paradigm that joins the world’s two largest continents and populations, as well as an anti-imperialist, insurgent identity that is no longer majority white in orientation. Afro Asia, that is, is the imperative to imagine a ‘‘new world’’ grounded upon two great ancient worlds as well as a radical and revolutionary anti-imperialist tradition. It is a tradition with long roots, one that includes and links W. E. B. DuBois, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Zedong, Malcolm X, Robert F. Williams, the Black Panthers, the Asian Pacific American movement, Yuri Kochiyama, Ishmael Reed, Frank Chin, and Maxine Hong Kingston, to name just a few. These figures give a name and voice to their international counterparts in the black and Asiatic worlds, and they have for two centuries sustained a tradition of collaborative radical political and cultural connections heretofore undocumented in the literature of the West. From the earliest days of the United States, Africans and Asians in the Americas have been linked in a shared tradition of resistance to class and racial exploitation and oppression. With the formal abolition of African slavery arose the Asiatic ‘‘coolie’’ (or contract labor) trade that brought Asian laborers, often on the very same ships that transported captured Africans, to the very same plantation societies in the West. In this common and often overlapping diasporic experience, shared traditions of resistance and struggle have developed for liberation and equality.

### Coalitions Solvency

#### Afro Asian solidarity is historically powerful and facilitates the forging of resistance to class and racial exploitation and oppression

Keisha N. Blain, professor of history at University of Iowa, January 30, 2015

"The Deep Roots of Afro-Asia," African American Intellectual History Society, http://www.aaihs.org/the-deep-roots-of-afro-asia/ (accessed 8/13/2016)

Indeed, the historical experiences of peoples of Asian and African descent have been deeply intertwined for centuries. “From the earliest days of the United States,” Fred Ho and Bill Mullen explain, “Africans and Asians in the Americas have been linked in a shared tradition of resistance to class and racial exploitation and oppression.” In a 1905 speech, civil rights leader W.E.B. Du Bois acknowledged the link between the “color line” and ‘Yellow Peril.’ The racist ‘yellow peril’ ideology of the late nineteenth century, which stemmed from white fears and anxieties over Asian immigration, persisted well into the twentieth century and extended beyond national borders. The negative images and stereotypical depictions of Asian cultures that dominated Western mass media mirrored the pervasive global racist attitudes towards African Americans, and other people of color. Du Bois understood this connection and during the early twentieth century, he advocated political collaboration and solidarity between peoples of African and Asian descent.

### Polyculturalism Solvency

#### Polyculturalism is a critical methodology of engagement revealing long-repressed solidarity between working class African-Americans and Asians; this is the key to a unified, global anti-racist and anti-imperialist struggle

Vijay Prashad, Chair in South Asian History and Professor of International Studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, Beacon Press, http://www.homeworkforyou.com/static/uploadedfiles/User\_506913122015[Vijay\_Prashad]\_Everybody\_Was\_Kung\_Fu\_Fighting.\_Af(BookZZ.org).pdf (accessed 8/13/2016)

The polycultural view of the world exists in the gut instincts of many people such as Q-Unique. Scholars are under some obligation to raise this instinct to philosophy, to use this instinct to criticize the diversity model of multiculturalism and replace it with the antiracist one of polyculturalism. Culture cannot be bounded and people cannot be asked to respect ‘‘culture’’ as if it were an artifact, without life or complexity. Social interaction and struggle produces cultural worlds, and these are in constant, fraught formation. Our cultures are linked in more ways than we could catalog, and it is from these linkages that we hope our politics will be energized. The Third World may be in distress, where the will of the national liberation movements has put the tendency to anti-imperialism in crisis, and where the Third World within the United States has often been overrun by the dynamic of the color blind and of the desire to make small, individual gains over social transformation. Nevertheless, the struggle is on, in places like Kerala and Vietnam, but also within the United States as the Black Radical Congress greets the Asian Left Forum, the Forum of Indian Leftists, the League of Filipino Students (among others), and as all of them join together against imperialism, against racism. History is made in struggle and past memories of solidarity are inspiration for that struggle.

#### Polyculturalism combines anti-racist and working-class resistance to understand the complexities and manipulation of race by elites

Bill V. Mullen, professor of English and American Studies at Purdue University, and Fred Ho, founder of Afro Asian Music Ensemble, 2008

Afro Asia: Revolutionary Political and Cultural Connections between African Americans and Asian Americans, https://books.google.com/books?id=SnF3hUgoIf0C&printsec=frontcover&dq=https://books.google.com/books?isbn%3D0822381176&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj-\_sjl877OAhVG2mMKHVF7AP4Q6AEIHjAA#v=onepage&q=https%3A%2F%2Fbooks.google.com%2Fbooks%3Fisbn%3D0822381176&f=false (accessed 8/13/2016)

Indeed, the publication of Vijay Prashad’s two important books The Karma of Brown Folk and Everybody Was Kung-Fu Fighting helped to reanimate attention to Afro Asian intersections. Prashad used the term ‘polyculturalism’ to characterize the long, repressed but vital tradition of Afro Asian encounter and exchange, particularly among the working classes. While the focus of this anthology is likewise on shared and common struggles as well as the linkages, connections, cross-cultural borrowing, and mutual solidarity, it is important to recognize the complexities, contradictions, and conflicts between black and Asian peoples in the United States. It is also important to provide a proper framework and analysis of the systemic causes for such complexities as well as the political function served by the manipulation of race, the promotion of nationalist divisions and rivalries, and the inculcation of mutually pervasive stereotypes and racial jealousies.

### Polyculturalism Solvecy

#### Only polyculturalism empowers shared struggle against white supremacy and prevents cooptation by the state

Manan Desai, professor of culture and history at University of Michigan, January-February 2009

"Afro-Asian Collaborations," Solidarity, https://www.solidarity-us.org/node/2034 (accessed 8/13/2016)

A deliberate echo of multiculturalism, polyculturalism stresses antiracism as grounds for shared struggle, whereas multiculturalism posits a facile diversity, ultimately managing and maintaining difference through cultural essentialisms. Polyculturalism in short challenges, whereas multiculturalism accommodates. Indeed, Ho and Mullen argue that along with the decline of the New Left, the majority of anti-racist polycultural movements of the 1960s and 1970s, which at their best endorsed an “anti-imperialist Third World unity,” had soon thereafter been either repressed or co-opted by the state. Exacerbated by the conditions of local and global capitalism, a narrow nationalism and ethnic economic protectionism has taken their place.

### White Supremacy/Racism Impacts

#### Racism is what allows all other forms of domination to deploy murder and genocide as tactics; racism empowers the state to destroy its individual subjects

Eduardo Mendieta, professor of philosophy at Pennsylvania State University, April 25, 2002

"'To Make Live and To Let Die': Foucault on Racism," Paper Presented at American Philosophical Association Central Division Meeting, http://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/philosophy/people/faculty\_pages/docs/foucault.pdf (accessed 8/13/2016)

This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state. They are two sides of one same political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes and medicalizes war. Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture. As I wrote somewhere else, racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other, of others, an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

### White Supremacy/Racism Impacts

#### White supremacy is the ultimate unchallenged ideology, the most important system in global history, requiring a theoretical framework of awareness and challenge that underlies all other struggles against injustice—it informs prejudice, legal inequities, and material inequalities

Charles Mills, professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, 1997

Racial Contract, <https://books.google.com/books?id=GnmuAwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=isbn:0801471346&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjC273B_L7OAhUGMGMKHYTsAaUQ6AEIHjAA#v=onepage&q&f=false> (accessed 8/14/2016)

White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today. You will not find this term in introductory, or even advanced, texts in political theory. A standard undergraduate philosophy course will start off with Plato and Aristotle, perhaps say something about Augustine, Aquinas, and Machiavelli, move on to Hobbes, Locke, Mill, and Marx, and then wind up with Rawls and Nozick. It will introduce you to notions of aristocracy, democracy, absolutism, liberalism, representative government, socialism, welfare capitalism, and libertarianism. But though it covers more than two thousand years of Western political thought and runs the ostensible gamut of political systems, there will be no mention of the basic political system that has shaped the world for the past several hundred years. And this omission is not accidental. Rather, it reflects the fact that standard textbooks and courses have for the most part been written and designed by whites, who take their racial privilege so much for granted that they do not even see it as political, as a form of domination. Ironically, the most important political system of recent global history-the system of domination by which white people have historically ruled over and, in certain important ways, continue to rule over nonwhite people-is not seen as a political system at all. It is just taken for granted; it is the background against which other systems, which we are to see as political are highlighted. This book is an attempt to redirect your vision, to make you see what, in a sense, has been there all along. Philosophy has remained remarkably untouched by the debates over multiculturalism, canon reform, and ethnic diversity racking the academy; both demographically and conceptually, it is one of the "whitest" of the humanities. Blacks, for example, constitute only about 1 percent of philosophers in North American universities-a hundred or so people out of more than ten thousand-and there are even fewer Latino, Asian American, and Native American philosophers! Surely this underrepresentation itself stands in need of an explanation, and in my opinion it can be traced in part to a conceptual array and a standard repertoire of concerns whose abstractness typically elides, rather than genuinely includes, the experience of racial minorities. Since (white) women have the demographic advantage of numbers, there are of course far more female philosophers in the profession than nonwhite philosophers (though still not proportionate to women's percentage of the population), and they have made far greater progress in developing alternative conceptualizations. Those African American philosophers who do work in moral and political theory tend either to produce general work indistinguishable from that of their white peers or to focus on local issues (affirmative action, the black "underclass") or historical figures (W. E. B. Du Bois, Alain Locke) in a way that does not aggressively engage the broader debate. What is needed is a global theoretical framework for situating discussions of race and white racism, and thereby challenging the assumptions of white political philosophy, which would correspond to feminist theorists' articulation of the centrality of gender, patriarchy, and sexism to traditional moral and political theory. What is needed, in other words, is a recognition that racism (or, as I will argue, global white supremacy) is itself a political system, a particular power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and norms for the differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties. The notion of the Racial Contract is, I suggest, one possible way of making this connection with mainstream theory, since it uses the vocabulary and apparatus already developed for contractarianism to map this unacknowledged system. Contract talk is, after all, the political lingua franca of our times.

### Must Critique White Supremacy First

#### A vocabulary for understanding white supremacy as a basic political system must precede calls to political action—this is the key to reaching insight in debates

Angela Davis, author, activist and professor emeritus at University of California-Santa Cruz, June 27, 2015 “The Truth Telling Project: Violence in America” in Freedom Is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement (Haymarket Books), https://books.google.com/books?id=O8piCwAAQBAJ&lpg=PA81&ots=9J-irEGZa5&dq=%E2%80%9CThe%20Truth%20Telling%20Project%3A%20Violence%20in%20America%E2%80%9D&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q=%E2%80%9CThe%20Truth%20Telling%20Project:%20Violence%20in%20America%E2%80%9D&f=false (accessed 8/14/2016)

In this context I want to take issue with one of Obama’s points in his quite amazing eulogy of Reverend Clementa Pinckney in Charleston, South Carolina, yesterday. I want to take issue with what he said when he exclaimed that if we want to be successful in our struggle against racism we cannot say that we need more conversations about race. Rather we should say that we need action. Certainly we need a great deal more than talk, but it is also the case that we need to learn how to talk about race and racism. If we do not know how to meaningfully talk about racism, our actions will move in misleading directions. The call for public conversations on race and racism is also a call to develop a vocabulary that permits us to have insightful conversations. If we attempt to use historically obsolete vocabularies, our consciousness of racism will remain shallow and we can be easily urged to assume that, for example, changes in the law spontaneously produce effective changes in the social world. For example, those who assume that because slavery was legally abolished in the nineteenth century, it was thereby relegated to the dustbin of history, fail to recognize the extent to which cultural and structural elements of slavery are still with us. The prison-industrial complex furnishes numerous examples of the persistence of slavery. There are those who believe that we have definitively triumphed in the struggle for civil rights. However, vast numbers of Black people are still deprived of the right to vote-especially if they are in prison or former felons. Moreover, even those who did acquire rights that were not previously available to them did not thereby achieve jobs, education, housing, and health care. The mid-twentieth-century campaign for civil rights was an essential moment in our struggle for racial equality, but it is important to develop vocabularies that help us acknowledge that civil rights was and is not the entire story. Such an analysis of racism would be helpful to those who are celebrating yesterday’s Supreme Court decision on marriage equality as if the final barrier to justice for LGBTQ communities had been surmounted. The decision was indeed historic, but the struggles against homophobic state violence, [for] economic rights, health care, et cetera, continue. Most importantly if the intersectionality of struggles against racism, homophobia, and transphobia is minimized, we will never achieve significant victories in our fight for justice. This is yet another reason why it is essential to develop richer and more critical vocabularies with which to express our insights about racism. The inability to understand the complexity of racism can lead to assumptions, for example, that there is an independent phenomenon we can call “Black-on-Black crime” that has nothing to do with racism. So, the development of new ways of thinking about racism requires us not only to understand economic, social, and ideological structures, but also collective psychic structures. One of the major examples of the violence of racism consists of the rearing of generations of Black people who have not learned how to imagine the future-who are not now in possession of the education and the imagination that allows them to envision the future. This is violence that leads to other forms of violence-violence against children; violence against partners; violence against friends…in our families and communities, we often unconsciously continue the work of larger forces of racism, assuming that this violence is individual and sui generis. If the popularization of more complex analyses of racism, especially those that have been developed in the context of Black and women-of-color feminisms, can assist us to understand how deeply embedded racist violence [is] in our country’s economic and ideological structures, these ways of talking about racism can help us to grasp the global reach of our struggles. Palestinian-Americans’ involvement in the Ferguson protests was complemented by expressions of solidarity with Ferguson from Palestinian activists in the West Bank and Gaza. The Ferguson struggle has taught us that local issues have global ramifications. The militarization of the Ferguson police and the advice tweeted by Palestinian activists helped to recognize our political kinship with the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement and with the larger struggle for justice in Palestine. Moreover, we have come to understand the central role Islamophobia has played in the emergence of new forms of racism in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. Deep understandings of racist violence arm us against deceptive solutions. When we are told that we simply need better police and better prisons, we counter with what we really need. We need to reimagine security, which will involve the abolition of policing and imprisonment was we know them. We will say demilitarize the police, disarm the police, abolish the institution of the police as we know it, and abolish imprisonment as the dominant mode of punishment. But we will have only just begun to tell the truth about violence in America.

### Answers to Marxism/Anti-Capitalist Critique

#### Permutation: Do both. The formation and praxis of anti-capitalism is already multi-racial solidarity—Marxism emerged from the struggles of people of color

Vijay Prashad, Chair in South Asian History and Professor of International Studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, Beacon Press, http://www.homeworkforyou.com/static/uploadedfiles/User\_506913122015[Vijay\_Prashad]\_Everybody\_Was\_Kung\_Fu\_Fighting.\_Af(BookZZ.org).pdf (accessed 8/13/2016)

Intellectuals of the Afro-Asian world found immense political, moral, and intellectual resources in the tradition of Marxism and Communism, something that has been wonderfully catalogued in recent years. The depth of this connection is forgotten or else minimized by the example of George Padmore’s resignation from the CPUSA or Aime´ Cesaire’s celebrated letter to Maurice Thorez resigning from the Communist Party of France. Cesaire wrote in that letter, ‘‘What I want is that Marxism and Communism be harnessed into the service of colored people, and not colored people into the service of Marxism and Communism.’’ There is a falseness to this statement because Marxism and Communism both emerged from the labors of ‘‘colored people’’ (whether as the materials for Marx’s analysis of the world system or at the debates in the Comintern between the Indian Communist M. N. Roy and Lenin or else in the developments of communisms outside Europe whose heritage continues till this day).

### Answers to Marxism/Anti-Capitalist Critique

#### The permutation solves better because it welcomes liberal anti-racism alongside the radical critique of capitalism, creating a broader network of support

Charles W. Mills, professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, 1997

(Cornell University Press), http://www.faculty.umb.edu/lawrence\_blum/courses/318\_11/readings/mills\_revisionist\_ontologies\_theorizing\_white\_supremacy.pdf (accessed 8/14/2016)

Moreover, whereas Marxism's claims about the intrinsically exploitive character of capitalism and the viability and attractiveness of socialism as a solution have always been - and are now more than ever - highly controversial, all good liberals should oppose racism and should want to eradicate its legacy. If, as many now argue, the events since 1989 have conclusively demonstrated that capitalism is the only feasible option for humanity, then what one wants is a capitalism that lives up to its advertising. Liberals as well as radicals should therefore enthusiastically endorse rather than object to the exposure of global white supremacy as a political system, since it clearly contravenes the ideal of a color-neutral, racially accessible market society. The Marxist anticapitalist goal is currently of severely limited appeal, but in theory at least one would like to think that all people of goodwill would support the critique and ultimate elimination of white supremacy, including the whites privileged by it. Doubtless, then, the project will be broadly supported, insofar as it is consonant with the proclaimed values of the liberal ideology that is now triumphant across most of the globe.

#### Racism doesn't come from capitalism--assuming it does weakens the struggle against both

Brian Martin, professor of Science, Technology and Society at University of Wollongong, 1990

"Uprooting War," BrianMartin.cc, http://www.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/90uw/uw13.html (accessed 8/14/2016)

The trouble here is that much of the socialist left sees capitalism as the sole source of evil in the world. This approach is blind to the roots of social problems that do not primarily grow out of class domination, including racism, sexism, environmental degradation and war. Because of this blindness, even the struggle against capitalism is weakened, since attention is not paid to systems of power such as patriarchy and bureaucracy which are mobilised to support capitalism as well as other interests.

### Answers to Marxism/Anti-Capitalist Critique

#### Analysis of white supremacy goes above and beyond the insights of the critique of capitalism; we don’t preclude a materialist critique but including whiteness as an autonomous category is critical to understanding the superexploitation of racialized capitalism

Charles W. Mills, professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, 1997

(Cornell University Press), http://www.faculty.umb.edu/lawrence\_blum/courses/318\_11/readings/mills\_revisionist\_ontologies\_theorizing\_white\_supremacy.pdf (accessed 8/14/2016)

The important point-as "race men" have always appreciated - is that a racial perspective on society can provide insights to be found in neither a white liberalism nor a white Marxism, and when suitably modified and reconstructed, such a perspective need not imply biological generalizations about whites or commit the obvious moral error of holding people responsible for something (genealogy, phenotype) they cannot help. A specifically left objection, correspondingly, might be that to see race as theoretically central implies a return to a pre-Marxist conception of the social order and ignores class. To begin with, of course, in today's largely postcommunist world, Marxism's explanatory credentials are hardly unchallengeable. But in any case, the constructivist conception of race presupposed does leave open the possibility that a convincing historical materialist account of the creation of global white supremacy can be developed. To make race central is not to make it foundational; it is simply to take seriously the idea of an at least partially autonomous racial political system. (For those with left sympathies, the traditional explanatory route will be through the European Conquest, the imposition of regimes of superexploitation on indigenous and imported populations, and the differential motivation and cultural/ideational power of local and metropolitan ruling classes to ensure that race crystallizes as an overriding social identity stabilizing the resultant system.

#### Only a critique of white supremacy can explain the commonalities of racism across different economic systems

Charles W. Mills, professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, 1997

(Cornell University Press), http://www.faculty.umb.edu/lawrence\_blum/courses/318\_11/readings/mills\_revisionist\_ontologies\_theorizing\_white\_supremacy.pdf (accessed 8/14/2016)

"Capitalism" as a concept has obviously been found useful by many generations of thinkers, both lay and academic, as a general way of categorizing a certain kind of economic system with a core of characteristic traits, despite the vast differences between the capitalism of a century ago and the capitalism of today, and among the capitalist systems of Japan, the United States, and Jamaica. For detailed case studies, one must descend empirically to the investigative level of the political scientist, the economist, the sociologist. But for the purposes of supplementing the conceptual apparatus of the political philosopher, this distance from empirical detail does not seem to me to be problematic. At this level, one is concerned with the general logic of the abstract system, the overarching commonalities of racial subordination between, say, colonial Kenya and independent Australia, slave Brazil and the postbellum United States, which warrant the subsumption of these radically different polities under a general category. "White supremacy" captures these usually ignored racial realities, and on this basis it should take its rightful place in the official vocabulary of political theory, along with such other political abstractions as absolutism, democracy, socialism, fascism, and patriarchy.

# Neg AfroAsian

### Marxism/Anti-Capitalism Solves

#### Capitalism constructs race as an oppressive category within the logic of exploitation—the social relations of white supremacy emerge from the marking for exploitation that constitutes race as a justification for material oppression

Robert Young, Editor of Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies, Winter-Spring 2006

"Putting Materialism back into Race Theory: Toward a Transformative Theory of Race," The Red Critique #11, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm (accessed 8/14/2016)

Contrary to Mills, I believe a more effective materialist class analysis foregrounds exploitative social-economic structures and the consequent class struggle between the international ruling class and the international proletariat. My project situates race in relation to the international division of labor. Race emerges historically and within specific political-economic coordinates. These coordinates link the logic of race to the logic of capitalist exploitation. In other words, race is implicated in the historic and ongoing (class) struggle to determine the ratio of surplus value. For me then, race signals a marking for exploitation, and this economic assignment, in turn, generates an accompanying ideological machinery to justify and increase that exploitation. Any understanding of this economic assignment, which represents an historically objective positionality, has been removed from the contemporary intellectual scene. Race represents not just a cultural or political category as many critics attest to, but it represents an historic apparatus for the production, maintenance, and legitimation of the inequalities of wage-labor.

#### Lack of Marxist perspective empirically obscures African-American coalition building with China; African-Americans and Asians developed mutually negative stereotypes in World War II and only communists saw through this error

Socialism and Democracy Online, May 20, 2012

"Afro-Asia and Cold War Black Radicalism," Socialism and Democracy Online, http://sdonline.org/55/afro-asia-and-cold-war-black-radicalism/ (accessed 8/13/2016)

Yet while large numbers of African Americans, with the exception of African American Communists, believed Japan might overthrow the imperialist system, they were frequently indifferent, at times disapproving, of China, a nation ravaged by Western imperialism after the Opium War and the Treaty of Nanjing in 1842. According to Gallicchio, segments of the African American population deemed China as “a kind of ‘uncle Tom’ of Asia” (65), and consequently endorsed Japan’s occupation of China in 1931 because they believed Japan’s invasion might unite Japan and China against Western imperialism in China and other parts of East Asia. It is in these sections that Gallicchio’s analysis becomes especially intriguing. Gallicchio lays out the various negative depictions through which Japan racialized other Asian populations such as Koreans and Chinese, and how African Americans overlooked these policies. He also examines how African Americans, Chinese, and Asian Americans too created stereotypes of each other and how and why this contradicted their efforts to build solidarity.

### Marxism/Anti-Capitalism Solves

#### Capitalism is the best starting point for examining white supremacy and all the oppressions it intersects with because oppression stems from the ability to materially oppress people in systems of production

Ben Norton, journalist and writer for Salon and other publications, June 25, 2015

"Adolph Reed: Identity Politics is Neoliberalism," BenNorton.com, http://bennorton.com/adolph-reed-identity-politics-is-neoliberalism/ (accessed 8/13/2016)

This should not by any means be interpreted as a blanket condemnation of anti-racism, feminism, or other movements for social equality. Rather, it should be construed as a condemnation of a politics that is centered on social constructs like race or gender, rather than on material conditions. White supremacy, patriarchy, cisheteronormativity, ableism, and more should specifically be seen as what they are: the social relations that are created by a white supremacist, patriarchal, cisheteronormative, ableist system of production—that is to say created by capitalism. Race and gender must be analyzed in a true intersectional manner, as inextricably linked to the material (i.e., economic) conditions of which they are constituted.

#### Theories of multiple racial oppressions risk abstraction from their material context—focus on materiality solves this and gives reference points to narratives of oppression

Eve Mitchell, writer and organizer at Unity and Struggle, September 12, 2013

"I am a woman and a human: a Marxist feminist critique of intersectionality theory," LibCom.org, https://libcom.org/library/i-am-woman-human-marxist-feminist-critique-intersectionality-theory-eve-mitchell (accessed 8/13/2016)

Similarly, theories of an “interlocking matrix of oppressions,” simply create a list of naturalized identities, abstracted from their material and historical context. This methodology is just as ahistorical and antisocial as Betty Friedan’s. Again, patriarchy and white supremacy are not objects or “institutions” that exist throughout history; they are particular expressions of our labor, our life-activity, that are conditioned by (and in turn, condition) our mode of production. In Capital, Marx describes labor as the “metabolism” between humans and the external world; patriarchy and white supremacy, as products of our labor, are also the conditions in which we labor. We are constantly interacting with the world, changing the world and changing ourselves through our “metabolic” labor. So patriarchy and white supremacy, like all social relations of labor, change and transform.

### Marxism/Anti-Capitalism Solves

#### Capitalist exploitation necessitates and presages racial oppression—our method doesn’t minimize racism, it emphasizes the way it maintains the exploitation-oppression process

Sharon Smith, author of Subterranean Fire: A History of Working-Class Radicalism in the United States, July 11, 2008

"Marxism and Identity Politics," Socialist Worker, https://socialistworker.org/2008/07/11/marxism-and-identity-politics (accessed 8/13/2016)

There is a caricature in what often passes for a critique of Marxism in many circles today, which assumes that when Marxists call for the building of a united working class movement of all oppressed and exploited people, and that equals subordinating the fight against oppression to the fight against exploitation. That caricature could not be further from the truth. That is because both exploitation and oppression are rooted in capitalism. Exploitation is the method by which the ruling class robs workers of the wealth they produce. The various forms of oppression play a primary role in maintaining the rule of a tiny minority over the vast majority. In every case, the enemy is one and the same. Each form of oppression is different, and each individual's experience of it is different, but all oppression is rooted in a system that thrives upon oppression as well as exploitation for its survival. So the point is not--and this never been the Marxist tradition--for the oppressed to wait until after the revolution to raise their demands, as is often the caricature. On the contrary, Marxism is about demanding that the entire working-class movement champion the rights of all the oppressed, thereby putting the collective strength of the working class behind the fight against oppression. The argument here is straightforward: the lessons of building a united movement against capitalism trains workers to act in solidarity with everybody who is oppressed and exploited. As long as we can be divided, we can be conquered; once we unite in a common movement, we cannot be defeated. As the old saying, the people united can never be defeated--and that is the Marxist method.

#### Our method doesn’t minimize racism; it explains it; class doesn’t compete with race because class stems from exploitation while racism is a primary form of oppression

Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, professor of African-American Studies at Princeton University, January 4, 2011

"Race, class and Marxism," Socialist Worker, https://socialistworker.org/2011/01/04/race-class-and-marxism (accessed 8/13/2016)

To claim, as Marxists do, that racism is a product of capitalism is not to deny or diminish its importance or impact in American society. It is simply to explain its origins and the reasons for its perpetuation. Many on the left today talk about class as if it is one of many oppressions, often describing it as "classism." What people are really referring to as "classism" is elitism or snobbery, and not the fundamental organization of society under capitalism. Moreover, it is popular today to talk about various oppressions, including class, as intersecting. While it is true that oppressions can reinforce and compound each other, they are born out of the material relations shaped by capitalism and the economic exploitation that is at the heart of capitalist society. In other words, it is the material and economic structure of society that gave rise to a range of ideas and ideologies to justify, explain and help perpetuate that order. In the United States, racism is the most important of those ideologies.

### Marxism/Anti-Capitalism Solves

#### Socialism facilitates the true elimination of racism because it eliminates the production of difference and accompanying ideological narratives that lay the material foundation for racism

Robert Young, Editor of Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies, Winter-Spring 2006

"Putting Materialism back into Race Theory: Toward a Transformative Theory of Race," The Red Critique #11, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm (accessed 8/14/2016)

In my view, race oppression dialectically intersects with the exploitative logic of advanced capitalism, a regime which deploys race in the interest of surplus accumulation. Thus, race operates at the (economic) base and therefore produces cultural and ideological effects at the superstructure; in turn, these effects—in very historically specific way—interact with and ideologically justify the operations at the economic base [1]. In a sense then, race encodes the totality of contemporary capitalist social relations, which is why race cuts across a range of seemingly disparate social sites in contemporary US society. For instance, one can mark race difference and its discriminatory effects in such diverse sites as health care, housing/real estate, education, law, job market, and many other social sites. However, unlike many commentators who engage race matters, I do not isolate these social sites and view race as a local problem, which would lead to reformist measures along the lines of either legal reform or a cultural-ideological battle to win the hearts and minds of people and thus keep the existing socio-economic arrangements intact; instead, I foreground the relationality of these sites within the exchange mechanism of multinational capitalism. Consequently, I believe, the eradication of race oppression also requires a totalizing political project: the transformation of existing capitalism—a system which produces difference (the racial/gender division of labor) and accompanying ideological narratives that justify the resulting social inequality. Hence, my project articulates a transformative theory of race—a theory that reclaims revolutionary class politics in the interests of contributing toward a post-racist society. In other words, the transformation from actually existing capitalism into socialism constitutes the condition of possibility for a post-racist society—a society free from racial and all other forms of oppression. By freedom, I do not simply mean a legal or cultural articulation of individual rights as proposed by bourgeois race theorists. Instead, I theorize freedom as a material effect of emancipated economic forms.

### Marxism/Anti-Capitalism Solves

#### Confrontation with racism alone doesn’t change the system; we must confront the material privilege that gives elites an interest in perpetuating white supremacy

Sharon Smith, author of Subterranean Fire: A History of Working-Class Radicalism in the United States, July 11, 2008

"Marxism and Identity Politics," Socialist Worker, https://socialistworker.org/2008/07/11/marxism-and-identity-politics (accessed 8/13/2016)

Oppression is not caused by the race, gender or sexuality of particular individuals who run the system, but is generated by the very system itself--no matter who's running it. It goes without saying that we want to confront sexism, racism and homophobia wherever it happens. But that alone is not going to change the system. The flip side of the theory of identity politics, which places all straight white men in the enemy camp, is equally problematic--because the entire element of social class is missing from the analysis. The class divide has not been more obvious in the United States than since the Great Depression of the 1930s. This is not some side issue, but it is the centerpiece of the capitalist system. And it's getting worse by the minute. As we know, food and fuel costs are forcing working-class people to make a choice between filling up their tank with gas so they can get to work and putting food on the table for their families. But the most basic class analysis is entirely absent from the theory of identity politics. At best, it acknowledges a word we've probably all heard: "classism" "Classism" pretty much reduced to snobbery or a problem of attitude. Now, of course, we're all against snobbery, and we should confront it. But confronting snobs--not that we don't enjoy doing it--does nothing to change the class system. And this is where Marxism provides a much more logical analysis than identity politics. Figuring out who has an objective interest in upholding women's oppression and in continuing to promote racist ideology or anti-gay bigotry--who materially benefits from racism, sexism and homphobia--depends entirely on what social class you come from.

### Coalitions Bad

#### The system will use racial coalitions to deny everyone genuine material emancipation

Adolf Reed, Jr., professor of political science at University of Pennsylvania, September 2009

"The Limits of Antiracism," Left Business Observer, http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html (accessed 8/13/2016)

As I suggest above, various pressures of the postwar period—including carrots of success and sticks of intimidation and witch-hunting, as well as the articulation of class tensions within the Civil Rights movement itself—drove an evolution away from this perspective and toward reformulation of the movement’s goals along lines more consonant with postwar, post-New Deal, Cold War liberalism. Thus what the political scientist Preston Smith calls “racial democracy” came gradually to replace social democracy as a political goal—the redress of grievances that could be construed as specifically racial took precedence over the redistribution of wealth, and an individualized psychology replaced notions of reworking the material sphere. This dynamic intensified with the combination of popular demobilization in black politics and emergence of the post-segregation black political class in the 1970s and 1980s. We live under a regime now that is capable simultaneously of including black people and Latinos, even celebrating that inclusion as a fulfillment of democracy, while excluding poor people without a whimper of opposition. Of course, those most visible in the excluded class are disproportionately black and Latino, and that fact gives the lie to the celebration. Or does it really? From the standpoint of a neoliberal ideal of equality, in which classification by race, gender, sexual orientation or any other recognized ascriptive status (that is, status based on what one allegedly is rather than what one does) does not impose explicit, intrinsic or necessary limitations on one’s participation and aspirations in the society, this celebration of inclusion of blacks, Latinos and others is warranted.

#### Empirically all successful anti-racist struggles in the U.S. have begun with Blackness at the center—rejecting whiteness makes no sense from a racial coalition starting point

Adolf Reed, Jr., professor of political science at University of Pennsylvania, September 2009

"The Limits of Antiracism," Left Business Observer, http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html (accessed 8/13/2016)

The contemporary discourse of “antiracism” [and identity politics overall] is focused much more on taxonomy than politics. It emphasizes the name by which we should call some strains of inequality—whether they should be broadly recognized as evidence of “racism”— over specifying the mechanisms that produce them or even the steps that can be taken to combat them. And, no, neither “overcoming racism” nor “rejecting whiteness” qualifies as such a step any more than does waiting for the “revolution” or urging God’s heavenly intervention. If organizing a rally against racism seems at present to be a more substantive political act than attending a prayer vigil for world peace, that’s only because contemporary antiracist activists understand themselves to be employing the same tactics and pursuing the same ends as their predecessors in the period of high insurgency in the struggle against racial segregation. This view, however, is mistaken. The postwar activism that reached its crescendo in the South as the “civil rights movement” wasn’t a movement against a generic “racism;” it was specifically and explicitly directed toward full citizenship rights for black Americans and against the system of racial segregation that defined a specific regime of explicitly racial subordination in the South. The 1940s March on Washington Movement was also directed against specific targets, like employment discrimination in defense production. Black Power era and post-Black Power era struggles similarly focused on combating specific inequalities and pursuing specific goals like the effective exercise of voting rights and specific programs of redistribution.

### Coalitions Bad

#### Anti-Blackness surpasses and exceeds all other racial oppressions; silencing this even with the intention of coalition-building destroys Black inquiry into the foundations of anti-Blackness

Jared Sexton, professor of African-American studies and film and media studies at the University of California-Irvine, 2010

"People-of-Color-Blindness," Social Text vol. 28 no. 2, http://socialtext.dukejournals.org/content/28/2\_103/31.abstract (accessed 8/13/2016)

If the oppression of nonblack people of color in, and perhaps beyond, the United States seems conditional to the historic instance and functions at a more restricted empirical scope, antiblackness seems invariant and limitless (which does not mean that the former is somehow negligible and short-lived or that the latter is exhaustive and unchanging). If pursued with some consistency, the sort of comparative analysis outlined above would likely impact the formulation of political strategy and modify the demeanor of our political culture. In fact, it might denature the comparative instinct altogether in favor of a relational analysis more adequate to the task. Yet all of this is obviated by the silencing mechanism par excellence in Left political and intellectual circles today: “Don’t play Oppression Olympics!” The Oppression Olympics dogma levels a charge amounting to little more than a leftist version of “playing the race card.” To fuss with details of comparative (or relational) analysis is to play into the hands of divide-and-conquer tactics and to promote a callous immorality.72 However, as in its conservative complement, one notes in this catchphrase the unwarranted translation of an inquiring position of comparison into an insidious posture of competition, the translation of ethical critique into unethical attack. This point allows us to understand better the intimate relationship between the censure of black inquiry and the recurrent analogizing to black suffering mentioned above: they bear a common refusal to admit to significant differences of structural position born of discrepant histories between blacks and their political allies, actual or potential. We might, finally, name this refusal people-of-color-blindness, a form of colorblindness inherent to the concept of “people of color” to the precise extent that it misunderstands the specificity of antiblackness and presumes or insists upon the monolithic character of victimization under white supremacy—thinking (the afterlife of) slavery as a form of exploitation or colonization or a species of racial oppression among others.

### Coalitions Bad

#### Obscuring the structural position of Blackness undermines solvency

Jared Sexton, professor of African-American studies and film and media studies at the University of California-Irvine, 2010

"People-of-Color-Blindness," Social Text vol. 28 no. 2, http://socialtext.dukejournals.org/content/28/2\_103/31.abstract (accessed 8/13/2016)

The upshot of this predicament is that obscuring the structural position of the category of blackness will inevitably undermine multiracial coalition building as a politics of radical opposition and, to that extent, force the question of black liberation back to the center of discussion. Every analysis that attempts to understand the complexities of racial rule and the machinations of the racial state without accounting for black existence within its framework—which does not mean simply listing it among a chain of equivalents or returning to it as an afterthought—is doomed to miss what is essential about the situation. Black existence does not represent the total reality of the racial formation—it is not the beginning and the end of the story—but it does relate to the totality; it indicates the (repressed) truth of the political and economic system. That is to say, the whole range of positions within the racial formation is most fully understood from this vantage point, not unlike the way in which the range of gender and sexual variance under patriarchal and heteronormative regimes is most fully understood through lenses that are feminist and queer. What is lost for the study of black existence in the proposal for a decentered, “postblack” paradigm is a proper analysis of the true scale and nature of black suffering and of the struggles—political, aesthetic, intellectual, and so on—that have sought to transform and undo it. What is lost for the study of nonblack nonwhite existence is a proper analysis of the true scale and nature of its material and symbolic power relative to the category of blackness.

#### Centrality of African-American experience is necessary for Black activists to address their own historical oppression

Molefi Kete Asante, Professor and Chair, Department of African American Studies at Temple University, April 13, 2009

"Afrocentricity," www.asante.net, http://www.asante.net/articles/1/afrocentricity/ (accessed 8/13/2016)

One of the key assumptions of the Afrocentrist is that all relationships are based on centers and margins and the distances from either the center or the margin. When black people view themselves as centered and central in their own history then they see themselves as agents, actors, and participants rather than as marginals on the periphery of political or economic experience. Using this paradigm, human beings have discovered that all phenomena are expressed in the fundamental categories of space and time. Furthermore, it is then understood that relationships develop and knowledge increases to the extent we are able to appreciate the issues of space and time. The Afrocentric scholar or practitioner knows that one way to express Afrocentricity is called marking. Whenever a person delineates a cultural boundary around a particular cultural space in human time, this is called marking. It might be done with the announcement of a certain symbol, the creation of a special bonding, or the citing of personal heroes of African history and culture. Beyond citing the revolutionary thinkers in our history, that is, beyond Amilcar Cabral, Frantz Fanon, Malcolm X and Nkrumah, we must be prepared to act upon our interpretation of what is in the best interest of black people, that is, black people as an historically oppressed population. This is the fundamental necessity for advancing the political process.

### Overdetermination Bad

#### Focus on race simultaneously reveals and obscures truths of emancipation—focusing on whiteness destroys the struggle for racial equality because it places whiteness into a unique category—this also makes backlash inevitable

Howard Winant, professor of sociology at University of California-Santa Barbara, September-October 1997

"Behind Blue Eyes: Contemporary White Racial Politics," New Left Review #225, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/winant/whitness.html (accessed 8/14/2016)

In a situation of racial dualism, as Du Bois observed more than 90 years ago, race operates both to assign us and to deny us our identity. It both makes the social world intelligible, and simultaneously renders it opaque and mysterious. Not only does it allocate resources, power, and privilege; it also provides means for challenging that allocation. The contradictory character of race provides the context in which racial dualism -or the "color-line," as Du Bois designated it, has developed as "the problem of the 20th century." So what's new? Only that, as a result of incalculable human effort, suffering, and sacrifice, we now realize that these truths apply across the board. Whites and whiteness can no longer be exempted from the comprehensive racialization process that is the hallmark of US history and social structure. This is the present-day context for racial conflict and thus for US politics in general, since race continues to play its designated role of crystallizing all the fundamental issues in US society. As always, we articulate our anxieties in racial terms: wealth and poverty, crime and punishment, gender and sexuality, nationality and citizenship, culture and power, are all articulated in the US primarily through race. So what's new? It's the problematic of whiteness that has emerged as the principal source of anxiety and conflict in the postwar US. Although this situation was anticipated or prefigured at earlier moments in the nation's past -- for example, in the "hour of eugenics" (Stepan 1991, Kevles 1985, Gould 1981) -- it is far more complicated now than ever before, largely due to the present unavailability of biologistic forms of racism as a convenient rationale for white supremacy. Whiteness -- visible whiteness, resurgent whiteness, whiteness as a color, whiteness as difference -- this is what's new, and newly problematic, in contemporary US politics. The reasons for this have already emerged in my discussion of the spectrum of racial projects and the particular representations these projects assign to whiteness. Most centrally, the problem of the meaning of whiteness appears as a direct consequence of the movement challenge posed in the 1960s to white supremacy. The battles of that period have not been resolved; they have not been won or lost; however battered and bruised, the demand for substantive racial equality and general social justice still lives. And while it lives, the strength of white supremacy is in doubt. The racial projects of the right are clear efforts to resist the challenge to white supremacy posed by the movements of the 1960s and their contemporary inheritors. Each of these projects has a particular relationship to the white supremacist legacy, ranging from the far right's efforts to justify and solidify white entitlements, through the new right's attempts to utilize the white supremacist tradition for more immediate and expedient political ends, to the neoconservative project's quixotic quest to surgically separate the liberal democratic tradition from the racism that traditionally underwrote it. The biologistic racism of the far right, the expedient and subtextual racism of the new right, and the bad-faith anti-racism of the neoconservatives have many differences from each other, but they have at least one thing in common. They all seek to maintain the long-standing association between whiteness and US political traditions, between whiteness and US nationalism, between whiteness and universalism. They all seek in different ways to preserve white identity from the particularity, the difference, which the 1960s movement challenge assigned to it. The racial projects of the left are the movements' successors (as is neoconservatism, in a somewhat perverse sense).

### Overdetermination Bad

#### Focus on whiteness risks assuming whites cannot be allies and still be white, undermining solvency

Howard Winant, professor of sociology at University of California-Santa Barbara, September-October 1997

"Behind Blue Eyes: Contemporary White Racial Politics," New Left Review #225, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/winant/whitness.html (accessed 8/14/2016)

They both seek to associate whites and nonwhites, to reinterpret the meaning of whiteness in such a way that it no longer has the power to impede class alliances. Although the differences and indeed the hostility -- between the neoliberal and abolitionist projects, between the reform-oriented and radical conceptions of whiteness -- are quite severe, we consider it vital that adherents of each project recognize that they hold part of the key to challenging white supremacy in the contemporary US, and that their counterpart project holds the other part of the key. Neoliberals rightfully argue that a pragmatic approach to transracial politics is vital if the momentum of racial reaction is to be halted or reversed. Abolitionists properly emphasize challenging the ongoing commitment to white supremacy on the part of many whites. Both of these positions need to draw on each other, not only in strategic terms, but in theoretical ones as well. The recognition that racial identities -- all racial identities, including whiteness -- have become implacably dualistic, could be far more liberating on the left than it has thus far been. For neoliberals, it could permit and indeed justify an acceptance of race-consciousness and even nationalism among racially-defined minorities as a necessary but partial response to disenfranchisement, disempowerment, and superexploitation. There is no inherent reason why such a political position could not coexist with a strategic awareness of the need for strong, class-conscious, transracial coalitions. We have seen many such examples in the past: in the anti-slavery movement, the communist movement of the 1930s (Kelley 1994), and in the 1988 presidential bid of Jesse Jackson, to name but a few. This is not to say that all would be peace and harmony if such alliances could come more permanently into being. But there is no excuse for not attempting to find the pragmatic "common ground" necessary to create them. Abolitionists could also benefit from a recognition that on a pragmatic basis, whites can ally with racially-defined minorities without renouncing their whiteness. If they truly agree that race is a socially constructed concept, as they claim, abolitionists should also be able to recognize that racial identities are not either-or matters, not closed concepts that must be upheld in a reactionary fashion or disavowed in a comprehensive act of renunciation. To use a postmodern language I dislike: racial identities are deeply "hybridized"; they are not "sutured," but remain open to rearticulation. "To be white in America is to be very black. If you don't know how black you are, you don't know how American you are" (Thompson 1995, 429).’

### Secrecy Turn

#### The politics of resistance require secrecy, but the affirmative reveals both the vulnerability and the potential emancipatory strategies of oppressed groups—this is a case turn—in this instance shared understanding is bad

Catherine Hundleby, professor of philosophy at University of Windsor, 2005

"The Epistemological Evaluation of Oppositional Secrets," . Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy, 20, http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=philosophypub (accessed 8/14/2016)

Secrets concerned with resistance, such as in the Underground Railroad, women’s shelters and lesbian passing, must be especially valuable and relevant to developing knowledge from a standpoint, because activism is supposed to be necessary to acquire the advantage. Yet, revealing aspects of resistance so vulnerable that they are kept secret risks undermining the potential of those secrets for resisting and opposing oppression. Thus, the epistemological value of oppositional secrecy seems to conflict with standpoint theorists’ advice of emancipatory activism. The case of oppositional secrecy seems to indicate an exception to standpoint theory, a case in which emancipatory politics does not encourage but prohibits sharing understanding. However, as I will argue, the need to preserve oppositional secrecy is not an exception to, but only a limited case of, standpoint epistemology. Some understanding that might be gained is not barred by political considerations, but political distinctions do indicate when and where the cognitive value of such understandings tapers off. The cognitive significance of exposing hidden understanding reduces in cases of extreme political vulnerability that morally require secrecy.

### Secrecy Turn

#### Sharing oppressive experiences and anti-oppression strategies is a case turn: strips the solvency of consciousness-raising and risks greater oppression

Catherine Hundleby, professor of philosophy at University of Windsor, 2005

"The Epistemological Evaluation of Oppositional Secrets," . Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy, 20, http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=philosophypub (accessed 8/14/2016)

The benefit for an outsider’s understanding of the world diminishes with the preciousness of the secret. Such understandings are not merely suppressed or underdeveloped, but valuable because of and therefore contingent on the possibility of social change. If an understanding is extremely vulnerable in the current political climate, there is only a small chance that it will bear out. The project served by the secret is likely to fail. For instance, sharing knowledge of the existence of a secret may encourage others to seek out further details, and endanger the plans and corresponding projection of the world, as Douglass worried. Whatever aspect of a secret is revealed, revelation of the information tends to change the political nature of the world and can undermine the secret’s cognitive potential if that potential is fragile. Fresh scrutiny will face the sabo- taging wife should others become aware that there is some secret regarding her behavior. Their watchful eyes will make it difficult for her to continue to act out, and so will amplify the oppression she experiences. The extreme case of genocide demonstrates vividly how political necessity mitigates epistemological values. There approaches nothing to learn of the future world from the understandings of peoples who do not survive. Although there is much to learn from them about their oppression, that oppression stops being part of the world as those oppressed people stop being part of the world. The world becomes less the world those people lived in and understood, and their perspectives decline in relevance and epistemological value.

### Secrecy Turn

#### Emancipation depends on keeping the secret; exposure could cost the oppressed their lives—they must first justify revealing the narrative before this undertaking

Catherine Hundleby, professor of philosophy at University of Windsor, 2005

"The Epistemological Evaluation of Oppositional Secrets," . Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy, 20, http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=philosophypub (accessed 8/14/2016)

Given the two distinguishable forms of oppositional secrecy, the question remains what political reasons generally keep people who oppose oppression from revealing or investigating the secrets of the oppressed despite the potential understanding to be gained. How does a person guided by standpoint theory decide when an oppositional secret may be revealed? How does an intellectual activist against oppression, who may or may not share a particular experience of oppression, know when to resist revealing or investigating politically justified secrecy? Whether one shares the particular experience of oppression, or shares the secret itself, the most obvious reasons for respecting the secrets of the oppressed rely on moral and political considerations. The political project of emancipation depends on keeping the secret, at least to some extent or in some way, and so an inquirer must be aware that violating that secrecy jeopardizes those who participate in it. The cost may be even their lives. Clearly, no foreseeable substantial moral or political threat to the participants in a secret can result from a permissible revelation. How is the threat to the oppositional project recognized and evaluated? People tend to resolve such dilemmas by seeking out those who share in the form of oppression, and those who are already trusted in sharing the secret. In the wrong hands, secrets are dangerous, can be misused, and indeed can reinforce the circumstances of oppression, however noble one’s intentions. The type of ignorance encouraged by social privilege may make a knower unaware of the dangerous implications of a particular piece of knowledge for the welfare of marginalized people. Consider how white or straight folks may be oblivious as they “out” and thus endanger a person who is passing. To ward off potential danger, one appeals to the immorality of disrespecting the secrets of others. The decision of when and how to reveal a secret is left as much as possible to the judgment of those whose secret it is. The more removed one is from the content being hidden—whether or not the circumstance involves oppression, but with special care if it does—the less political authority one has to evaluate that circumstance and to investigate or share the secret.5 So, one avoids revealing or inquiring into the sexual or racial identity of others. The person or people in question judge best the full practical and political import of open identification.

### Pragmatism Solves

#### Pragmatism is a superior paradigm to solve racism--our only alternative is an engagement with institutions that expand the reach of democracy

Eddie S. Glaude, chair of the Center for African-American Studies at Princeton University, 2007

Excerpts: In a Shade of Blue: Pragmatism and the Politics of Black America," University of Chicago Press Page, http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/298248.html (accessed 8/14/2016)

Ralph Ellison makes a similar claim. He recognized that the grand democratic vision of Ralph Waldo Emerson was limited by his racial myopia, in the sense that Emerson failed fundamentally to recognize African-descended people as autonomous agents. In Invisible Man, for example, Ellison puts forward a profound reconstruction of Emerson’s vision by drawing a circle, to invoke the title of one of Emerson’s important essays, around his powerful but limited vision of American democratic life. Emersonian ideas of self-reliance and representativeness, both of which presuppose a white American subject, are recalibrated to provide those consistently marginalized in Emerson’s “imaginative economy” a central and canonical place in the very construction of American identity. Indeed Ellison claimed to be an inheritor of Emerson’s language. But in claiming that inheritance, he also makes an argument about the direction and meaning of American pragmatism. As Michael Magee writes, “In returning to Emerson, Ellison recalls the uncanny truth about pragmatism, that it is ‘the partial creation of black people.’” This provocative formulation signals the extent to which American pragmatism is the direct reflection of the unique character of America itself, which is inextricably connected to the presence of its darker citizens—America’s blues people. There has indeed been a longstanding tradition of African Americans explicitly taking up the philosophical tools of pragmatism to respond to African American conditions of living. Cornel West stands in this tradition even though he has, over the years, distanced himself from the label. West’s prophetic pragmatism, as expressed in The American Evasion of Philosophy, ushered in a formal articulation of the sensibility that I have generally outlined here. In his hands, pragmatism encounters the underside of American life, it grapples with the tragic dimensions of our living, it gives attention to individual assertion and structural limitations, and it asserts the need for a fuller grasp of the realities of white supremacy (and other forms of oppression) that inform our self-understanding. He rightly notes that American pragmatism “tries to deploy thought as a weapon to enable more effective action” and that “its basic impulse is a plebian radicalism that fuels an antipatrician rebelliousness for the moral aim of enriching individuals and expanding democracy.”

### Pragmatism Solves

#### Institutional engagement is pragmatically necessary for resistance to white supremacy: Black Panther program proves this

The Black Panther Party, October 15, 1966

"Ten Point Program," Marxists Internet Archive, https://www.marxists.org/history/usa/workers/black-panthers/1966/10/15.htm (accessed 8/13/2016)

We believe that the federal government is responsible and obligated to give every man employment or a guaranteed income. We believe that if the White American businessmen will not give full employment, then the means of production should be taken from the businessmen and placed in the community so that the people of the community can organize and employ all of its people and give a high standard of living. We Want An End To The Robbery By The Capitalists Of Our Black Community. We believe that this racist government has robbed us, and now we are demanding the overdue debt of forty acres and two mules. Forty acres and two mules were promised 100 years ago as restitution for slave labor and mass murder of Black people. We will accept the payment in currency which will be distributed to our many communities. The Germans are now aiding the Jews in Israel for the genocide of the Jewish people. The Germans murdered six million Jews. The American racist has taken part in the slaughter of over fifty million Black people; therefore, we feel that this is a modest demand that we make. We Want Decent Housing Fit For The Shelter Of Human Beings. We believe that if the White Landlords will not give decent housing to our Black community, then the housing and the land should be made into cooperatives so that our community, with government aid, can build and make decent housing for its people. We Want Education For Our People That Exposes The True Nature Of This Decadent American Society. We Want Education That Teaches Us Our True History And Our Role In The Present-Day Society. We believe in an educational system that will give to our people a knowledge of self. If a man does not have knowledge of himself and his position in society and the world, then he has little chance to relate to anything else. We Want All Black Men To Be Exempt From Military Service. We believe that Black people should not be forced to fight in the military service to defend a racist government that does not protect us. We will not fight and kill other people of color in the world who, like Black people, are being victimized by the White racist government of America. We will protect ourselves from the force and violence of the racist police and the racist military, by whatever means necessary. We Want An Immediate End To Police Brutality And Murder Of Black People. We believe we can end police brutality in our Black community by organizing Black self-defense groups that are dedicated to defending our Black community from racist police oppression and brutality. The Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States gives a right to bear arms. We therefore believe that all Black people should arm themselves for self- defense. We Want Freedom For All Black Men Held In Federal, State, County And City Prisons And Jails. We believe that all Black people should be released from the many jails and prisons because they have not received a fair and impartial trial. We Want All Black People When Brought To Trial To Be Tried In Court By A Jury Of Their Peer Group Or People From Their Black Communities, As Defined By The Constitution Of The United States. We believe that the courts should follow the United States Constitution so that Black people will receive fair trials. The Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution gives a man a right to be tried by his peer group. A peer is a person from a similar economic, social, religious, geographical, environmental, historical and racial background. To do this the court will be forced to select a jury from the Black community from which the Black defendant came. We have been, and are being, tried by all-White juries that have no understanding of the "average reasoning man" of the Black community.

# Aff Afro-Orientalism

### A2 Framework – IR Education (1/2)

#### China’s contemporary presence in Africa requires an engagement with historically constituted knowledges—traditional IR is epistemologically bankrupt.

Terence Jackson, Professor of Cross Cultural Management, Middlesex University Business School, 2012

“Postcolonialism and organizational knowledge in the wake of China’s presence in Africa: interrogating South-South relations,” Organization, vol. 19, no. 2 pp. 181–204, <http://org.sagepub.com/content/19/2/181.short> (Accessed 8/13/16)

The purpose of this article is to interrogate the adequacy of emerging critical theory in international and cross-cultural management studies in the light of a changing geopolitical dynamic, and to discuss the possible need for a new theoretical lens through which to understand and research China’s presence in Africa at organizational and community level. Attempts to understand management and organizational knowledge from the South may well be taking on a new turn in the light of such developments. As with postcolonial theory, which has taken management scholars several decades to take on board, so the changing geopolitical dynamics involving the ‘resurgence of ancient civilizations’ (Jackson, 2011: 239), specifically China, has so far bypassed any serious discussion in management and organization studies. Currently there is a dearth of empirical studies. The presence of China in Africa, which provides a focus in the current work, has implications on at least two fronts. Firstly, postcolonial theory, and dependency theory which is also discussed in the current work, grew out of and developed within a specific historical and global context, dealing with North-South (or West-East) dynamics. It provides a critique, for example, of why African local or indigenous knowledge has been disparaged and often ignored in favour of a dominant (modernizing) management knowledge (Wong, 2010). For example, it could be argued that the motives for (Western) colonialism, the need to subjugate periphery countries, and even the task of ruling a country with a minimum colonial army (Ferguson, 2003), the motive to impose a ‘civilizing’ religion (Thomson, 2000) and more latterly the neo-colonial motives to impose a Western liberal democratic governance structure and universal human rights (Schech and Haggis, 2000), all add up to a pejorative portrayal of local knowledge and values that appears reflected in the modernizing project in management and organization. Any study of the presence of China in Africa and its implications for resulting management knowledge, has to be interrogated in relation to China’s motives. Secondly as a result of an increased Chinese organizational and management presence in Africa, the combined influences on management and organizational knowledge in Africa, and the way these influences come together in different hybrid forms of managing and organizing may be changing. Hence Bhabha’s (1994) elucidation of ‘mimicry’ of the colonizer by the colonized, part of a process giving rise to cultural ‘third spaces’, may have to be reconsidered from a perspective of a South on South relationship, rather than one where the ‘North’ dominates the ‘South’: in terms of both process and content. Jackson (2004) has pointed to the lack of appropriateness and synergies of imposed Western management knowledge (from the North) with local African values and knowledge. African voices are still weak in this context and at variance or subordinated to dominant Western approaches. Is China’s engagement with African countries likely to make a difference? Of key interest in the current work is the relevance and appropriateness of Chinese management knowledge in Africa, and possible synergies with African management knowledge, how the dynamics and resultant management knowledge might be conceptualized within this emerging geopolitical context, and how empirically this might be studied, and for example, is local knowledge likely to be given a stronger voice, or will it again be subsumed within a more dominant body of management knowledge?

### A2 Framework – IR Education (2/2)

#### It is necessary to theorize south-south dynamics in order to understand the broader geopolitical dynamics of Chinese neocolonialism in Africa.

Terence Jackson, Professor of Cross Cultural Management, Middlesex University Business School, 2012

“Postcolonialism and organizational knowledge in the wake of China’s presence in Africa: interrogating South-South relations,” Organization, vol. 19, no. 2 pp. 181–204, <http://org.sagepub.com/content/19/2/181.short> (Accessed 8/13/16)

The main importance of postcolonial theory to the current work is its critical perception that indigenous knowledge is somewhat elusive given the historical circumstances of colonialism, decolonization and neo-colonialism and the associated power relationships in constituting resultant hybrid forms of knowledge. Indeed, if ‘Africa’ is a colonial invention that colours contemporary discussion, then interpreting the ‘indigenous’ and indigenous knowledge, and making it available and understandable to an ‘international’ body of scholarship is a Western project. Through a lens of postcolonial theory we should rightly be critical of this project. Yet this critique is premised on a North-South dynamic, and does not take account of South-South (or more accurately SouthNorth-South) dynamics, that although have been present for many years, have recently come to the fore, and appear to be re-shaping geopolitical relations (Campbell, 2008). The current work is premised on the assumption that wider geopolitical dynamics have a major impact on the nature of knowledge, the way knowledge is transferred internationally and the nature of local knowledge resulting from and contributing to this dynamic. This includes scholarly and management knowledge, as well as concepts such as organizing and managing people. This is particularly relevant to scholarly work in areas such as the international transfer of knowledge and the way the contribution of knowledge from different parts of the world is assessed and evaluated from the perspective of a dominant knowledge base. For example, Smith (1999), speaks of the wariness of indigenous peoples towards Western research directed towards them, and the need for research to follow an indigenous agenda in order to decolonize knowledge. Yet this critique itself is premised on assumptions of the post-colony that already may be out of date, and superseded by new dynamics that cannot be readily accounted for without re-thinking some of the premises of postcolonial theory (of which possible implications are summarized later in Table 1). However, this is not a straightforward assumption as China (as part of the Western construct of the ‘orient’, and in its relationship with the West) has been brought under the critical gaze of postcolonial theory, as a perceived mixture of primitivism and the exotic (Said, 1978/1995), perhaps in contradistinction to Africa, which has been largely seen through a prism of primitivism (Jackson, 2011). Within the management literature there is evidence of Western influence on organization and management in China (Jackson, 2002; Jackson and Bak, 1998; Warner, 1996; Zheng & Lamond, 2009) and of ‘reverse diffusion’ of Western knowledge taken back to China by Chinese MNCs operating in Western countries (Zhang and Edwards, 2007). So it is likely that any new geopolitical dynamic involving a relationship with African countries also assumes a prior Western relationship with China, as well as with Africa. That China’s relationship with the West has been fundamentally different from Africa’s relationship with the West provides a problematic for an analysis and conceptualization of a South on South relationship between China and African countries.

### CP DA/Solvency Deficit – Conceptual Poetry

#### They cannot solve—from the negative viewpoint it will always be “their” performance—this strategically exhumes the k’un-lu-nu but fails to let them speak.

Ken Chen, Executive Director of the Asian American Writers' Workshop and the author of Juvenilia, selected by Louise Gluck for the Yale Series of Younger Poets, 11 June 2015

“Authenticity Obsession, or Conceptualism as Minstrel Show,” The Margins, <http://aaww.org/authenticity-obsession/> (Accessed 8/10/16)

They differ in one major respect: the “viewpoint” that is being transcribed. In Seven American Deaths and Disasters, Goldsmith transcribes news broadcasts responding to the tragedies—in other words, an imagined public sphere. The tragedies are conceptualized as having happened to “us.” In his most recent piece, Goldsmith did not transcribe mass media responses to Michael Brown’s death, perhaps because he did not see Brown as one of “us.” Instead, he read Michael Brown’s autopsy report. He literally performed the role of the state, the man slicing apart the fallen body of Michael Brown. When I first heard about the performance, I was initially struck by how Goldsmith’s reading felt less like a faux-pas or a mistake, than the kind of deeply revealing slip from a psychoanalytic case study, that gesture by which the subject reveals the unconscious self-knowledge that they did not know they possessed. What I learned when Goldsmith read the autopsy report of Michael Brown is this: Conceptual Poetry literally sees itself as white power dissecting the colored body. Goldsmith saw Michael Brown not as a body but as a death-archive to be enumerated, dissected, and possessed (in the sense both of property and haunting). He wrote in another lineage—not just Western Modernism, but also the literary tradition that made modernity possible: the documents, the ledgers and the logs of the slave trade.

#### Zero risk the counterplan solves—their conceptual poetry is played out.

Ken Chen, Executive Director of the Asian American Writers' Workshop and the author of Juvenilia, selected by Louise Gluck for the Yale Series of Younger Poets, 11 June 2015

“Authenticity Obsession, or Conceptualism as Minstrel Show,” The Margins, <http://aaww.org/authenticity-obsession/> (Accessed 8/10/16)

Kenneth Goldsmith and Vanessa Place are respectively the court jester and law-giver, the brand manager and ideologue, of Conceptual Poetry, a poetry movement whose chief affect is a snickering, joyless humor (the poems often read like punch lines with the laughter redacted) and whose writers subject text to “uncreative” processes, such as redaction, appropriation, situation, and Oulipo-based routines. It is a movement they have relentlessly marketed and one that, in the past few months, they have destroyed. While the techniques of Conceptual Poetry will continue to be deployed after Spring 2015—just as poets still deploy Imagistic tropes without thinking they continue the politics of Ezra Pound—the brand is perhaps dead. An anonymous poetry collective called The Mongrel Coalition Against Gringpo has led a charge against Conceptual Poetry, spearheading the campaign around Place’s role at AWP. In Berkeley, Place was scheduled to appear at a poetry conference. Most of the participants dropped out in protest. Undergraduate poets of color released a letter boycotting the conference. The conference fell apart. And yet to appropriate Conceptual Poetry’s media kit, Goldsmith and Place’s individual authorship is insignificant. They are symptoms, not super villains. This is not the first time a white poet has publicly embarrassed himself by writing about Ferguson, nor is it the first time that Place herself has been banned for opportunistic blackface.

### A2 ‘Your Poetry Reifies Racism’ (1/2)

#### The aff is not an uncritical recounting of the afro-orientalist record, but a scrambling that empowers excluded identities and identifications.

Andrew Wei Ling (A.W.) William Lee, PhD Cultural Studies, Queens University, September 2015

“Performing ManChyna: Unmapping Promissory Exaltation, Multicultural Eugenics, and the New Whiteness (Or, “Call Me Dr. ManChyna”)” Thesis, <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/1974/13741/1/Lee_Andrew_W_201509_PhD.pdf> (Accessed 8/11/16)

For Muñoz, humour represents a hopeful way out of the impasse between power and resistance. Disidentificatory performers and texts humorously recycle and rethink dominant cultural codes and discourse – resistance to ideology within ideology. A strategy of scrambling and reconstructing “the encoded message of a cultural text … both exposes the encoded message’s universalizing and exclusionary machinations and recircuits its workings to account for, include, and empower minority identities and identifications.” 148 Disidentification opens a space for complex cultural circuits to be exploded and explored, not with political impunity, but resisting kneejerk rhetorical reduction to “good dog/bad dog criticism and instead lead[ing] to an identification that is both mediated and immediate, a disidentification that enables politics.”149 In his description, the strategy Muñoz lays out becomes hopeful, gesturing toward a novel mode of resistance within the confines of ideology. Dominant ideologies in “a phobic majoritarian public sphere that continuously elides or punishes … subjects who do not conform to the phantasm of normative citizenship” 150 are met with disidentificatory laughter – evasive, momentary, and ambivalent. Such ambivalence, Muñoz continues, "accomplishes important cultural critique while at the same time providing cover from, and enabling the avoidance itself of, scenarios of direct confrontation with phobic reactionary ideologies.”151 Minoritarian humour and performance become tactics for survival, prodding and ‘dis-ing’ identification while (mostly) evading its punitive reaches.

### A2 ‘Your Poetry Reifies Racism’ (2/2)

#### Revisiting the worn out archives of the slave trade makes it possible to open up a space for the commodity to speak.

Ken Chen, Executive Director of the Asian American Writers' Workshop and the author of Juvenilia, selected by Louise Gluck for the Yale Series of Younger Poets, 11 June 2015

“Authenticity Obsession, or Conceptualism as Minstrel Show,” The Margins, <http://aaww.org/authenticity-obsession/> (Accessed 8/10/16)

The slave trade required documents like Brown’s autopsy report: texts that testified that these bodies were actually things. The black feminist geographer Katherine McKittrick writes: “historic blackness comes from: the list, the breathless numbers, the absolutely economic, the mathematics of the unliving.” In an incredible, rhapsodic essay titled “Mathematics Black Lives,” McKittrick quotes old slaver ledgers—what Goldsmith might call “dry texts.” One of them ends: “Jenny Frederick, 32 years, ordinary wench… Certified to be free by Jonah Frederick of Boston, New England… Betty Rapelje, 21 stout wench, (Peter Brown)… Says she was born free at Newton, Long Island.” Commenting on this sudden last eruption, the cry of Betty Rapelje asserting her freedom from within the ledger book, McKittrick writes: Worn out, bill of sale produced, certified to be free, ordinary wench, proved to be the property of, formerly slave to, formerly the property of, all with parenthetic possessors. New world blackness arrives through the ordinary, proved, former, certified, nearly worn-out archives of ledgers, accounts, price tags, and descriptors of economic worth and financial probability. The list of slaves upon these ships is a list of properties commodities. The slave is a possession, proved to be property. Yet a voice interrupts: says she. The tropes of Goldsmith’s performance are here: the anodyne documents of the exploitative power and the necromancy of anti-black violence—but McKittrick hears one voice speaking back within the archive: Says she was born free. What McKittrick identifies is the surprise of this utterance—the wonder that a piece of property could speak back. And this wonder, this listening deep into the archive of the slave trade, forms the basis of one of the most compelling recent poetry books of the archive. In 1781, the captain of the slave ship Zong had thrown almost 150 slaves overboard and sought to recover restitution from his insurers for his lost property. More than two hundred years later, Canadian-Caribbean poet M. NourbeSe Philip’s similarly titled poetry collection appropriates text from the only record of the massacre: a legal case called Gregson v. Gilbert, which sided against the slave-trading syndicate that operated Zong, but did not dispute that it was legal to kill one’s own slaves. Philip does not simply recapitulate the ledger book of triangular trade, but deforms it to resurrect the traumatic music, the moans, ululations and utterances smothered by the records of the law.

### PIC DA/Solvency Deficit – Transcription

#### Their transcription of our performance renders it into a dry text and formally reproduces the exhibitionist violence of lynching.

Ken Chen, Executive Director of the Asian American Writers' Workshop and the author of Juvenilia, selected by Louise Gluck for the Yale Series of Younger Poets, 11 June 2015

“Authenticity Obsession, or Conceptualism as Minstrel Show,” The Margins, <http://aaww.org/authenticity-obsession/> (Accessed 8/10/16)

In Goldsmith’s performance, Michael Brown was not a person, not a body, not a boy who was murdered for no reason. He was a transaction. Goldsmith saw a transcription of Michael Brown’s body being dismembered as simply another “dry text,” just another document undifferentiated from any other document and ready to be “massaged” into literature. He wrote, “I did not editorialize; I simply read it without commentary or additional editorializing,” and yet he edited the report to end with a description of Michael Brown’s “unremarkable” genitalia—a classic obsession of the white overseer. In America, minstrel shows featured the common trope of black castration—as did another quintessentially American social occasion, the lynching. While Goldsmith obviously did not lynch anyone, he unknowingly mimicked the narrative structure of the lynching by ending a half-hour long reading on the state inspection of Brown’s genitalia, despite it having little relevance to Brown’s murder. This took intention. The line was not prominent in the original report; it’s mentioned in a list of unremarkable organs on page ten of sixteen. Goldsmith is not the first white male poet to pen a phallocentric Ferguson poem. The Pulitzer Prize finalist Frederick Seidel’s “The Ballad of Ferguson, Missouri”—published in The Paris Review—starts: “A man unzipping his fly is vulnerable to attack. / Then the zipper got stuck.” But Goldsmith’s autopsy poem captures Conceptual Poetry’s bipolar relation to the body, at once repressing its existence while simultaneously exhibiting it in its most private aspects, death and sex.

### A2 Coalitions DA (1/2)

#### The aff disidentifies with the established racial hierarchy—whiteness must be displaced as the mediator of all minoritarian identity.

Andrew Wei Ling (A.W.) William Lee, PhD Cultural Studies, Queens University, September 2015

“Performing ManChyna: Unmapping Promissory Exaltation, Multicultural Eugenics, and the New Whiteness (Or, “Call Me Dr. ManChyna”)” Thesis, <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/1974/13741/1/Lee_Andrew_W_201509_PhD.pdf> (Accessed 8/11/16)

The kernel of eugenic logic is exaggerated and disidentified with in “Tiger Mom” (2012). The last verse of “Tiger Mom” relishes in the bivalence of genetic purity and multicultural hybridity implicit in the codes of interracial improvement, found in Minaj and Chua’s disidentificatory celebrations of capitalist excellence and multicultural assimilation. I’m takin this shit to the Tyra Banksy I’m the Top Model minority My vogue is the shit. all 10s. no Bs you can call me fucking Hermione. I'm a Pure blood. Mudblood. inbreed Singapore. Sino. I'm all chinese. got no black in me. i'm talking bout genes but #realtalk. i want some black in me. My celebration of Sino-purity articulates an indistinct distinction between pure breeds and inbreeds (how are they so different, anyway?) by transiting through the fantasy world of Harry Potter. 728 Rowling, in her universe, uses a stratification of witches and wizards as an allegorical indictment of class inequality in Britain; magical characters are informally categorized as ‘pure bloods’ (unbroken magical lineage), ‘half-bloods’ (of mixed magical and non-magical heritage), and the most derogatory ‘mudblood’ (magical character born to non-magical parents). As one character explains of the latter, “It’s a disgusting thing to call someone. Dirty blood, see. Common blood. It’s ridiculous.” 729 As Skyler Hijazi points out, “[r]acial tensions [in Harry Potter] appear instead as (dis)placed onto the question of blood purity, and a discourse of blood purity becomes the regulatory grammar around which both the spaces and the relationships in the wizarding world are organized.”730 ManChyna’s verse skips around such connotations of genetic purity and dirty blood, rendering indistinct these distinctions, and returning Rowling’s trope of consanguinity directly to the coordinates of race. In addition to blurring these imaginary hierarchies, I disidentify with the established racial taxonomy. Queerly, I celebrate the sexual mixis (“#realtalk, I want some black in me”), which usually informs anti-Black cultural anxieties over miscegenation and white degeneration in an Anglo-Saxon imagination. Additionally, a performative aspect to my lyrical misdirection exists. ‘Genes’ also refers to the black ‘jeans’ that I often usually wear on stage, which I sensually touch while, “I’m talkin bout genes.” My cross-racial desire for interracial anal penetration also effectively displaces whiteness from the equation in my yearning for Black material (genetic/phallic) that I lack, being “all Chinese.” I am of course activating malicious registers of masculinity within ideological stereotypes of masculinity that imagine Black masculinity as hypersexual and Asian masculinity as psychosexually castrated. 731 Usually, such polarization works to the advantage of white supremacy by normalizing, and rendering invisible, white masculinity in its desire for a ‘bestial Black phallus’ or the ‘castrated and feminized Asian anus.’ By eliding whiteness and recircuiting its desire for racial others altogether, however, I am interested in the potential for cross-racial strength set in opposition to whiteness.

### A2 Coalitions DA (2/2)

#### Their case turn reauthorizes the black-white binary by supposing anti-blackness cannot exist in beyond the domestic context.

Shannon Steen, associate professor in the Department of Theater, Dance and Performance Studies at UC Berkeley, where she also serves as affiliated faculty for the Program in American Studies, 2010

“How Uncle Tom’s Cabin Killed the King of Siam,” Racial Geometries of the Black Atlantic, Asian Pacific and American Theatre, pp. 5-6

To this point, the primary conception of race used by scholars is of a process through which certain groups are either equated with or excluded from national citizenship.7 The oppositional logic of race in this conception has had the unfortunate effect of producing a binary model of the category, and has perniciously limited our understanding of racial formation to models of black and white, despite clear historical evidence from cultural and political arenas that suggests a more multiform model of racial dynamics. The race/nation formula problematically implies that race is somehow determined by the nation independently of its international context, as though racial meanings and identities were determined solely through a matrix of domestic political and economic tensions. In reframing racialized performances within their international dimensions, we can more easily dismantle binary conceptions of race that prevent our ability to wrestle with the racial contours of American culture imagined in works such as The King and I. That musical, like the other performances under scrutiny in this book, posited a different shape through which race was conceived

### A2 ‘Elite Backlash’

#### We don’t prescribe public disidentification in all cases for all minoritarian subjects—we only argue that our performance is good in the context of this relatively safe educational space.

Andrew Wei Ling (A.W.) William Lee, PhD Cultural Studies, Queens University, September 2015

“Performing ManChyna: Unmapping Promissory Exaltation, Multicultural Eugenics, and the New Whiteness (Or, “Call Me Dr. ManChyna”)” Thesis, <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/1974/13741/1/Lee_Andrew_W_201509_PhD.pdf> (Accessed 8/11/16)

ManChyna intermingles implicit and explicit critiques of majority culture and I make sense of this in different spaces, at different times speaking more or less opaquely in spaces of planning, performance, and analysis. I first look at performance, the main locus of attention in my project. As Muñoz asserts about the performance of disidentification, it “is not always an adequate strategy of resistance or survival for all minority subjects. At times, resistance needs to be pronounced and direct; on other occasions, queers of color and other minority subjects need to follow a conformist path if they hope to survive a hostile public sphere”245 (original emphasis). Muñoz suggests that direct and clear denouncements of majority culture and conformation, or assimilation, into it are at times necessary. For the minoritarian, however, clearly and directly implicating oneself in public denouncements of majority potentially courts danger within systems in which the promise of one’s mobility is only conditional and limited. Muñoz is acutely aware of the dangers of phobic publics, sensitizing his ability to hear and see disidentification in performances where and when others may not. His reading of disidentificatory humour as a dialectic resolution of identification and counteridentification renders intelligible the safer space of kitschy laughter that disidentification can create for minoritarians. In my public performance of non-localizable humour (as Heems asked, “DO I CALL THIS GAY CHINESE CANADIAN RAP?”), I share in the “deep pleasure” that Muñoz experiences when bearing witness to such hidden, “swishy” critique and “ in ‘getting’ the fantastic bitchiness” of minoritarian quips. 246 But the cogent space of shared pleasure, where the impulse of implicit critique bubbles up into an explicit minoritarian consciousness, happens for ManChyna privately off-stage.

### A2 ‘Performative Contradiction”

#### Their demand that minoritarian subjects prove the reality and coherence of their experiences promotes the liberal fiction of unity in suffering and discounts intangible violence.

Andrew Wei Ling (A.W.) William Lee, PhD Cultural Studies, Queens University, September 2015

“Performing ManChyna: Unmapping Promissory Exaltation, Multicultural Eugenics, and the New Whiteness (Or, “Call Me Dr. ManChyna”)” Thesis, <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/1974/13741/1/Lee_Andrew_W_201509_PhD.pdf> (Accessed 8/11/16)

Some minoritarians bravely engage in exercises of refusal, regardless of the consequences. Others tread more cautiously. Careful reading practices are extremely useful in deconstructing a wide range of texts, productively sketching the dynamics and outlines of power. But for some minoritarians, to challenge phobic conditions of mobility in public, and to the wrong listeners, can jeopardize one’s survival. Worse still, the burden of proof falls on the individual minoritarian, to prove not only that their experiences are real, but also that they are without contradiction. In the fictions of liberal welfare, majoritarian understandings of injustice demand a unity of our suffering. This task of proving the existence of something intangible (a feeling about something real but not legislated, like Anzaldúa’s fiction) is rendered all the more difficult within exercises of power that seek to incorporate our narratives to shore up their own legitimacy and invisibility. This requires equally evasive tactics of individual survival, disidentification, which may also appear contradictory.

### A2 ‘Your History Wrong’

#### Their historical indicts miss the boat and fetishize authenticity in a way that privileges a dominant Eurocentric narrative.

Ken Chen, Executive Director of the Asian American Writers' Workshop and the author of Juvenilia, selected by Louise Gluck for the Yale Series of Younger Poets, 11 June 2015

“Authenticity Obsession, or Conceptualism as Minstrel Show,” The Margins, <http://aaww.org/authenticity-obsession/> (Accessed 8/10/16)

At one fair, the Khedive of Egypt was invited and asked to occupy a simulated palace, one exhibited to Londoners as though in a Natural History Museum. In the Opium Wars of China, where the British and the French sacked the Emperor’s Summer Palace, her Majesty’s soldiers stole what they believed to be the skull of Confucius, which later ended up for sale at Christie’s. In Saint Louis, just two years after the United States killed almost a quarter of a million people in the Philippines, the 1904 World’s Fair showcased indigenous Filipinos as a “living exhibit”—a project written about most recently by the poet Aimee Suzara in her book Souvenir. As Timothy Mitchell writes, many Nineteenth Century writers—Melville, Nerval, Gautier, Flaubert, Bentham, Edward Lane—wanted the bustling streets of the Middle East to conform to what they saw at the World’s Fairs—that is, a commodified diorama. These writers sought to cleave themselves from what they saw as the squalid Arab Street (to use a phrase that still has purchase today), all the better to imbibe its signifiers and incorporate it into one’s work. In Giza, servants carried Europeans on litters to the ruined vertices of the Great Pyramid, where their gaze could extend panoptically and behold all that was before them. Back in the city, the Europeanized Turkish elite began to wear sunglasses—this was the fashion of surveillance. Many of these writers found themselves searching for an authentic East, but found the actual east too impure to match the one they dreamed. Nerval wrote to Gautier that the true and “authentic” Cairo was not in Egypt, but in the operas and cafes of Paris. It was not the Egypt of actuality, but the abstract Orient fantasized by the Western mind, that was real. And in the South Asian subcontinent, the learned orientalists essentially invented the traditions of Indian religion and philosophy, having found the actual lived rituals and practices of contemporary Indians too base and primitive to match the more perfect India they imagined. As the writer and artist Youmna Chlala has written in a poem, “Authenticity died with colonialism”—that is, authenticity did not predate colonialism, the remnant of a pristine pre-colonial Eden, but was created by the curatorial eye of those who came to own the world.

### A2 ‘Performance is Commodified’ (1/2)

#### Non-unique—blackness is always already commodified so there’s only a risk that our survival pedagogy produces resources to navigate capitalist cultural production.

Andrew Wei Ling (A.W.) William Lee, PhD Cultural Studies, Queens University, September 2015

“Performing ManChyna: Unmapping Promissory Exaltation, Multicultural Eugenics, and the New Whiteness (Or, “Call Me Dr. ManChyna”)” Thesis, <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/1974/13741/1/Lee_Andrew_W_201509_PhD.pdf> (Accessed 8/11/16)

But I wonder to what degree K’naan’s celebrated origin story, which the music industry and audiences value above much else, is tied to the Blackness he embodies. I defend K’Naan’s cultivated narrative – not the narrative, per se, but rather the cultivation of it. “Wavin Flag’s” original 2009 lyrics included a verse that narrates a cutting, anti-war indictment of colonial powers: So many wars, settlin' scores, bringing us promises, leaving us poor, I heard them say, love is the way love is the answer, that's what they say But look how they treat us, make us believers we fight their battles, then they deceive us try to control us, they couldn't hold us 'cause we just move forward like Buffalo soldiers All earlier references to war and poverty are stripped from the later, more popular remixes of the song (measured by chart status, industry awards, international reach, and corporate tie-ins). Bond et al describe this as a, “tragic commercialization and depoliticization” of K’naan’s work.669 While true, Bond’s critique undervalues the material rewards for K’naan who successfully navigates a capitalist mode of cultural production. I am not defending the dubious ethics of individualist pursuits of capital. I am, however, interested in the notion that K’naan’s strategy of material survival/success is inherently ‘tragic.’ Such aspersion assumes the original, more critical variation of K’naan’s work is more politically profound than the later version. Bond’s critique suggests that the labour involved in blunting some of Wavin Flag’s more poignant lines diminishes the realness of it and, by extension, K’naan. Within a western discursive field limiting the range of possible ontologies for Black bodies (especially in hip-hop), K’naan shifts his public image from critic to symbol of aspiration. Such a shift, in my view, is not one of kind but rather degree. In both cases, K’naan does not represent a threat to the west’s infantilizing relationship with Africa or Black bodies that serve as synecdoche for the ‘dark continent.’ In the first narrative, as a critic, K’naan is a survivor of civil war, rightfully angry at the destitution and despair European colonization wrought on Africa. Such criticism has little effect on liberal white Canadians who can neatly compartmentalize it as “European” and “in the past.” In the second, as a symbol, K’naan becomes the Coke-drinking version of a football-wunderkind Popeye, who represents hope and aspiration, and a (statistically unlikely) route out of poverty. In both cases, the rapper remains an embodied conduit for ‘poor Africa.’ Another Canadian rapper, k-os, initiated a public beef with K’naan because of the latter’s cultivated use of African imagery, made for the acceptable consumption by western audiences. In his song B-Boy Stance (2004), k-os disses K’naan for filming an earlier music video in Kenya, transparently instrumentalizing his out-of-Africa narrative, which remains tastefully consumable for white folks: “they took cameras to Africa for pictures to rhyme/ Over: Oh, yes, the great pretenders […] Religious entertainers who want to be life savers.”670 K’naan’s performance of his African authenticity for his audiences is not lost on his contemporaries. Such internal disputes about representation point to an important implication that white exaltation of individual multicultural spokespeople has for antiracist coalitions. In K’naan’s defense, I read his strategy for minoritarian success as a cynical disidentification with the limited tropes made available to him within a culture of liberal multiculturalism. In both versions of K’naan’s public presentation of self, he reiterates the ‘poor Africa’ narrative, first with rage and second as embodied aspiration. In the second, however, his work is more commercially successful. Why must the burden of representation fall on one man’s shoulders when the liberal listening public will either dismiss it or gobble it up when convenient? The ever-shifting nature of the new whiteness is resilient enough to take direct criticism and even sometimes incorporate it along with the minoritarians who open themselves up, their life stories and bodies, for public consumption. However, it is the promise of success within this hungry system of injustice, which K’Naan thoroughly supplicates to, that may triangulate the outline of the white beast.

### A2 ‘Performance is Commodified’ (2/2)

#### Survival outweighs--building affective networks through critique can push back against the inclusionary fictions of whiteness and globalization.

Andrew Wei Ling (A.W.) William Lee, PhD Cultural Studies, Queens University, September 2015

“Performing ManChyna: Unmapping Promissory Exaltation, Multicultural Eugenics, and the New Whiteness (Or, “Call Me Dr. ManChyna”)” Thesis, <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/1974/13741/1/Lee_Andrew_W_201509_PhD.pdf> (Accessed 8/11/16)

In spite of the grim theoretical picture ManChyna animates, he is also my methodological

tool of autocritical humour that strategically yields to but refuses the cultural logics of the new

whiteness. By thinking with the pleasures of performance, I offer minoritarians an apparatus of

critical laughter and political pleasures, within and against the demands of majoritarian culture.

In the face of inclusionary statist nationalism that attempts to enfranchise minoritarian

subjectivity, we can still find deep swishy pleasures in each other’s enunciations. Even though

the new, kinder and gentler, whiteness still wants to consume and discipline our bodies, our

performances can and do enable survival within and mockery of its inclusionary fictions.

### A2 ‘Slave Focus Naturalizes Other Suffering’

#### To speak of slavery as a form of gratuitous unfreedom is not to deny the status of other unfreedoms.

Annuska Derks, Assistant Professor in the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Zurich and Chair of the Department’s Focus Area on Social Transformation Processes, 2010

“Bonded Labour in Southeast Asia: Introduction,” Asian Journal of Social Science, Vol. 38, No. 6, pp. 839-852, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23654858> (Accessed 8/13/16)

Why focus on 'bonded labour' when it is actually more fashionable to speak of 'modern' or 'new' forms of 'slavery,' 'trafficking' and 'forced labour'? Although referring to different practices and to different discourses originat ing in different times and in different efforts to combat these practices, the terms are often used interchangeably. To illustrate, the ILO (2005; 2009)2 considers 'slavery' and 'bonded labour' as a form of 'forced labour' and 'trafficking' as a practice leading to 'forced labour'; the U.S. State Department (2005; 2009)3 calls 'the enslavement of people for purposes of labour exploi tation' or 'forced labour,' as well as 'bonded labour,' a form of 'trafficking'; and Bales (1999) sees 'chattel slavery,' 'debt bondage' and 'contract slavery' in modern labour relations as forms of 'new slavery.' To avoid confusion and to bring some nuance in the analysis of these phenomena, it is, thus, necessary to be clear about what one is talking about when using a concept like 'bonded' labour. Probably the easiest way to start doing so is by looking at what is generally considered to be its opposite: 'unbound' or 'free' labour. For Marx (1974[ 1857— 1858]:406), 'free labourers' are 'free' in two respects, namely free from means of production (i.e., they are property-less) and free from old patron-client and bondage obligations. As a result, 'free labourers' are forced to sell their labour power (Arbeitskraft) as if it were a commodity in order to survive. Although 'free' labourers do not belong to one who buys their labour power and are thus 'able to enter and withdraw from the labour market at will' (Brass, 1999:10), they are dependent on the whole class of buyers (employers) for their subsistence. Marx ( 1975[ 1885]) puts this in contrast to slave labour: Slaves have been sold, together with their labour power, to one. This does not mean that all non-slave labour should be considered 'free' (Engerman, 1999:2). Indeed, as Brass (1999:11) states, to view all forms of labour relationships that do not entail ownership of persons as 'free' would be to ignore additional forms of'unfreedom.'5 These forms of'unfreedom' occur in situations where labour power is prevented from entering or withdrawing from the labour-market under any circumstances, in person, or only with the consent or at the convenience of someone else than its owner {ibid.). These are, according to Brass, exactly the kinds of 'unfreedom' which arise in the case of bonded labour.

### Perm – General

#### Survival pedagogy does not exclude their criticism but is flexible and therefore compatible with a multiplicity of political/theoretical commitments.

Andrew Wei Ling (A.W.) William Lee, PhD Cultural Studies, Queens University, September 2015

“Performing ManChyna: Unmapping Promissory Exaltation, Multicultural Eugenics, and the New Whiteness (Or, “Call Me Dr. ManChyna”)” Thesis, <http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/1974/13741/1/Lee_Andrew_W_201509_PhD.pdf> (Accessed 8/11/16)

The texts I collect in the following chapters revel in shared moments of autocritical humour, revealing glimpses of a shared minoritarian consciousness that strategically and selfconsciously form and break ties with majoritarian culture. Returning to Chela Sandoval’s differential mode of oppositional consciousness, she explains that it requires flexible politics for survival within phobic spheres. Such consciousness depends on, according to Sandoval, the ability to read the current situation of power and of self-consciously choosing and adopting the ideological form best suited to push against its configuration, a survival skill well known to oppressed peoples. Differential consciousness requires grace, flexibility, and strength: enough strength to confidently commit a welldefined structure of identity for one hour, day, week, month, year; enough flexibility to self-consciously transform that identity according to the requisites of another oppositional ideological tactic if readings of power’s formation require it…to self-consciously break and reform ties to ideology, activities which are imperative for the psychological and political practices that permit the achievement of coalition across differences.262 Performing disidentification requires the differential mode of oppositional consciousness, to commit temporarily to a well-defined structure of identity, within and against ideologies, for however long one’s performance lasts. ManChyna performances last well beyond the confines of a single set or music video; my disassimilation precedes and outlasts such ephemera. Such consciousness also allows, in Sandoval’s words, “Self-conscious agents of differential consciousness [to] recognize one another as allies, country-women and men of the same psychic terrain.” 263 But differential consciousness and disassimilation are, at their cores, tactics for survival; and sometimes survival within phobic ideologies requires cautious, temporary silence. Such silence, however, does not mean an inability to recognize a shared consciousness of opposition. In recognizing the covert moments of autocritical humour, we can map our shared consciousness. Recognition and temporary epistemic bridges can be made, even between explicitly political works and less obvious ones.

### A2 China Good – Human Rights

#### Reparations are necessary to correct power imbalances that lead to massive human rights violations on the African continent.

Ayodeji Bayo Ogunrotifa, Master’s degree in African Studies with International Politics at the school of Social and Political Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 2011

“The Chinese in Africa: New Colonialism is not a New Deal” Pula: Botswana Journal of African Studies, Vol. 25, No. 2, https://www.academia.edu/2774733/The\_Chinese\_in\_Africa\_New\_Colonialism\_is\_not\_a\_New\_Deal (Accessed 8/1/16)

It is clear that China need not be a colonialist power especially in the age of globalisation¶ in order for it to exercise hegemonic domination over other areas. However, China’s¶ economic and political interventions in key sectors of African economies suggest that¶ China may also be susceptible to the same criticisms previously levelled against the¶ overtly neo-colonial domination of Africa by the West. Scholarly arguments that the¶ Chinese ‘scramble’ for Africa is not dissimilar to neo-colonialism have the following¶ merits: first, there is abundant empirical evidence of China’s support for authoritarian¶ regimes (Taylor, 2006). Overt support for regimes with questionable democratic¶ credentials such as Robert Mugabe’s Zimbabwe and Omar Al-Bashir’s Sudan makes¶ China especially guilty of the same tendencies by neo-colonial forces of domination to¶ ~~turn a blind eye~~ ignores to tyranny whenever the dominant power derives economic benefits e.g.¶ France in Gabon and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Griffins 2007; Reeds¶ 1987:283-4); Chinese support for tyrannical regimes in Africa is comparable to Britain’s¶ land monopoly in Zimbabwe and Southern Africa (Palmer, 1977; Chafer 2002:343); and¶ US complicity in the overthrow and assassination of Patrice Lumumba in the then Zaire¶ (present day DRC), as well as overt support for ‘corrupt allies’ in Chad, the Democratic¶ Republic of Congo and Equatorial Guinea (Collins 1992; De Witte 2001; Collins and¶ Askin 1993). The major criticism levelled against China is that its quest for resources,¶ energy and potential markets makes ~~her~~ it vulnerable to the criticism that ~~she~~ it supports¶ African dictatorships, hindering economic development, and exacerbating existing¶ conflicts and human rights abuses in troubled countries such as the Sudan and Zimbabwe.¶ Similarly, Amnesty International has argued that “China is having an adverse effect on¶ human rights in other countries because by dealing with repressive regimes by putting its¶ economic and trading interests ahead of concern for human rights, thus allows these¶ regimes to be provided with resources that they would not otherwise get so easily”¶ (Amnesty International, 2006:1). For instance, in Nigeria huge concerns over human¶ rights issues and underdevelopment in the Niger Delta have been overlooked by Chinese¶ policy makers as they seek to access Nigeria’s oil. To be fair, “Western actors could be¶ accused of the same, but there are serious problems in Sino-Nigerian relations, centred on¶ the oil industry, that undermine efforts by local activists to improve human rights in¶ Nigeria” (Taylor, 2006:77). All this suggests that China, like the West, is supporting¶ odious regimes in order to have unfettered access to natural resources.

### A2 China Good – Econ Development

#### China’s economic engagement in Africa destroys economic self-determination, stripping the land of all its natural resources and domestic industries.

Ousman Murzik Kobo, associate professor of history at The Ohio State University, MA in IR, PhD in African History, May 2013

“A New World Order?” Africa and China, vol. 6, issue 8, <http://origins.osu.edu/article/new-world-order-africa-and-china> (Accessed 8/13/16)

The growing Chinese economic presence in Africa has created concern over how China operates on the continent. Many Africans accuse Chinese companies of underbidding local firms and not hiring Africans. Chinese infrastructure deals often stipulate that up to 70 percent of the labor must be Chinese. Even non-construction projects usually involve some material and technical assistance from China.¶ It is worth noting in this context that 70 percent of Africa’s exports to China come from the oil exporting countries: Angola, the Republic of Congo, South Africa, and Sudan. Another 15 percent of Africa’s exports to China consist of raw materials (timber and minerals). China’s exports to Africa are mostly manufactured goods (cell phones and computers, automobile parts, machinery, textiles).¶ Many Western critics and African academics argue that China’s exports are killing Africa’s industrialization programs, since Africa’s industrial goods cannot compete with Chinese goods either in China or in Africa.¶ For example, low-cost Chinese textiles and electronics attract African consumers but these low-cost imports compete with local industries. This is classic “dumping” that often collapses local infant industries and causes massive unemployment.¶ The South African textile sector, for instance, is believed to have laid off 50 percent of its labor force between 1996 and 2006 as a result of its inability to compete with Chinese imports.

### A2 China Good – Genocide

#### Chinese imperialism fuels anti-black genocides in Africa—empirically proven in the case of Sudan

Chuka Enuka, lecturer in International Relatons at Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria, Summer 2011

“China's military presence in Africa: Implications for Africa's wobbling peace,” Journal of Political Studies vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 15-30, <http://www.japss.org/upload/5.%20chinamilitary.pdf> (Accessed 8/13/16)

Darfur reveals the hollowness of the post-Holocaust promise of "never again". In Darfur for nearly three years, the Sudanese government together with militia proxies committed widespread, systematic violence against the region's black African population. The violence was massive and often executed in broad daylight. Arab perpetrators displaced more than two million black Africans and claimed the lives of more than two hundred thousand civilians (Scott, 2006). But what has been the role of China in this drama? China has played a direct role in selling arms to Sudan and in developing its weapons industry. Chinese arms sales rose twenty five fold within the Sudan's war years (SaveDarfur, 2007). Much of this occurred in spite of United Nations Security Council's arm embargo. In spite of China's denials, evidence points to the contrary. Shell casings collected from various sites in Darfur suggest that most of the ammunition used by parties to the conflict in Darfur is manufactured in China (United Nations, 2006). China has a huge investment in Sudanese economy, the oil sector in particular (Brautigam, 2009, Dijk, 2009, Rotberg, 2008). China is the leading developer of Sudanese oil industry and major purchaser of Sudanese oil. Though Beijing regularly justify China's economic involvement in Sudan as being key to that country's development, but it is obvious that in the context of rising imperative for peace and multilateral efforts to halt the blood-thirsty Khartoum regime, the concentration of wealth and weapons among the Sudan's ruling elite by Chinese investment and arms deals, unconditionally feeds conflict. As the Sudanese erstwhile Deputy Central Bank governor, Elijah Aleng said, "When you exploit oil resources and nothing goes to the population, then you are financing the war against them with resources and that is negative" (Sunday Tribune, 2007). With the help of its Muslim Janjaweed militia groups and the blessing of Bashir, the Sudanese Air Force has used Chinese-given weapons against defenseless villagers in Darfur (Scott, 2006, Puska, 2007). There have been also persistent claims by independent aid groups that Sudanese government troops and rebels have used Chinese oil company airstrips to conduct bombing raids on villages and hospitals. The pilots of the Fatan A5 jets used in massacres against unarmed civilians in Darfur, were trained by China (Bonincontro, 2010).

### A2 US/West = Root Cause

#### Chinese policy in Africa is clearly distinct from Western development programs but is equally aimed at subordinating “the dark continent”

Ian Taylor, Professor in International Relations and African Politics at St Andrews and also Chair Professor in the School of International Studies, September 15, 2014

“Unpacking China’s Resource Diplomacy in Africa” Africa Horn Now, <http://africahornnow.com/2014/09/15/news-1/> (Accessed 8/13/16)

But most observers view such transfers as profoundly destabilizing, particularly as African governments and armies are rarely in full control of the weapons they receive, as well as the more general point that providing arms to oppressive regimes is inherently anti-developmental. For how long China can maintain its position predicated on “non-interference” is a crucial question, particularly as China becomes more and more integrated into the global order and when on the very same day as the Dutch government were suspending nearly $150 million in aid to Kenya because of longstanding concerns over corruption, China was busy securing an important oil exploration agreement with that same country. A telling illustration of the difference in approaches between the West and China vis-à-vis malgovernance on the continent. Currently, Beijing does not seem to realize that corruption and political instability sabotage the long-term possibilities of sustained Sino-African economic links and also help maintain the situation where Africa remains at the bottom of the global hierarchy, plagued by dictators and human rights abusers. Whilst a certain type of African leader is deeply appreciative of such a friend, it is doubtful that the average African shares the same sentiments. Problematically, as a Kenyan report put it: China has an Africa policy. Africa doesn’t have a China policy, only a Beijing-controlled forum in which Mandarins figure out which country to take a sweet shot at. China talks of mutual trust…The danger is that China will politely rip off Africa, just as the West did (The Nation, Nairobi, June 12, 2006).

# Neg Afro-Orientalism

### 1NC Etymology Wrong

#### Their etymological analysis misrepresents the historical record—they cannot give a voice to the k’un-lu-nu if they cannot recognize who they were.

Vijay Prashad, director and associate professor of international studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, pp. 8-9

Migration of African peoples, unfortunately, has come to be associated firmly with the enslavement of human beings. The Atlantic brutalities from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century marked all Africans as chattel slaves, despite the rich history of Africa outside modern slavery and notwithstanding the complex relationship of Indian Ocean peoples with ‘‘slavery.’’ Scholarly work on the Zheng He expedition reveals that for some time the Chinese nobility acquired the services of a few Africans, this alongside the services of enslaved peoples from across the Asian periphery (from Korea to Malaysia). In the s, one reads in Chinese texts of the ‘‘devil slaves’’ (gui-nu), ‘‘black servants’’ (hei-xiao-si), and ‘‘barbarian servants’’ (fan-xiao-si or fannu). While there is evidence of Africans among the enslaved population, most of the slaves seem to have been Malay and Chinese. The word black, for instance, should not be taken to mean those from Africa (or to be read entirely based on racist notions that follow from Atlantic racism).36 Ma Huan, from Zheng He’s expedition, described people from the perimeter of the Indian Ocean who did not match up to his standards of civilization in a vocabulary that agrees with that of the terms used above. Of the people of Bengal, he wrote that ‘‘all the people are black [or brown pear color, as one translation puts it], with but an occasional white person.’’ Of Meccans, we hear that the people ‘‘are stalwart and fine looking and their limbs and faces are of a very dark purple color.’’ Finally, he says of the inhabitants of the island that is now Sri Lanka, ‘‘they have naked bodies, all without a stitch of clothing, like the bodies of brute beasts.’’ He calls Sri Lanka the ‘‘country of the naked people’’ (or ‘‘naked body country’’) and the people are said to live in caves.37 I tend to believe that this is a descriptive text written by an elite man who saw people whom he did not regard as social equals. There is little hint that he uses terms like black in anything more than a descriptive sense, and his comparison of the people of Ceylon to ‘‘brute beasts’’ should not be read as a denigration of their humanity, but as a comment on their cultural mores as compared to the Imperial Court.38

### 2NC Etymology Wrong

#### Problematizing terms like Kunlun cannot prove mass enslavement of Africans in China.

Adams Bodomo, Professor of African Studies @ the University of Vienna, December 2013

“The Blacks of Premodern China (Review)” African Studies Review, Volume 56, Number 3, December 2013, pp. 244-246, <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/528530> (Accessed 7/17/16)

With respect to highlighting the historical fact that there were black slaves in premodern China, the book is groundbreaking. Throughout the book’s three chapters (“From History’s Mints,” “The Slaves of Guangzhou,” and “To the End of the Western Sea”) the author sifts various pieces of historical evidence and queries and problematizes key words such as Kunlun and heiren. These terms, the author claims, point to the fact that the premodern Chinese had interactions with blacks and that there were asymmetrical relations between the two populations, suggesting that many of these black people served the Chinese as slaves. But does the fact that one can ascertain the presence of blacks in premodern China indicate that these blacks were African? Whereas the book is very successful in signaling the presence of blacks, it does not appear, in my opinion, to have achieved the same amount of success in showing that any of them were of African origin, let alone that the Chinese of that era owned African slaves. For example, as the author himself acknowledges frequently, the Chinese of that era and even to this day often refer to ethnicities in South and Southeast Asia such as the Malays as “blacks.”

#### Their argument is based on analysis of a few cherry-picked texts—Chinese classics do not affirm racial hierarchy.

Vijay Prashad, director and associate professor of international studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, pp. 9-10

In China we see a similar development. In the third century b.c.e., Chinese classics ascribed colors to the different tribes that they deemed to be barbarians, the red or black Dai, the white or black Man, and the black Lang. The Chinese classics understood that those who did not enjoy the fruits of civilization lived in recoupable banishment. There was, however, no sense that these people are in a race-based, and therefore permanent, hierarchy. The Chinese notion of cultural difference is captured in the idea of yongxiabianyi, ‘‘to use the Chinese [Xia] ways to transform those who are different [the Yi people, in this phrase]’’: assimilation, or the end to the hierarchy, is possible. Historian Frank Diko¨tter rightly argues that the coloration of people in the Chinese texts was ‘‘symbolic. They indicated either the dominant tint of the minorities’ clothes or the five directions of the compass: white for the West, black for the North, red for the East, blue-green for the South. Yellow represented the centre.’’53

### 1NC Political Economy Wrong

#### The enslavement of Africans based on skin color was certainly not the economic foundation of the Chinese empire.

Vijay Prashad, director and associate professor of international studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, pp. 9-10

In China, as in most of the world, prisoners of war became the property of their captors and could be kept as the captors so desired. The Chinese, like the Arabs, Indians, Africans, and Europeans, enslaved their own, to enjoy the free labor slavery provided. Despite the evidence of enslavement, it is clear, however, that the premodern mode of production was not based on slave labor (as was the Atlantic economy in a later age) nor was the sort of slavery practiced based upon the dehumanization of one particular people. The slaveholder, by all indications, endowed the slave with humanity at the same time as the slave was rendered unfree. At its most benign, premodern slavery was a form of apprenticeship in which merchants and traders bought a slave, who was loyal to them, learnt their trade, entered their lineage group, and then was able to obtain manumission. Indeed, as Amitav Ghosh establishes in In an Antique Land, ‘‘Slavery was often used as a means of creating fictive ties of kinship between people who were otherwise unrelated.’’40 Finally, slavery was also a way by which military leaders constituted their armies and drew in loyal battalions whose ‘‘slave’’ status seems to have been fairly nominal (the slave dynasty in Egypt, 1260-1517 and that in the Delhi Sultanate, 1206-1290, are evidence of this).41 One has to pay heed to the distinctions between domestic servitude and plantation slavery, of the relationships forged between masters and slaves in the Indian Ocean as opposed to the chattel relationship in the Caribbean, in the U.S. South, and in Zanzibar from a later period.

### 2NC Political Economy Wrong

#### There is no historical evidence of a master-slave relation between premodern Chinese and Africans.

Adams Bodomo, Professor of African Studies @ the University of Vienna, December 2013

“The Blacks of Premodern China (Review)” African Studies Review, Volume 56, Number 3, December 2013, pp. 244-246, <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/528530> (Accessed 7/17/16)

The author’s third thesis, that the Chinese of premodern China owned African slaves, is supported by the proposition that since the Arabs of the era traded in African slaves, and since the Chinese traded with the Arabs, the Chinese could have bought African slaves from the Arabs. But again this thesis, arguably, is not proved sufficiently by the available historical evidence. In fact, the historical data in the book suggest an alternative thesis: that whereas Africa’s relations with Europe were mostly those of master and slave (i.e., the trans-Atlantic slave trade), Africa’s relations with China were altogether different. There was neither a trans-Indian nor a trans-Pacific slave trade involving the buying of Africans by the Chinese. As I have argued in my own book (Africans in China, Cambria Press, 2012), Africans and Chinese met for the first time in the fifteenth century, on equal footing for the most part, and Africans and Chinese never owned each other on any large scale or in any systematic manner. Several studies (e.g., by Lila Abu-Lughod, Richard Gould, and Louis Levathes) suggest that this first-time meeting between Africans and Chinese came about following the wreck of a ship captained by Admiral Zheng He, a Ming-era seafarer on the East Coast of Africa, with the Africans helping the Chinese to land on shore. There are no available records suggesting that Zheng He sent back slaves to China, even though he sent many African goods and acquisitions, including giraffes and African spices.

#### The aff reifies a totalizing conception of African history as a history of slavery.

Adams Bodomo, Professor of African Studies @ the University of Vienna, December 2013

“The Blacks of Premodern China (Review)” African Studies Review, Volume 56, Number 3, December 2013, pp. 244-246, <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/528530> (Accessed 7/17/16)

Unfortunately, readers of Wyatt’s book may be left with the impression that many groups of people in the world—from East to West—owned Africans as slaves in the past, even though Wyatt does not state this explicitly and may not have even intended to suggest this. Perhaps inadvertently, however, [End Page 245] the book bolsters a conceptualization of African history and of Africa’s historical connections with the rest of the world as a history of slavery, as we see in far too many African American studies and African history programs in North America. This tendency is a bit worrying, as is the over-emphasis on colonialism among European Africanists. The history of Africa’s contact with other races should not always be defined by master–slave relations.

### 1NC Aff=Presentism

#### They misread Chinese cultural history because they presuppose analogies between Western modernist categories of race and premodern symbolic and political economies—this is presentism par excellance.

Lynn Hunt, President of the American Historical Association, May 2002

“Against Presentism,” Perspectives on History, <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2002/against-presentism> (Accessed 7/17/16)

Who isn't, you say? Hardly any "ism" these days has much of a scholarly following. Yet presentism besets us in two different ways: (1) the tendency to interpret the past in presentist terms; and (2) the shift of general historical interest toward the contemporary period and away from the more distant past. Although the first propensity was implicit in Western historical writing from its beginnings, it took a more problematic turn when the notion of "the modern" began to take root in the 17th century. Over time, modernity became the standard of judgment against which most of the past, even the Western past, could be found wanting. The second trend, the shift of interest toward the contemporary period, clearly has a connection to the invention of modernity, but it did not follow as much in lockstep as might be expected. As late as the end of the 19th century, and in some places even after that, students in history expected to study mainly ancient history and to find therein exemplars for politics in the present. Ten or fifteen years ago, survey courses routinely stopped at World War II. French historians still refer to history in the 16th–18th centuries as histoire moderne; for them "contemporary history" began in 1789, and until recently, it stopped about the time of World War I, the rest of the 20th century being consigned to the province of journalism rather than historical scholarship. I believe that the 20th century should be part of historical scholarship and teaching, of course, but it should not crowd out everything else.

### 2NC Presentism Bad

#### Reject their scholarship—presentism appropriates Chinese history to confer legitimacy on contemporary research programs.

Hun Joon Kim, Assistant Professor in the Department of Politics and International Relations @ Korea University, spring 2016

“Will IR Theory with Chinese Characteristics be a Powerful Alternative?” Chinese Journal of International Politics, vol. 9, issue 1, pp. 59-79, <http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/9/1/59.full> (Accessed 7/17/16)

The relationship between history and theory has long been a core questions in IR.54 The tension between history and theory is ever present in IR theory, and the debate is ongoing.55 One of the key criticisms of using history or historical thinkers is that it constitutes presentism, which is ‘a tendency to write the history of the field in terms of its participation in an ancient or classic tradition of thought that often serves to confer legitimacy on a contemporary research program’.56 The critical problem of presentism is that history could be distorted to fit the theoretical assumptions or claims the author makes.57 Abundant historical resources in China could thus be used to construct new theories or modify existing ones. A closer examination of the use—and possible misuse—of history in the Chinese IR theory will provide an important case through which to explore one of IR’s perennial problems, i.e. the role of history in IR theory.

#### It’s not that such programs are unimportant—but presentism is counterproductive because it conditions violence toward historical difference.

Lynn Hunt, President of the American Historical Association, May 2002

“Against Presentism,” Perspectives on History, <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2002/against-presentism> (Accessed 7/17/16)

There is a certain irony in the presentism of our current historical understanding: it threatens to put us out of business as historians. If the undergraduates flock to 20th-century courses and even PhD students take degrees mostly in 20th-century topics, then history risks turning into a kind of general social studies subject (as it is in K–12). It becomes the short-term history of various kinds of identity politics defined by present concerns and might therefore be better approached via sociology, political science, or ethnic studies. I'm not arguing that identity politics have no place in historical study; women's history, African American history, Latino history, gay and lesbian history, and the like have all made fundamentally important contributions to our understanding of history. It is hard to imagine American history in this country without some element of national identity in it. And present-day concerns have helped revivify topics, such as imperialism, that needed reconsideration. But history should not just be the study of sameness, based on the search for our individual or collective roots of identity. It should also be about difference. World history, for example, should be significant not only because so many Americans have come from places other than European countries but also because as participants in the world we need to understand people who are hardly like us at all.

### 1NC Colonialism Turn

#### As an analytic category, K’un-lu homogenizes indigenous dark-skinned people of the south pacific and African persons—failing to acknowledge the particularities of indigenous experience occludes struggles for self-determination.

ANTONIO T. TIONGSON JR., assistant professor of American studies at the University of New Mexico, Fall 2015

“Afro-Asian Inquiry and the Problematics of Comparative Critique,” Critical Ethnic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 33-58, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.2.0033> (Accessed 7/17/16)

A third issue has to do with the way Afro-Asian inquiry invokes Indigeneity to accentuate the purported limits of the black-white binary and bolster its critique of the paradigm. Specifically, in what have become conventional exhortations against the black/white paradigm within the field, Native peoples are invoked as yet another group overlooked by the paradigm along with Asian Pacific Americans and Latin@s with the effect of collapsing Indigenous peoples with these other groups. Native peoples, in other words, are positioned as yet another “minority” group subsumed under the category of “people of color,” predicated on what Enakshi Dua has described in another context as a politics of commonality that serves to flatten substantive and incommensurable differences among colonized and racialized groups.81 In the case of Park and Park, their lack of acknowledgment of Native peoples evacuates Indigenous subjects of contemporaneity and occludes their ongoing struggles for self-determination.82

#### That itself is an act of colonialism.

ANTONIO T. TIONGSON JR., assistant professor of American studies at the University of New Mexico, Fall 2015

“Afro-Asian Inquiry and the Problematics of Comparative Critique,” Critical Ethnic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 33-58, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.2.0033> (Accessed 7/17/16)

As Indigenous studies scholars have endeavored to point out, however, Native peoples are more appropriately construed as a colonized group who are also members of sovereign nations. These scholars assert that the categorization of Native peoples as “ethnic minorities” is tantamount to a form of colonialism because of the way it obscures fundamental differences between Native peoples and people of color including their distinct relationship to the land. Winona Stevenson writes, “Given the current political climate surrounding Aboriginal self-government and land rights, the continued act of ‘naming’ us ‘ethnic’ can only be understood as colonialist.”8 For Stevenson, a viable comparative project needs to situate Native peoples in relation to other Native peoples around the globe rather than with non-Native people of color in order to avoid collapsing the overlapping yet distinct processes of racialization and colonization.

### 1NC Coalitions Turn

#### It is not the afterlife of premodern naming practices that constitute Blackness in relation to China, but a European colonial order that threatens the integrity of both—the aff only risks detracting from sustained coalitional resistance to white supremacy.

Andrew F. Jones, Professor and Louis B. Agassiz Chair in Chinese, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures @ Cal Berkeley, and Nikhil Pal Singh, Associate Professor of Social and Cultural Analysis and History at New York University, Spring 2003

“Guest Editors' Introduction,” Positions, Volume 11, Number 1, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/40649> (Accessed 7/14/16)

If area studies overlooks the ways in which the global circulation of European and U.S. racist imaginaries proved central to the construction and mediation of imperial national identities in both China and Japan, U.S.- style cultural pluralism underestimates the significance of transethnic and transnational solidarities of African and Asian peoples, as Daniel Widener demonstrates in his detailed “regional” history of Japanese and black migrants in interwar Los Angeles. Rejecting the conventional U.S. sociological wisdom that weighs the intranational fortunes of blacks and immigrants in terms of an abstract contrast between those bedeviled by “race” and those blessed with “ethnicity”—Widener instead shows how in response to different but common racial exclusions, blacks and Asians in California forged insurgent, if fragile, communities of meaning in a “dialectic of international questions and local communities.” As this and many other essays gathered here suggest, the African American province has been a uniquely powerful and privileged locale for the generation of planetary visions of transracial solidarity, one nurtured in part in the crucible of Black Pacific disseminations of African American popular culture in Asian markets, as well as by the impact of Asian cultural productions (and particularly cinema) on the African American imaginary. Vijay Prashad’s account of the anti-imperialist iconography of Bruce Lee (as refracted through the avowed Maoism of both the Black Panthers in the United States and the Naxalite insurgency on the Indian subcontinent) sketches a circuit of what might eventually be a more adequate genealogy of so-called Third Worldism as the form of cosmopolitical desire arrayed both within and against the twin pillars of the modern world system: Euro-American racialization and capitalist globalization.

### 2NC Aff Kills Coalitions

#### Construing Sino-African relations antagonistically props up white supremacy.

ANTONIO T. TIONGSON JR., assistant professor of American studies at the University of New Mexico, Fall 2015

“Afro-Asian Inquiry and the Problematics of Comparative Critique,” Critical Ethnic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 33-58, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.2.0033> (Accessed 7/17/16)

Afro-Asian inquiry seems to embody the potential and promise of comparative critique, performing a number of critical interventions. Specifically, this body of literature has mounted what appear to be powerful critiques against approaches wedded to a biracial framing, seemingly offering a more nuanced frame for making sense of complex racial dynamics that exceed the bounds of this kind of framing. Additionally, Afro-Asian inquiry’s centering of relations between groups of color serves to undermine the normative status of whiteness as the analytical referent for the study of race. At the same time, it brings to the fore a largely ignored or overlooked history of Afro-Asian encounters and exchanges that serves as a powerful counter to white supremacy predicated on pitting minoritized groups against one another. In doing so, Afro-Asian inquiry has wielded new ways of imagining relations between groups previously viewed as having mutually exclusive histories, making a compelling case that Afro-Asian relations cannot be construed in terms of a zero sum game or under the rubric of “racial conflict.”

#### Their historical account implies Chinese identity re: African slavery is analogous to whiteness, fostering oppositional politics.

Edward J. W. Park, director of the Asian Pacific American Studies Program at Loyola Marymount University, and John S. W. Park, doctoral candidate in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program at Boalt Hall at the University of California, Berkeley, October 1999

“A New American Dilemma?: Asian Americans and Latinos in Race Theorizing,” Volume 2, Number 3, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/14565> (Accessed 7/17/16)

In another, similar version of race theory, Stephen Steinberg suggests that Asian Americans and Latinos are like Whites chiefly because of their role in the economy and their impact upon African Americans. 9 Here, Steinberg argues that the presence of Asian Americans and Latinos undermines the chances that African Americans will integrate more fully into the mainstream economy, because the former groups are used by white capital to undercut both the employment base and the wage structure for African Americans in the urban economy. In this understanding of race in America, immigrant workers are portrayed as having taken over—or as “populat[ing] almost entirely”—the core sectors of the urban economy, and they are said to displace African American workers, and not simply by taking the “super-exploited jobs” that native workers do not want. 10 Asian Americans also help white capitalists uphold the official myth of the American dream, and both Asian Americans and Latinos frustrate attempts at a more radical critique of a racist capitalist system. 11 Because the theory conceives the structural integration of Asian Americans and Latinos in this way, the Los Angeles civil unrest of 1992 can be taken as a product of the economic exclusion of African Americans, due in large measure to the influx of Asian and Latino immigrants. 12 To underscore the suggestion that Asian Americans and Latinos contribute to the racial oppression of African Americans, commentators like Steinberg call for the “tear[ing] down of racist barriers” against African Americans in Asian American and Latino ethnic economies. 13 Moreover, to protect African Americans, proponents of this view defend efforts to curtail immigration, because the current immigration policy hurts African Americans the most: “to state the matter bluntly, immigration policy amounts to a form of disinvestment in native workers.” 14

### 2NC Eurocentrism=Root Cause (1/2)

#### Race is a European construct which was then exported elsewhere—challenging that legacy should be prioritized.

Vijay Prashad, director and associate professor of international studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, pp. 12

Frank Snowden, therefore, is quite correct in his assessment that antiblack notions perhaps would not have gained credence ‘‘in the modern world in the absence of such phenomenon as Negro slavery and colonialism.’’75 Indeed, most scholars agree that the idea of race can be traced to the late 1600s and the conventional marker is Franc¸ois Bernier’s Nouvelle division de la terre par les diff´erents espe`ces ou races qui’l habitent(1684).76 Bernier, a French traveler, spent more than a decade (1656–68) in India and western Asia, about which he wrote a famous travel book. His travelogue was one of many such, a panoply of books about places that Europe did not know before in any detail and about which, thanks to Magellan’s circumnavigation of the globe in 1519–22 and the printing press, the European public was to know more than it could process. Bernier’s account of his travels provided considerable knowledge to his contemporaries, but it also allowed them to live with the certain knowledge that their own society was the very bestthing possible. Comparing Mughal India and Ottoman Turkey with the France of Louis XIV, Bernier wrote that ‘‘take away the right to private property in land, and you introduce, as an infallible consequence, tyranny, slavery, injustice, beggary and barbarism.’’77 Upon his return to Europe and after the success of his travel book, Bernier wrote Nouvelle division which was one of the first of many such compendiums on race. Bernier divided humanity into four or five ‘‘espe`ces ou races,’’ with lines of demarcation based on physical traits (hair, stature, nose, and lips), geography, and, significantly, skin color.78 Bernier’s work was followed, in the eighteenth century, by that of the Swedish scientist Carolus Linneaus (who transformed the method of raciology with his scientific classification schemes) and of the German naturalist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (who devised the field of physical anthropology and who provided the early linkage of African man with ape). This scholarship was the first to classify humanity into groups or races based on biological principles. Xenophobia was classified and institutionalized and the idea of race was born

### 2NC Eurocentrism=Root Cause (2/2)

#### The Social Darwinist ideology they criticize was specifically a response to European imperial domination.

Vijay Prashad, director and associate professor of international studies at Trinity College, 2001

Everybody was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity, pp. 22

To say that there was no mass popularity for volkish or racial nationalism is not to say that Asia was immune from raciology. The development of raciology in Asia came principally in the context of a nationalist sentiment that grew under the shadow of European imperialism. Asian popular movements and intellectuals attempted to construct their own national stories in response to their colonizer’s condescension and in an effort to unite peoples whose destiny was seen as a reason for Asia’s failure to withstand the onslaught of Europe. By the late nineteenth century, three hundred years into the development of the concept of race, this would be countered by an attempt to forge national identities and communities, rather than local ones. A central figure for the construction of Asian notions of cultural nationhood was the English philosopher and father of sociobiology, Herbert Spencer. Greatly influenced by Darwin’s1859 On the Origin of Species, Spencer devised the theory that in human evolution the fittest survived and transmitted evolved traits across generations, which was clearly enunciated in his late 1860s two-volume Principles of Biology and his 1876 first-volume Principles of Sociology. If the idea of the ‘‘survival of the fittest’’ was taken from Darwin, the belief in hereditary transmission of modified organisms was drawn from the by then largely discredited work of the eighteenth-century French naturalist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck. What attracted cultural nationalists among the colonized Asians was Spencer’s idea of the ‘‘survival of the fittest’’ and of the hereditary coherence of a people (we should keep in mind, though, that this idea grew on the ground of earlier xenophobic ideas). Colonized people could recover their glory if they earned their freedom and asserted themselves against weaker foes. The 1884 Japanese translation of Spencer’s evolutionary theory acted as a touchstone for the entry of Atlantic racism into Asia. In China, as well, it was Spencerian rhetoric that drew to the fore such newly racialized slogans as yousheng-liebai, ‘‘the superior win, the inferior lose.’’102 ‘‘Against a background of widespread social change brought about by policies of industrialisation,’’ Richard Siddle notes in Race, Resistance and the Ainu of Japan, ‘‘national and social conflict were increasingly presented in terms of the ‘survival of the fittest’ (yusho reppai) in the ‘struggle for survival’ (seizon kyoso) in the journals and newspapers that proliferated between 1890 and 1920.’’103

### 2NC A2 Aff Solves/Outweighs

#### Black survival cannot be a prophylactic against criticism of their epistemology.

Edward J. W. Park, director of the Asian Pacific American Studies Program at Loyola Marymount University, and John S. W. Park, doctoral candidate in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program at Boalt Hall at the University of California, Berkeley, October 1999

“A New American Dilemma?: Asian Americans and Latinos in Race Theorizing,” Volume 2, Number 3, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/14565> (Accessed 7/17/16)

Finally, whether being more careful with race, or documenting distinct racial histories, or exploring transnational dynamics, American race relations theorists should try to look beyond the political appeal of any one theory, and rather discuss honestly the errors and mistakes in many contemporary works. These works often contain a powerful and important central argument—that African Americans face gross and continuing social inequalities in a nation that sometimes seems intent on turning back the clock on issues of race. Still, the political appeal of that message should not be a prophylactic against criticism for major conceptual and empirical flaws in works that happen to contain that message. By ignoring claims that Asian Americans and Latinos are “just like Whites,” or that they further the racial oppression of African Americans, or that they are not even bona fide racial groups at all, theorists overlook much of the literature in their own field since the 1970s.

### 2NC A2 Coalitions Bad/Impossible

#### Reject the aff’s historiography—it reifies Sino-African antagonism by erasing the record of productive cultural engagement that is the Black Pacific.

Andrew F. Jones, Professor and Louis B. Agassiz Chair in Chinese, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures @ Cal Berkeley, and Nikhil Pal Singh, Associate Professor of Social and Cultural Analysis and History at New York University, Spring 2003

“Guest Editors' Introduction,” Positions, Volume 11, Number 1, pp. 1-9, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/40649> (Accessed 7/14/16)

Hughes’s anecdote is not so much an anomaly, then, but a cipher for a multitude of unsung and unlikely Afro-Asian connections, a cipher that, in its very indeterminacy, alerts us to the existence of unknown and as yet unsounded historical depths. With this special issue of positions, we ask not only how we might begin the task of charting the history of the Black Pacific traversed by Langston Hughes in the interwar years, but also, as Françoise Vergès suggests in her commentary on the Indian Ocean as a creolized space of Afro-Asian encounter, how we might begin sketching a “new cartography of possibilities” that can break out of the enclosures of neocolonial color lines and the insularity of ethnonationalist identity politics. Such insularity has long been reinforced by our own practices of knowledge production. The gaps in the historical record that render Hughes’s Shanghai encounter so tantalizingly illegible to us today are not born, but actively produced by the departmentalization of historical and theoretical work along national and supraregional lines. Stories such as those excavated by Brent Edwards in his essay “The Shadow of Shadows,” in which a young Ho Chi Minh develops new anticolonial tactics of textual production in tandem with the Senegalese activist Lamine Senghor while sojourning in Jazz Age Paris, exist in a sort of no-man’s-land between typically Eurocentric discussions of cosmopolitanism and the exigencies and exclusions of nationalist historiography.

### 1NC No Solvency

#### Surrogation can only gesture toward a wounded absence which can provide no basis for subjectivity.

Yumi Pak, Faculty Member, Department of English at USC San Bernadino and Faculty Member, Africana Studies at Hamilton University, 2012

“Outside relationality : autobiographical deformations and the literary lineage of Afro-pessimism in 20th and 21st century African American literature,” http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2h76s393 (Accessed 7/17/16)

In the fourth chapter, “The Afterlife of Slavery: Singing the Unspeakable Familial/Familiarity in Gayl Jones’ Corregidora,” I frame Jones’ novel as a collective autobiography of slavery that challenges the contemporary trend in performance studies that states that there is something regenerative and/or recuperative in black performance and blues music. Examining scholars such as Daphne Brooks and Fred Moten, I argue that it is not enough to state that “objects resist”; rather, we must examine the impetus – or the violent force – behind that resistance. In other words, what makes them resist? In Ursa’s performance of the blues, what becomes evident is Jones’ articulation of the social death which permeates the social life of blackness, or the impossibility to sing a black subjectivity that can be incorporated into history.15 Although the narrative is not one which expounds upon more than the bare bones of Jones’ autobiography, I argue that it is still an autobiographical novel by using Joseph Roach’s concept of surrogation, or the performance of memory through replacement with revision, the attempt to fill the void left through death and disappearance with performances that gesture toward an absent presence, but never perfectly. In Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance, Roach writes that in “the life of a community, the process of surrogation does not begin or end but continues as actual or perceived vacancies occur in the network of relations that constitutes the social fabric” (Cities of the Dead 2). With Corregidora, Jones gestures toward the impossibility of a collective that must be defined through a wounding/wounded absence, both in terms of family (the Corregidora women) and history (the history of slavery). What Jones does, too, is to contest the reliance on text, or the archive (the documentation of slavery through papers) and instead prioritize oral history. The unreliability of the written word is discussed by various scholars working in performance studies and elsewhere; in Signs and Cities: Black Literary Postmodernism, Madhu Dubey argues that “African-American novelists in the postmodern era thereby convey not only the diminishing credibility of existing models of racial representation but also a keen suspicion toward the very category of print literature” (Dubey 6). In much the same fashion, Ursa’s great grandmother focuses on childbirth as the means by which to bear witness, to remember, as opposed to the papers which can be – and have been – burned.

### 2NC No Solvency

#### Moten is wrong—transpositions in the poetic register cannot mitigate the positional instability that disallows Black folk from levying claims of grievance in the first place.

Jared Sexton, Associate Professor of African American Studies and Film and Media Studies at the University of California, Irvine, 2010

“African American Studies.” John Carlos Rowe (ed.) A Concise Companion to American Studies. 2010. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell: 210- 28.

In her ground-breaking Scenes of Subjection, Saidiya Hartman calls our attention to the ease with which scenes of spectacular violence against the black body – what she terms “inaugural moment[s] in the formation of the enslaved” – are reiterated in discourses both academic and popular, “the casualness,” she writes, “with which they are circulated, and the consequences of this routine display of the slave’s ravaged body”: Rather than inciting indignation, too often they immure us to pain by virtue of their familiarity – the oft-repeated or restored character of these accounts and our distance from them are signaled by the theatrical language usually resorted to in describing these instances – and especially because they reinforce the spectacular character of black suffering. [. . .] At issue here is the precariousness of empathy and the uncertain line between witness and spectator. Only more obscene than the brutality unleashed at the whipping post is the demand that this suffering be materialized and evidenced by the display of the tortured body or endless recitations of the ghastly and terrible. In light of this, how does one give expression to these outrages without exacerbating the indifference to suffering that is the consequence of the benumbing spectacle or contend with narcissistic identification that obliterates the other or the prurience that too often is the response of such displays. (Hartman 1997: 4) To put it bluntly, how does one engage with black suffering at all without simply erasing it – refusing it, absorbing it, appropriating it – in the very same gesture? Hartman’s inventive response to what might appear, at first glance, to be a rhetorical question or a cruel joke (that is, making a case with evidence that is, strictly speaking, inadmissible) is to move away from the expected “invocations of the shocking and the terrible” and to look, alternately, at “scenes in which terror can hardly be discerned,” “the terror of the mundane and quotidian,” what she phrases appositely as “the diffusion of terror.” What she finds, if calling it a “finding” is not immediately to betray it, is the recapitulation – the repetition and summation – of this spectacular primal scene across the entirety of the social text of racial slavery and its aftermath. That is to say, it is never the case that this terror is not present. It saturates the field of encounter. It is ubiquitous and yet it is, perhaps for the same reason, barely discernible. One wonders thus: how might the discussion of this dispersed, ambient terror become any more compelling than that which is condensed and acute? The point being not that blacks enter the wrong evidence or pursue the wrong argument, but rather that they are disallowed from entering evidence or building arguments in the first place, barred, as it were, from bringing charges and levying claims of grievance or injury as such. Again, what does it mean to suffer, in this way? This “challenge,” as Hartman modestly calls it, of giving expression to the inexpressible is taken up again in Fred Moten’s remarkable text, In the Break. In fact, it is the discrepancy between subjection and objection that launches the accomplishment of a project opened and closed around the impossibility and the inevitability of “the resistance of the object” (Moten 2003: 1). That, at least, is how it sounds to me. What is disquieting and provocative in this exchange is what I take to be a certain turning away from the implications of Hartman’s precarious distinction between witness and spectator, a positional instability that is not mitigated by transpositions in the sonic register, nor, for that matter, in the performance arts more generally (Barrett 1999; Weheliye 2005).