Prosperity
Negative Case by Shaylea Sawyers



This case argues that globalist economics are the best way for countries to pool resources and increase competition. It argues that nationalism protects its industries unfairly. In doing so, it limits its potential for economic growth. Globalism, on the other hand, opens up trade between countries to create the most prosperous environment possible.

Making this argument stick hinges on your ability to keep the debate within the realm of economics. It is highly unlikely that AFF will use an economic resolutional analysis, so you will have to prove why your take on the resolution is better than theirs.

You will also need to have a strong understanding of the economic theory that drives the case. It may seem easy to grasp when you’re reading the case, but it can get trickier in rebuttals. Make sure you’re comfortable enough with it to explain it in your own words during rebuttals.

It’s likely that AFF will try to refute your case by bringing up examples of failed free trade deals. If you have a strong understanding of the economic theory, you can use that to refute AFF’s examples.

Prosperity

“I am in favor of helping the prosperity of all countries because, when we are all prosperous, the trade with each becomes more valuable to the other.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

It’s because I agree with President William Howard Taft that I stand…

**Resolved: Nationalism ought not to be valued above Globalism.**

To start off, I want to clarify our terms with a couple…

# Definitions

The American Heritage Dictionary defines Nationalism as

“The belief that nations will benefit from acting independently rather than collectively, emphasizing national rather than international goals.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

And the Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines Globalism as:

“The idea that events in one country cannot be separated from those in another and that economic and foreign policy should be planned in an international way.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

Next, let’s talk about how we should view this resolution with my…

# Resolutional Analysis: Economic Policy

Money makes the world go round. All people need money so they can buy things that keep them alive and happy! It’s clear that Economic Policy is a concern that affects everyone, no matter what society you’re in or what role you play in that society. Therefore, it’s through the lens of Economic Policy that we should view this resolution. And since we’re talking economics, it seems fitting that we’d use the…

# Value: Prosperity

The COBUILD Advanced English Dictionary defines Prosperity as

“a condition in which a person or community is doing well financially.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

Prosperity basically means that most people are employed, that they have reasonable amounts of discretionary income, and that they’re able to purchase what they need with that income.

To explain why prosperity is the best value for today I present a

# Reason to Prefer: Measures Economic Policy

Prosperity is the best way to measure the effectiveness of economic policy. If most citizens are financially well-off, then we can safely say the economic policy is doing its job.

Now, to explain how valuing Globalism maximises prosperity with my two contentions.

# Contention One: Nationalism is Short Sighted

Nationalism believes that nations would do better to act independently than to cooperate with other nations. As an economic philosophy, this is known as protectionism. Protectionism supports domestic production by pushing foreign production away. This causes foreign nations to retaliate with their own protectionist policies, hurting domestic exports and making the country and its industries less competitive in international commerce.[[5]](#footnote-5) An example of this can be found in…

## Application: the Hawley-Smoot Tariff of 1930

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff increased duties on items such as sugar, cotton, hides, meat and dairy products, cotton, wool and silk textiles, chinaware, and surgical instruments.[[6]](#footnote-6) It was intended to protect US production, especially farming, but instead, it launched a trade war. Economist Percy Bidwell wrote in 1930, immediately after the signing of the bill that “The European response... was disapproval--immediate, undisguised and unanimous [7].”[[7]](#footnote-7) Because Europe could no longer sell its products to us at a reasonable rate, it decided it would no longer buy from us either. Alan Reynolds, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, reports that: “[US] exports fell from $7 billion in 1929 to $2.5 billion in 1932”[[8]](#footnote-8) he goes on to explain that foreign nations could no longer afford US goods “thus bankrupting both [US] farmers and the farmers’ banks.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

When we enact nationalist policies that give our industries the advantage, it causes other nations to do the same, stealing exports from the very industries we intended to protect. Nationalism, and its protectionist policies, is short sighted and prevents society from prospering. Globalism, on the other hand, does a much better job, as seen in

# Contention Two: Globalism Yields Lasting Benefits

Globalism acknowledges that nations cannot act in a vacuum and seeks to plan its policy in an international way. In economics this is known as free trade. Free trade policies remove international barriers to let global competition work itself out. As Alexander Tziamalis, Senior Lecturer at Sheffield Hallam University, explains: “Free trade makes everything cheaper and improves the quality of products, directly benefiting everyone… The argument goes that if each country focused and specialised on what they do best or cheapest, they would produce better quality or cheaper products. These could then be traded between countries, making every consumer happier.”[[10]](#footnote-10) One example of free trade policy is…

## Application: NAFTA

NAFTA, or The North American Free Trade Agreement is a treaty that removes trade barriers between Canada, the United States, and Mexico.[[11]](#footnote-11) While some complain of NAFTA giving US jobs to Mexico and allowing workers to get paid less to do those jobs, the short term drawbacks of free trade are far outweighed by its benefits. As president of WorldMoneyWatch.com, Kimberly Amadeo, reported, since NAFTA’s enactment in 1994, trade between the three countries grew from $297 billion to $1.14 trillion, boosting economic growth, profits, and jobs.[[12]](#footnote-12) It’s also lowered prices on vital resources like oil and food, which lead to lower interest rates and a decreased risk of inflation.[[13]](#footnote-13) In addition, NAFTA boosted economic growth in areas like agriculture, automobiles, and services. Lastly, it helped modernise our auto industry.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Economic globalism makes people happier and their lives more prosperous. While free trade may appear to be dangerous at first glance, in the end it yields lasting benefits. By removing barriers and increasing competition, a globalistic view of economics creates greater prosperity.

#

Opposing This Case

This case rests on the idea that when nations combine their arena of competition they maximise their capacity for equity. The problem with that model is that it requires ALL nations to cooperate. It’s a good theory, but it’s too idealistic.

Globalism only works when everyone plays along. If every country drops their tariffs, stops subsidizing domestic production, and so on, then it works out. However, if China changes its mind and decides reimpose its subsidies, suddenly every country that competes with China is losing to artificially low prices. In that situation they can either keep trade open and suffer the loss, or impose their own protectionist measures and break the free trade model.

The reason this matters to the resolution is that in any situation other than the absolute ideal, nationalism is necessary to some extent. Some country, even if it isn’t yours, is going to favour its own economy at some point. When that happens, the only way to ensure prosperity is to protect your economy in response.

So, your argument as AFF is going to be that in all realistic situations, prosperity cannot be achieved without nationalistic economics. You can further illustrate this point with your own examples of failed trade deals or by turning the NAFTA application. The Huffington Post reported that NAFTA had some drawbacks, including…

“a staggering $181 billion U.S. trade deficit with NAFTA partners Mexico and Canada and the related loss of 1 million net U.S. jobs under NAFTA, growing income inequality, displacement of more than one million Mexican campesino farmers and a doubling of desperate immigration from Mexico, and more than $360 million paid to corporations after “investor-state” tribunal attacks on, and rollbacks of, domestic public interest policies.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

You can use this, as well as other examples, to point out that globalistic economics often fail to deliver on their big promises.
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