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Negative Case by Nathaniel Van Eeckhout



This case attempts to narrow down this broad resolution as much as possible by examining the resolution in an entirely economic scale. Instead of focusing on societal contacts and governmental philosophy, it simply asks which side of the resolution is better apt to help a nation grow fiscally. Understandably, economic prosperity should benefit a nation in a variety of different ways.

To win with this case, you first have to set up the definitions. I would recommend using a portion of cross-examination time to see if your opponent may agree with a variation of these definitions or, at the very least, that globalism opens up cooperation with other countries.

Also, stay on your ground. This case is designed to be as simple and easy to understand as possible. If you run away from the framework of economics, you’ll likely lose the round. However, with good statistics to back up yourself up in rebuttals, and an ability to hold your turf, this case offers promise.

Negative Case: Prosperity

In 2015, the World Trade Organization reported that during the 2014 fiscal year, an astounding 18.494 trillion dollars had been spent internationally on exports.[[1]](#footnote-1) This number, while not much of a change from the previous year, further expressed the expedited change in the world economy towards an international focus. The international economy has been growing steadily to the point where international exports of goods and services now account for roughly 30 percent of worldwide GDP, a number that is approximately 11 percent higher than it was just 25 years ago.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The world economy is choosing to go global. For an obvious reason, it stimulates economic growth and prosperity. Because of this, I choose to negate the resolution and stand resolved that **nationalism ought *not* to be valued above globalism**.

Before continuing to my main points and arguments, I choose to offer definitions to a few key terms which will bring clarification to the debate round.

# Definitions:

**Nationalism: “**the doctrine that nations should act independently (rather than collectively) to attain their goals.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Globalism: “**a national policy of treating the whole world as a proper sphere for political influence.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

# Value: Prosperity

For this round, I will be arguing for the value of prosperity which is defined as “a successful, flourishing, or thriving condition, especially in financial respects; good fortune.”[[5]](#footnote-5) Essentially, I am arguing that whichever side is best able to promote a flourishing and financially successful society or world should win this debate round.

## Reason to Prefer: National Goals

Why should you choose prosperity as the value for this round? Based off of the defining terms in this round, this resolution comes down to whether a nation is best able to achieve their goals through acting independently, or through trading and influencing other nations. I stand that prosperity is the best way to measure this resolution because it best encompasses what every nation tries to achieve, a flourishing society with a robust economy. Since this value best measures the general objective of common national policy, it only stands that this is the best measure of the round.

Next, I offer two key reasons as to why to choose globalism.

# Contention 1: Globalism Achieves Prosperity

While globalism is commonly viewed as a relatively new form of national policy, historical background shows us that it has been used successfully for centuries, if not millennia. Here are two examples, one historical and one modern, that show how globalism boosts economic prosperity.

## Application: The Roman Empire

The Roman Empire may very well be the first example of globalism becoming the primary political scope for a nation. Its expansion allowed trade that was previously unknown by any civilized society. As written by Lionel Cassel:

“The Roman man in the street ate bread baked with wheat grown in North Africa or Egypt, and fish that had been caught and dried near Gibraltar. He cooked with North African oil in pots and pans of copper mined in Spain, ate off dishes fired in French kilns, drank wine from Spain or France…” (As quoted in Jones, 2013).

Simply, this globalist policy allowed the Roman Empire to achieve economic lengths no empire had seen before and achieved this through a relatively uncomplicated system that lasted 700 years without much complexity.[[6]](#footnote-6)

## Application: Modern Economic Growth

The the economic world has become much more globalized within the last century. Beyond this, it is also blatantly obvious that on a worldwide scale, the economy has mushroomed into proportions never before seen. According, to the journal PLOS One, there is a direct correlation. In a study done by Parisa Samimi and Hashem Salarzadeh Jenatabadi to investigate the effect of economic globalization on economic growth in OIC countries, researchers found that “that economic globalization has statistically significant impact on economic growth in OIC countries” and that “Economic globalization not only directly promotes growth but also indirectly does so via complementary reforms.”[[7]](#footnote-7) Beyond this, numbers given on current export levels and worldwide GDP increase at the beginning of this speech further back up the point that there is a correlation between modern economic growth and globalization.

# Contention 2: Nationalism Inhibits Prosperity

As nationalism and globalism exist on opposite sides of a scale, it only makes sense that if globalism encourages economic growth, nationalism discourages it. As explained in the article *The Return of Economic Nationalism* in The Economist Newspaper,

“Policies designed to put something right at home can inadvertently eat away at the global system. Economic nationalism—the urge to keep jobs and capital at home—is both turning the economic crisis into a political one and threatening the world with depression.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

Essentially, the limitation of trading on a global scale only limits the economy of a nation who chooses to close itself off from the international market. This only harms a nation’s ability to become prosperous.

**Conclusion**

In the end, economic growth is best achieved by a nation that chooses to open up its options and trade on a global scale. As shown in the past through the Roman Empire and in modern times, globalization is a reliable way to achieve financial prosperity. Worldwide GDP growth only magnifies this fact. Because of this strong correlation between globalization and economic growth and prosperity, I strongly urge a negative ballot in today’s debate round.

Thank you for your time.

Opposing This Case

You can beat this case by avoiding the negative’s turf. Economic prosperity is great, but that is just one aspect of this resolution. Beyond this, who is to say that a nation can’t have great international trade agreements and still be individualistic while focusing on themselves? Globalization surely may make international trade easier, but that doesn’t mean that the same results can’t be achieved under a nationalistic mindset. Because of this, it is best to attack the second contention hard. It is the weakest link in the case. It also has the least material. If you have any examples or evidence of economically strong nationalistic minded countries, now is obviously the time to use them.

If you used the right definitions and you held your ground during cross-examination, there is a chance you may be able to win the round on that alone. This case relies very much on the idea that nationalism means limiting contact with other nations instead of just limiting aid to those same nations when they are in need.
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