

Devastating Impacts of China-USA Trade Disputes on U.S. Employment. Trump Wants to Reinforce “Neocolonial” Anti-Chinese Sentiment

By [Bhabani Shankar Nayak](#)

Global Research, November 14, 2024

Region: [Asia, USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#)

*The U.S.-China Business Council report on “U.S. Exports to China 2023” reveals that [\\$151.3 billion](#) worth of American goods were exported to China, **supporting over one million U.S. jobs**. According to the American Bureau of Economic Analysis, an official U.S. government agency,*

“In 2023, U.S. exports of goods and services to China were \$195.5 billion, down 0.9% from 2022, while **imports from China were \$447.7 billion, down 20.6% from 2022**. As a result, the trade deficit with China declined to \$252.1 billion”.

However, these economic facts and figures do not determine U.S. policy toward China. Instead, the neo-colonial and imperialist strategies led by the U.S. and Europe shape the nature of the U.S.-China trade dispute. The imperialist, colonial, and capitalist core finds an alternative model of development and economic growth neither acceptable nor tolerable.

In the name of trade disputes, U.S. **President Donald Trump** has consolidated and further reinforced the anti-Chinese policies and sentiments shaped by American business elites and their think tanks, such as the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the American Enterprise Institute, the Atlantic Council, and others. These institutes, under the guise of research, often serve as the propaganda arm of the American ruling elites, represented by the U.S. government. Trump’s second term is expected to be even more aggressively anti-China, particularly in terms of imposing tariffs on Chinese goods and services. Trump has stated that “tariffs are the greatest thing ever invented,” tariffs as an economic weapon used by imperialist countries like the U.S. and Western European nations to undermine and dismantle trading abilities of developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Tariffs are the foundations of unfair trade practices led by the imperialist countries in the name of protecting domestic industries, innovation and intellectual properties. American and European consumers suffer the most because of anti-Chinese trade practices.

However, these anti-Chinese tariffs are not intended to benefit American, European consumers or global economy. Instead, they aim to protect corporate profits by undermining high-quality, yet more affordable Chinese goods and services. The trade dispute is often framed as a trade war between the U.S. and China, a conflict that was both intensified and accelerated under Trump. According to Josh Lipsky, the ripple effects of the U.S.-China trade war in 2018 could have cost the global economy \$700 billion. It is going to grow in the second term of Trump presidency.

Who paid this huge cost? The simple answer is consumers—the working masses. The trade dispute between China and America led to rising consumer prices on goods and services

provided by China. As a result, working people bore the brunt of the increased cost of living, paying more for everyday products that are essential to their lives. In a capitalist market society dominated by imperialists, both at home and abroad, who truly cares for the masses? The policies that shape this system often prioritise corporate profits over the well-being of ordinary people.

American imperialism, along with its Western European allies, views the world primarily in terms of trade surpluses and deficits. These powers often use military conflicts to ensure the smooth flow of trade, free from any barriers imposed by governments in countries across Asia, Africa, and Latin America. These imperialist powers provoke anti-China sentiments in the China's neighbourhoods by forming military, strategic and economic alliances. President Trump, as a businessman, aligned himself with this imperialist market trajectory in world politics, seeking to undermine and dismantle any successful models of state-led economic development, such as China's. There is little distinction between Republicans and Democrats when it comes to containing China's growth and development. Both parties compete to be more anti-China, striving to outdo one another in their approach to the issue. The Biden administration, for instance, continued Trump's policies on China, even increasing tariffs and levies on Chinese products and services. The recently concluded election campaign further revealed that there was little difference between President-elect Trump and his opponent, **Kamala Harris**, in their stance on undermining China's alternative development model. Both Republicans and Democrats share a common approach when it comes to China, united in their efforts to curtail its rise.

American and European consumers are the beneficiaries of Chinese trade but these countries frequently accuse China of unfair trade practices, aiming to undermine its competitive advantage and progressive subsidy policies. They also accuse the Chinese state of engaging in business espionage and technology theft, alleging violations of international trade agreements. However, there is no truth to these accusations. **In reality, China has reformed its Foreign Investment Law to encourage technological cooperation based on voluntary, mutually agreed-upon rules that govern business investments.** The law not only bans forced technology transfers but also protects the trade secrets and intellectual property of foreign investors. These false allegations are part of a broader strategy to undermine China and its creative, technological, and scientific capabilities, as well as the productive potential of its skilled workforce.

American imperialism and its European allies have failed to acknowledge the failures of their capitalist models of development, which has led to a declining ability to meet their consumption needs through domestic production. Capitalism, driven by the pursuit of profit and mass consumerism, has undermined domestic industries, contributing to deindustrialisation in both Europe and America. The trade deficit is a direct result of this imbalance between production and consumption. In contrast, China's trade surplus is driven by its technologically advanced workforce, which produces more than it consumes. As a result, China exports more and imports less, leading to a trade surplus. Meanwhile, capitalist countries like the United States and those in Western Europe consume more than they produce, which causes their imports to exceed exports and results in trade deficits.

In this context, imperialist nations are engaged in an economic war with China over trade surplus. However, this trade dispute does not serve the interests of people worldwide. The imperialist powers are deflecting attention from their own capitalist failures by unjustly blaming China for its development, which is fundamentally centered around the well-being

of its people and people across the world.

China should reconsider its approach to retaliating against imperialist market logic. Moving away from a corporate-driven market strategy based on tariffs and levies is crucial. Increasing tariffs on American and European goods does not benefit consumers in China, Europe, America, or anywhere else in the global market. Instead, China should focus on promoting worker-led cooperative business models and investment strategies, both domestically and internationally. By prioritizing these models, China can foster more equitable and sustainable economic relationships that serve the interests of workers and consumers worldwide, rather than continuing to rely on punitive trade measures designed by the neocolonial imperialist and their crony capitalists.

*

Click the share button below to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Don't Miss Out on Global Research Online e-Books!](#)

Bhabani Shankar Nayak is a political commentator.

Featured image [source](#)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Bhabani Shankar Nayak](#), Global Research, 2024

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **[Bhabani Shankar Nayak](#)**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca