

3-10-2000

## Trends. Money Walks, Nobody Talks II: United States Trade with Sub-Saharan Africa

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp>



Part of the [African Studies Commons](#), and the [International Economics Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Editor (2000) "Trends. Money Walks, Nobody Talks II: United States Trade with Sub-Saharan Africa," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*: Vol. 8 : Iss. 10 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol8/iss10/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [commons@erau.edu](mailto:commons@erau.edu).

## International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: Trends. Money Walks, Nobody Talks II: United States Trade with Sub-Saharan Africa

Author: Editor

Volume: 8

Issue: 10

Date: 2000-03-10

Keywords: Africa, Trade, United States, United States Business and Industry Council

The United States (US) Business and Industry Council has come out against a US Government trade bill that would facilitate sub-Saharan exports apparel to the US. The stated rationale is that US apparel workers will "bear the brunt" of more African exports. Yet, the Council does not note that many US citizens would benefit from being able to buy lower-priced clothing. Moreover, facilitating exports from sub-Saharan Africa would be anti-inflationary.

The Council might note that the exports expected through the trade bill would not have much of an effect on inflationary pressures. Of course, logic dictates that the Council must admit that the trade bill would also not have much of an effect on almost all US workers.

However, the Council further asserts that the US workers most hurt by the trade bill would be black, Hispanic, and female. But black and female African workers would also be most hurt if the trade bill is not fully effected.

Certainly, political advocacy for a "special interest" is not a vice. But such specious advocacy might merit the special interest of the political, if not the clinical psychologist. (See African trade bill hurts U.S. workers. (March 9, 2000). *The New York Times*, p. A28; Fox, D. R. (1996). The law says corporations are persons, but psychology knows better. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 14, 339-359; Jennings, T.E. (1996). The developmental dialectic of international human-rights advocacy. *Political Psychology*, 17, 77-95; Kendler, H. H. (1983). Scientific conclusion or political advocacy? *American Psychologist*, 38, 1122; Maoz, Z., & Shayer, A. (1987). The cognitive structure of peace and war argumentation: Israeli Prime Ministers versus the Knesset. *Political Psychology*, 8, 575-604.) (Keywords: Africa, Trade, United States, United States Business and Industry Council.)