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INTRODUCTION

Over the last several decades, U.S. trade policies—captured by wealthy, corporate interests—have failed working people in the U.S.\(^1\) Trade policies undermined the U.S. response to the COVID-19 crisis, consistently failed to address climate change, and resulted in the outsourcing of millions of middle-class jobs to low-wage countries. It is clear that a new direction for trade policy is desperately needed.\(^2\) We need policies that center working people instead of corporate profit.

A firm understanding of the persistence of systemic racial economic inequities is critical to understanding the full scope of the consequences of failed trade policy in the U.S. Until recently, academics and policymakers have footnoted discussions about the intersection of systemic racial inequalities and trade policies.\(^3\)

While trade policy failures have directly harmed many workers across the country, wealth and income gaps, discrimination, and occupational segregation have all intensified the effects of dislocations for people of color—and in particular, Black workers. This should come as no surprise. Domestic policy decisions have maintained and normalized economic gaps that ensure Black people face harsher consequences as a result of our deeply flawed economic system, especially when the country is facing a myriad of intersecting crises as we are today.

Existing research looking at the distributional impacts of trade find negative effects on local labor markets, particularly in areas with robust manufacturing sectors where imports surged the most.\(^4\) However, these studies seldom disaggregate data by race, leaving incomplete answers to the question of how trade has impacted workers of color.

The path forward for trade policy must prioritize building worker power and strengthening labor and environmental standards domestically and globally.

Important new research from William Spriggs, Nyanya Browne, and Bethel Cole-Smith of Howard University provides a deeper understanding of the impact of trade policy on Black workers. Specifically, the authors examine the impact of the rapid increase of import competition from China on U.S. commuting zone-level employment and earnings by race.\(^5\)

They find that the trade shock resulting from rising import competition by China increased racial inequality for workers, as measured by the change in the share of Black employment and the Black hire rate. The authors assess impact in industries most exposed to trade (“exposed sector”) as well as non-exposed tradable industries (e.g. information and mining).
In particular, they find:

- **A 3.2 percentage point reduction** in the share of overall Black working age employment (ages 15-64), not just employment in the manufacturing sector, for every 1 percentage point increase in import exposure.\(^6\)

- **A 2.7 percentage point reduction** in the share of Black working age employment in the exposed sector for every 1 percentage point increase in import exposure.

- **A 32.4 percentage point drop** in the share of Black working age employment in the exposed sector, which includes manufacturing, forestry, and wholesale trade. The study used the average change across all commuting zones in import penetration from China for this evaluation.

- The authors’ estimates imply that the average shock to exposed industries resulted in a **32.4 percent reduction in jobs**. That translates to 405,679 jobs that would have continued to exist had it not been for import penetration from China.\(^7\)

- **The Black hire rate in these sectors was negatively impacted by the trade shock** relative to those communities with less exposure to Chinese trade. Strong economic growth alone did not restore Black access to high wage jobs as the hire rate did not recover during the economic expansionary period (2013-2019) following the Great Recession, which was the longest economic expansion in history.\(^8\) Ultimately, if Black employment can’t recover during a time of massive economic recovery, then Black employment will never recover without targeted policies.

- **They estimate Black earnings are reduced by 3.84 percentage points** for every 1 percentage point increase in import exposure in the exposed sector. The authors find that import competition from China had a significant and adverse impact on Black earnings even though it did not shift overall wages.

Building toward a more equitable trade policy will also require a new vision both for trade and broader economic policies. These policies must center workers and communities of color.

These findings are important for understanding the impact of trade shocks on manufacturing employment opportunities and employment opportunities at large for Black workers. The authors find the trade shock had a significant negative impact on Black employment in industries most exposed to trade (including manufacturing jobs), a lasting and significant negative employment effect on the second highest-paying sector, and a significant negative effect on Black earnings. This demonstrates the cascading effect of the trade shock on the economic security of Black workers as
a result of broader structural disadvantages in the U.S. labor market that many workers of color face.

While these analyses do not disaggregate racial groups by gender, prior evidence shows that Black women face particular and persistent structural disadvantages in the labor market. For example, Black women tend to face elevated unemployment rates, worse pay, and lower benefits across sectors as a result of systematic barriers in the economy. Those barriers include occupational segregation, outright and pervasive racism and sexism, and a legacy of exclusionary public policy decisions. A 2018 study found that the decline in manufacturing between 1960 and 2010 increased the poverty rate for Black women by eight percentage points. It’s imperative that economic outcomes for Black women guide economic policy. Thus, future research should analyze the intersection of race and gender as it relates to the effects of trade policies.

U.S. trade policies have failed most people in the U.S, and these policies have disproportionately failed Black workers. Low wages and weak labor and environmental standards exert downward pressure on employment, wages, and environmental standards and therefore harm and undercut workers both at home and abroad. The structure of the existing, corporate-rigged, neoliberal trade regime means the diffuse gains resulting from trade policies have largely been captured by corporations and wealthy interests. These gains do not provide adequate assistance to those most heavily and acutely impacted at the community or individual levels.

The labor market is designed to fail Black workers, and the resulting structural imbalances in our economy make negative labor market effects caused by trade policies especially harmful for workers of color who face perpetual economic gaps as a result of deliberate policy decisions.

The path forward for trade policy must prioritize building worker power and strengthening labor and environmental standards domestically and globally. It should also allow for greater transparency in policymaking when it comes to potential racial disparities. This can be achieved by enabling equitable assessments of trade policy and urgent reauthorization and reform of federal programs aimed at supporting workers dealing with the negative impacts of international trade.

That said, building toward a more equitable trade policy will also require a new vision both for trade and broader economic policies. These policies must center workers and communities of color. Without this change, the underlying reasons why trade shocks continue to have a disproportionately negative effect on workers of color will continue to exist, and people already at the greatest disadvantage in our economy will continue to be harmed.

THE ROLE OF UNIONIZED MANUFACTURING JOBS AND BUILDING ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR BLACK COMMUNITIES

Trade policies have played a significant role in declining economic security for Black workers because they create sharp declines in unionized manufacturing jobs that served as pivotal access points to economic security for many Black workers.
In the mid-twentieth century, millions of Black Americans migrated to the industrializing North and Midwest from the South to escape racialized violence and find economic mobility. This was known as the Great Migration. The burgeoning manufacturing sector in these industrialized areas, which were heavily unionized, provided better economic opportunities, higher wages, and better working conditions than other employment options, particularly for high school graduates, because systemic racism prevented Black people from attaining the same education as their white counterparts. The economic security that many Black Americans attained would not have been achievable without the manufacturing sector.

The economic security provided by manufacturing jobs has recently come under threat. Free trade policies over the past three decades led to mass job outsourcing that contributed to the loss of millions of jobs in the manufacturing sector. As factories closed across the country, many communities faced sharp rises in unemployment rates, flat wages and capital flight, leaving them bankrupt and devastated.

Black workers are particularly harmed when corporations amass unprecedented power over workers.

Much of the economic security of manufacturing jobs is attributed to high unionization rates in the manufacturing sector. However, many of the manufacturing plants that did stay in the U.S. moved their plants to rural right-to-work states in the West and South where policies make it harder for working people to form unions. This allowed corporations to wield more bargaining power over workers than they would have had in more union-friendly states. Trade policies fueled this capital flight; and living conditions in deindustrialized communities deteriorated because of a lack of willingness to boldly and swiftly invest in those facing the resulting economic devastation.

In 1983, 42.3 percent of Black manufacturing workers were represented by a union. By 2015, that number dropped to 13.3 percent. During this period, unionization rates fell more for Black workers than they did for white workers. At the same time, Black overall employment in the manufacturing sector was decreasing. Before the 1990s, Black and white workers were equally likely to be employed in manufacturing. By the 1990s, however, Black workers were less likely than their white counterparts to have employment in the manufacturing sector, and the share of Black workers employed in manufacturing was decreasing. Between 1960 and 2010, the downward trend in manufacturing employment contributed to a 12 percent increase in the racial wage gap between white and Black men.

U.S. trade policies, coupled with decades of policy decisions that gave employers greater bargaining power over workers, have aided the consolidation of corporate power and swiftly eroded economic gains made by working people.

For example, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) resulted in hundreds of thousands of jobs lost to countries with lower labor and environmental standards. The result was permanent loss of income for those who lost jobs, and heightened corporate power. New rights and privileges secured in the original NAFTA agreement allowed corporations the ability
to challenge government policies dedicated to public health and safety measures if they expected such policies to impact their “expected future profits.”

All of this together creates a system in which wealth and power is withheld from communities, particularly communities of color.

Corporations have wielded growing power over workers and unions through trade policy in many other ways, including negotiating structures that have allowed corporations to have a strong voice at the trade negotiating table while sidelining those who represent workers, consumers, and the environment.

Black workers are particularly harmed when corporations amass unprecedented power over workers. Corporations pay workers less for their labor, drive down crucial benefits, force people to pay more for the basic necessities of life, and skirt government safety regulations. All of this together creates a system in which wealth and power is withheld from communities, particularly communities of color. Anecdotes from workers we interviewed at former manufacturing plants provide firsthand accounts of how this increase in corporate power threatened workers. Workers witnessed threats by employers to shut down plants and move jobs to low-wage countries, and change crucial employee benefits.

As a result, workers have been experiencing declines in wages, benefits, and employment share, and deteriorating economic security. The effects of corporations’ outsized power have been pronounced for all workers, but Black workers—who also experience the compounding effects of systemic racism in the labor market—have been disproportionately impacted.

Focusing in on Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Milwaukee was a destination for many Black families in the late stages of the Great Migration. At the manufacturing industry’s height, Milwaukee was considered one of the best cities for Black people to live. The city’s manufacturing presence held the promise of economic mobility, livable wages, and a path to the middle class. In 1950, only 22,000 Black people lived in Milwaukee. By 1970, the Black population was over 105,000. Today, Black people make up 40 percent of the city’s population.

However, within a single generation, policy decisions that prioritized a “free market” over the rest of the economy contributed to outsized corporate power and unfettered neoliberal trade
policies. These policies, along with pervasive labor market discrimination, racial segregation, mass incarceration, and a myriad of other factors, ensured that Black people faced a persistent unemployment crisis. The deindustrialization process was particularly devastating for them.  

One study calls Milwaukee “the archetype of modern day metropolitan racial apartheid and inequality.” Black economic precarity skyrocketed with the decline of the manufacturing industry because employment in the manufacturing industry was one of the few avenues for building economic security for Black people. Manufacturing employment declined by 77 percent in the city of Milwaukee from 1963 to 2009. While the employment rate in Milwaukee for Black men plummeted to 45 percent by 2010, it was as high as 77 percent for white men.

Today, economic opportunity in Milwaukee continues to have a clear racial divide. Many of the manufacturing jobs that are left are located in suburbs and exurbs that are disproportionately white due to decades of racist housing policies. Almost 60 percent of industrial jobs in Milwaukee were located in the city in the 1960s, but today, less than 19 percent of local manufacturing is taking place in the city itself. This limits job opportunities for Black workers who also have limited mass transit options for commuting.

Waves of deindustrialization have alienated today’s generation of Black workers from manufacturing jobs, even if they come out of the city’s strong vocational education system. Furthermore, the city of Milwaukee is unable to generate enough jobs for all those looking for work, and many of the jobs that do exist in Milwaukee do not provide the same kind of economic security that employment in the manufacturing industry once did. Taken together, these factors contribute to the economic crisis that Black communities in Milwaukee are facing today. Black households in metropolitan Milwaukee have seen nearly a 29 percent real income decline since 1979. Over 50 percent of Black women in metropolitan Milwaukee earn poverty-level wages.

Milwaukee provides a harrowing and humanizing example of the negative impact of U.S. trade policies that prioritize corporate power and profits over working people and local economies, and particularly over Black workers. However, this is not an isolated incident. In many cities, tax revenues—including revenues generated through property and income taxes—fell steeply when the industrial manufacturing base declined. The result has often been a vicious cycle of negative second-order effects. Especially harmful are resulting cuts to necessary public services. This has had lasting and devastating consequences in formerly industrialized cities across the nation.

As John Russo and Sherry Lee Linkton from Youngstown State University put it, “... Deindustrialization undermines the social fabric of communities, states and the nation. The social costs of deindustrialization include the loss of jobs, homes and healthcare; reductions in the tax base, which in turn lead to cuts in necessary public services... Lack of maintenance or reduced garbage collection makes the local landscape look rundown and unattractive, which in turn makes it difficult to attract new businesses or residents. These changes can bring down property values, which reduce taxes even more. Deindustrialized cities often find themselves trapped, without the funds to improve their circumstances.”
A small but growing body of literature has pointed to negative economic effects caused by neoliberal trade policies coupled with the structural barriers facing Black workers.

An existing analysis from Acemoglu et al. on what is commonly referred to as the “China Shock,” or the impact of increasing Chinese imports to the U.S., examines the effects of trade on U.S. workers. The study finds that the increase in net imports with China caused significant reductions in U.S. manufacturing employment.

The authors estimate 2.0 to 2.4 million net job losses as a result of the rise in import competition from China between 1999 and 2011, and a decline in manufacturing jobs from 17.2 million to 11.4 million over the same time period, representing a 34 percent decrease. While this work provides thorough analyses on the impact of trade on industry and local labor market levels, the lack of disaggregated analysis masks important variations across racial groups.

Additional research from Batistich and Bond finds that in the 1970s, Black men who worked in the manufacturing industry were negatively impacted by our trade policies with Japan. The research finds that increased import competition with Japan decreased manufacturing employment, increased labor force nonparticipation, and decreased median household earnings for Black men.

A new analysis from Public Citizen finds that Black and Latinx workers have suffered disproportionately as a result of trade policies. Their analysis concludes that Black workers lost nearly half a million manufacturing jobs during the NAFTA-WTO era. They also find that Black and Latinx workers were both over-represented relative to their share of the total workforce in nine of the ten of the most trade-impacted sectors.

Black workers were crowded out, and lost both the best paying jobs and the second-highest paying jobs.

The study also analyzes Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) certifications by the race and ethnicity of certified workers’ geographic distribution and finds that locations with the largest Black and Latinx populations have experienced a disproportionate share of TAA certified trade-related job losses. Furthermore, Black and Latinx workers who did lose their jobs were less likely than their white counterparts to find other employment. For every 100 Black workers who lose their jobs, 21.2 remain unemployed, and for every 100 Latinx workers who lose their jobs, 21.8 remain unemployed. Meanwhile, for every 100 white workers who lose their jobs, 14.3 remain unemployed.
New analysis by Spriggs et al. contributes to this literature by looking at the impact of the increase in imports from China on Black employment and earnings. The study finds a significant negative impact of the trade shock on Black employment in industries most exposed to trade (including manufacturing jobs). It also finds a lasting and significant negative employment effect on the second highest paying sector i.e., non-exposed tradable industries (like information and mining jobs).

The study tested whether there is a shift away from jobs in the industries most exposed to trade (referred to as the “exposed sector”) to jobs in the non-exposed tradable sector, as workers are forced to find the next best paying jobs. They found that the trade shock both reduced Black employment in the exposed sector (manufacturing et al.), and lowered future Black employment in the second-highest paying sector. In other words, Black workers were crowded out, and lost both the best paying jobs and the second-highest paying jobs. Their overall employment levels suffered.

Spriggs et al. find a negative and statistically significant effect of import exposure on local labor market Black employment in the exposed industries. Their results show that a percentage point increase in import exposure reduces overall Black employment by 3.2 percentage points. Furthermore, a percentage point increase in local import exposure reduces the share of commuting zone Black employed workers by 2.7 percentage points in the exposed industries. Thus, the average commuting zone import exposure predicts a 32.4 percentage point drop in the Black share of employment in the exposed sector. Therefore, import penetration from China caused the loss of approximately 405,679 jobs.

As mentioned above, this trade shock both reduced Black employment in the exposed sector and decreased future Black employment in the second-highest paying sector, that is, the non-exposed tradable sector—which includes information and mining jobs. The results also show the Black hire rate in these sectors was negatively impacted by trade shock and did not recover during the economic expansionary period following the Great Recession (2013-2019)—the longest economic expansion in history. Ultimately, if Black employment can’t recover during a time of massive economic recovery, then Black employment will not recover without targeted policies.

The effects of the trade shock limit job opportunities in the highest wage and most exposed sectors for Black workers and workers of all races. This displacement causes a cascading employment effect which intensifies competition in other sectors, and in subsequent periods. Job growth in the second-highest paying sector was severely limited at best from 1999 to 2007. And in the subsequent expansionary period from 2013 to 2019, the findings show that Black workers were disproportionately excluded from jobs in the second highest-paying sector.

The analysis also finds a negative and statistically significant relationship between the import shock and overall Black earnings. They estimate that for every percentage point increase in
import exposure in the exposed sector, overall Black earnings are reduced by 3.84 percentage points. A percentage point increase in import exposure in the non-exposed tradable industries decreased Black earnings by 4.75 percentage points. Their estimates show that import competition from China had a significant and adverse impact specifically on Black earnings in the exposed industries and in the non-exposed tradable industries, even though it did not shift overall wages.

**IMPLICATIONS OF LASTING EFFECTS ON BLACK WORKERS AND THE ECONOMY**

These findings from Spriggs et al. confirm what Black workers already know. Systemic racism in our economy ensures that Black workers will endure worse outcomes than their white counterparts because of bad policy decisions and power hoarding by the wealthy elite at the expense of economic security for all people. These results shed light on the need to incorporate disaggregated data by race when assessing the impact of trade, as well as the perspectives and lived experiences of Black workers. This can help inform a much-needed restructuring of our current corporate-captured trade policies.

**Lived Experiences of Black Workers in Manufacturing**

While these numbers may be new, the stories that Black workers have been telling about their experiences in the manufacturing sector are not. One former manufacturing worker in Dayton, Ohio, Barbara Philpot, talked about seeing the impact of trade policies in her hometown: “I saw people that I worked side by side with lose everything. When people lost these jobs, their income was slashed more than half...people were starting basically from ground zero.” Once the manufacturing plant she worked at was closed, the only available jobs were minimum wage service jobs. People were taking pay cuts from $28 an hour to $7 or $8 an hour—not even a third of the wages they’d previously made at the GM plant.

Kenneth Dudley of Salem, Virginia, notes how the closing of the GE manufacturing plant in Roanoke devastated the local economy: “Not having GE here has hurt the community across the cities of Salem and Roanoke...a lot of good people are now unemployed or settling for half of what they previously made. Some people have second and third jobs just to try to make a living.”

Timi Jernigan’s story reminds us of the tangible effects of trade policies on working people. Laid off from his manufacturing job at DMAX in Dayton, Ohio in 2008, he was later rehired by a new manufacturing firm, Fuyao Glass Company. Fuyao was brought to the area in July of 2015 by a $10 million state tax incentive—a tax break funded by local tax dollars. Unlike the DMAX plant, Fuyao was not unionized.
Mr. Jernigan was paid a fraction of what he had made at DMAX, and working conditions were extremely dangerous. He said that Fuyao “did what they needed to do to keep OSHA at arm’s length,” and did the bare minimum in regards to safety standards, often at the expense of worker safety. “They wouldn’t have gotten away with half of what they had gotten away with if they were unionized.” Ultimately, Mr. Jernigan left his job at Fuyao after two years because of the working conditions.

In Mr. Jernigan’s community, and in communities like it all over the United States, the disappearance of manufacturing jobs harmed local economies, created worse job quality and safety, lowered workers’ dignity, and ultimately harmed the economic security of the region.

BUILDING TOWARD MORE EQUITABLE TRADE POLICY

U.S. trade policies have failed many workers across the country, and disproportionately failed Black workers. Low wages and weak labor and environmental standards harm and undercut workers both at home and abroad.

U.S. trade policies must prioritize building worker power and strengthening labor and environmental standards domestically and globally. A new vision for trade policy must be accompanied by bold investments in disadvantaged and deindustrialized areas that have been hurt most by our current trade policy regime. The recommendations below can provide a start for this reform, and should be taken as supplementary to a much needed new vision and framework for trade and broader economic policy that centers workers and communities to build a resilient economy for us all.

Equitable assessments of trade policy

Agencies designated to assess the impact of trade policies should be more explicit about assessing the outcomes on Black communities and other marginalized groups. Projected gains from trade, commonly calculated by general equilibrium models, have failed to capture these important nuances of the economic impact of trade on communities of color. These models miss critical labor market frictions by failing to include demographic data. Congress must ensure that any new grant of trade authority provided after fast track authority expires in July 2021 has a requirement that assessments of trade policies and agreements include racial and ethnic demographic information.

Though not exhaustive, this change would allow for greater transparency in policymaking when it comes to potential racial disparities. This is critical as policymakers contemplate solutions for all people, in particular those who are most vulnerable to labor market inequities.
Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) reform

The Department of Labor’s Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program is one of the methods through which the government has attempted to address the impacts of trade-related job loss. The TAA seeks to “provide adversely affected workers with opportunities to obtain the skills, credentials, resources, and support necessary to (re)build skills for future jobs,” including through “training, employment and case management services, job search allowances, relocation allowances, and income support in the form of Trade Readjustment Allowances (TRA).” Analysis of the effectiveness of TAA has found the program to be inadequate because of its low replacement wage rates and how small the program is relative to the scale of dislocations caused by trade.

New analysis from Public Citizen found that the vast majority of TAA-certified trade-related job losses occur in states that are disproportionately Black and Latinx. The 15 states that are home to 58 percent of the Black population account for 2.9 million of the 4 million total manufacturing job losses during the NAFTA-WTO era. That means that overall, these states accounted for 57 percent of all TAA-certified trade-related job losses during this period.

TAA is set to expire at the end of June and if it is not renewed before then it will revert to an older version of the program with more limited eligibility and benefit provisions, and then be fully phased out by 2022.

Policymakers must urgently reauthorize and reform TAA to increase its scope, expand funds and outreach, make it easier for workers to get into the program, and ensure that the most marginalized workers, like Black workers, are benefiting from the program. Reforms should include provisions that:

• Allow individuals more time on TAA if needed;
• Require information on disaggregated outcomes by race, gender, and ethnicity;
• Direct TAA funding to community-based organizations and future TAA Community College Industry Partnership Grants; and
• Require the inclusion of diversity, equity, and inclusion training for employer partners.

CONCLUSION

National attention on the loss of manufacturing jobs across the country too often focuses only on white, Midwestern workers. It fails to center those who are most impacted—Black workers who are facing diminished wages and are stripped of access to one of the few industries that provide economic security and access to the second highest-paying sectors.

And our bad trade policies aren’t just bad for Black manufacturing workers; they impact Black workers’ broader economic mobility, stability, and security. This is detrimental to economic outcomes for Black people and our economy as a whole. When bad trade policies harm the
manufacturing sector in the U.S. without providing additional support for people to deal with joblessness, and when systemic racism ensures that Black workers bear a bigger brunt of this impact than white workers, our policies become an affront to economic opportunity and security for Black people writ large. Deepening inequality only serves to further destabilize our economy.

The U.S. trade agenda has significant potential to build powerful foundations for a strong economy for us all, while centering the economic experiences of Black workers. It’s past time we do just that.

A continuation of the status quo is not inevitable. Trade policies can foster economic security and spur economic growth while uplifting families at home and abroad. Trade policies have the potential to build union jobs not just in the U.S., but around the world, and generate living wages, worker protections, and better working conditions. And while these goals are imperative on their own, supporting these reforms can also lead to shared economic prosperity.

Policy makers have an opportunity to live up to their stated values: build and strengthen economic security for all people, and especially those who are structurally disadvantaged in the labor market. The U.S. trade agenda has significant potential to build powerful foundations for a strong economy for us all, while centering the economic experiences of Black workers. It’s past time we do just that.

At the time of writing, we continue to experience a devastating economic crisis and pandemic, and discussions loom large about what recovery will look like. These findings offer yet another reminder to center the economic experiences of those who are too often left out of the narrative in policies for a recovery. Let’s not repeat centuries of anti-Black exclusionary policies that have led to the eternal question: “recovery for whom?” We can no longer afford to make policy choices that rely on Black workers to bear disproportionate burden and harm.
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