

## OPINION

## Clinton Won the Battle, Sanders the War

By Juan Williams

Bill Clinton took Democrats to the political middle. He met with Republicans to pass welfare-to-work laws and put more police on the streets. Barack Obama steered the party leftward with “change we can believe in.” He promised to end long-running wars, deliver an economic recovery, offer medical coverage to the uninsured and unify an increasingly diverse nation.

Hillary Clinton will claim the Democratic nomination this week in Philadelphia, but the party is no longer defined by its standard-bearer. The energy rests instead with a rising generation of Democrats excited to use activist government to protect them in anxious economic times.

### Hillary is living in Bernie’s party. So she backs free college and a ‘public option’ while jettisoning trade and charter schools.

Older Democrats and minority voters provided a “firewall” that allowed Mrs. Clinton to defeat her rival in the primaries, Sen. Bernie Sanders. Democrats who call themselves “somewhat liberal” went for Hillary by 13 percentage points, according to exit poll data analyzed by Public Opinion Strategies. “Moderates” backed her by 23 percentage points. But among the quarter of Democrats who see themselves as “very liberal,” she ran even with the socialist.

Bernie Sanders and his activist supporters have moved Mrs. Clinton and the party’s platform to the left. The result is that the Democrats have taken on an identity that comes from a new base: voters un-

der 40 who have no problem with Mr. Sanders’s socialist vision. A 2015 study by the Pew Research Center found that 51% of millennials “identify as Democrats or lean Democratic,” compared with only 35% for Republicans. Two-fifths of millennials are people of color and immigrants.

This is not your father’s—or even your older sister’s—Democratic Party. It is far more left-leaning than under Bill Clinton or President Obama.

Almost 60% of Democratic voters agree that “socialism has a positive” impact on society, according to a February poll by OnMessage Inc. and the American Action Network. In Iowa 43% of Democrats said in January that they would use the word “socialist” to describe themselves, a survey by the Des Moines Register and Bloomberg Politics found.

Forty-seven percent of Democrats told Gallup last year that they are both “socially liberal and economically moderate/liberal”—the highest level in the poll’s history. In 2001 only 30% of Democrats described themselves that way. Between 2000 and 2015 the percentage of “Democratic and Democratic-leaning registered voters” who consider themselves liberal has gone up to 42% from 27%, according to a Pew study in February.

Mrs. Clinton has been running to the front of this liberal parade. This month she wrapped her arms around one of Mr. Sanders’s biggest causes by backing tuition-free college at in-state public universities for families making less than \$125,000 a year.

She broke with Mr. Obama by calling for repeal of the so-called Cadillac tax on health-insurance plans, a priority for labor unions. She gave a sop to the teachers unions by backtracking on her decades-old support for charter schools. It is clear that in this new liberal order of Democratic politics,



Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders in Portsmouth, N.H., at a July 12 rally where the Vermont senator endorsed her presidential bid.

the unions will be the enforcers.

Mrs. Clinton is now even backing a “public option”—a Medicare-style government program to compete against private insurance companies. This idea was so radioactive during the debate over the Affordable Care Act that Democrats jettisoned it for fear of being tarred as proponents of socialized medicine.

With the implicit support of Mrs. Clinton and her allies, the Sanders coalition added language to the Democratic platform calling to raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour, put a price on climate-altering emissions like carbon, and abolish the death penalty.

The party also stripped out language supporting the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal, which Mr. Sanders opposed during the campaign. Mrs. Clinton had once praised the deal a “gold standard,” but last fall she withdrew her support.

“It is no secret that Hillary Clin-

ton and I disagree on a number of issues,” Mr. Sanders said this month as he endorsed her in New Hampshire. He correctly noted that the threat of a divided party had forced Mrs. Clinton to accept “the most progressive platform in the history of the Democratic Party.”

Mr. Sanders then urged his supporters to keep the pressure on: “Our job now is to see that platform implemented by a Democratic Senate, a Democratic House and a Hillary Clinton presidency—and I am going to do everything I can to make that happen.” The Vermonter has a stronger hand to play after the success of his populist campaign.

Meanwhile, Democrats in Congress have become more liberal—the mirror image of what has happened to the GOP. Democratic incumbents who were defeated during the Obama years were largely centrists from red states: Sens. Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Mark Pryor of

Arkansas and Mark Begich of Alaska.

After the 2012 election, much was written, including by me, about whether the Obama coalition of young people, blacks, Hispanics, gays and single women would keep Democrats in the White House for the near future. No one predicted that first of these core constituencies, young people, would become so vocally liberal.

A final factor is the GOP’s strategy of unrelenting obstructionism against President Obama, which sparked a low-grade fury among the left wing. This is why Monday night’s convention speaker, Sen. Elizabeth Warren, gets hundreds of thousands of views every time she posts a fiery speech on YouTube.

Senate Republicans have refused to have a hearing, much less a vote, on Merrick Garland, President Obama’s nominee to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court. Majority Leader Mitch McConnell even refused to give Mr. Garland the courtesy of a simple introductory meeting.

The result is that the bare-knuckle, activist-driven, take-to-the-streets politics of Occupy Wall Street and Black Lives Matter is becoming the rule among Democrats. This month Senate Democrats blocked Republican efforts to defund so-called sanctuary cities and impose harsh prison sentences on undocumented immigrants.

History will record this week’s convention as a coming-of-age for a new era of liberal Democratic politics. This is now Bernie Sanders’s party: Other Democrats—including Hillary Clinton—are merely living in it.

*Mr. Williams, a political analyst for Fox News and columnist for the Hill, is the author of “We the People: The Modern-Day Figures Who Have Reshaped and Affirmed the Founding Fathers’ Vision of America” (Crown, 2016).*

## Taiwan Should Tread Carefully on South China Sea Ruling

By Lynn Kuok

Following the arbitration award earlier this month in *Philippines v. China*, much of the media attention has focused on Beijing’s defiant reaction to the verdict. Less scrutiny has been paid to the response from Taiwan, even though Taiwan’s claims in the region are, at least on paper, almost identical.

In its decision, the tribunal set up in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea struck down the legitimacy of China’s assertion to the large area of the South China Sea encircled by Beijing’s so-called nine-dashed line. It also found that none of the features in the Spratly Islands, located just west of the Philippines, are islands capable of generating extended maritime zones.

The dashed line appears on both Chinese and Taiwanese maps. Taiwan also claims the four groups of features in the South China Sea, as well as “their surrounding waters in accordance with international law.” In addition, Taiwan has been in control

of the largest natural feature in the Spratlys, Itu Aba, since it first stationed personnel there in 1956.

Unlike China, Taiwan has, since around 2014, taken steps to clarify that it is only claiming maritime zones from land features in accordance with the convention. It has refrained from mention of the dashed line in official statements.

In 2015, Taiwan further made clear that it claims that Itu Aba is an island that can sustain human habitation or economic life on its own, and therefore entitled to a 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ).

The day after the tribunal issued its decision, Taiwan sought to make a display of its “resolve in defending the national interest,” to use Taiwanese President Tsai Ing-wen’s words. It sent a warship to the area to patrol the region. A week later a group of lawmakers visited Itu Aba.

Such actions will only heighten already fraught tensions. But it doesn’t put Taiwan on the wrong side of the law. The tribunal didn’t rule on sovereignty over Itu Aba or any other feature in the South

China Sea. And all user states, including their warships, enjoy innocent passage in a feature’s territorial sea.

More problematic was Taiwan’s statement immediately following the award decrying it as “com-

### Taipei’s claims are similar to Beijing’s. How it responds to the tribunal’s decision could put it at odds with its U.S. ally.

pletely unacceptable.” It also undermines Taipei’s efforts to carve out a position on the South China Sea that is distinct from Beijing’s. More fundamentally, it damages Taiwan’s reputation as a law-abiding member of international society.

Given that Taiwan wasn’t a party to the legal proceedings at The Hague, a mere statement that the award has “no binding force except between the parties” would have sufficed to express Taipei’s reservations.

Taiwan’s criticism that the tribunal overstepped its authority by ruling on the status of Itu Aba and other features not included in the Philippines’ original claim is unwarranted. The tribunal had to ascertain the status of the features and their maritime entitlements in order to determine if the court had jurisdiction to rule on the lawfulness of certain Chinese activities.

Taipei’s suggestion that its lack of formal participation in proceedings prejudiced its position is also uncalled for. The tribunal undertook an extensive examination of law and fact, including conducting its own exhaustive search of historical archives.

In addition, the tribunal carefully considered arguments and evidence that Taipei eventually made public. Taiwan had ample opportunity to put its best case forward for the tribunal’s consideration.

In future it is important for Taipei to ensure that its actions are consistent with the tribunal’s decision, even though it isn’t technically binding on Taiwan. Such a course wouldn’t require Taiwan give up its

claim to sovereignty over Itu Aba or any of the land features in the South China Sea.

It would, however, require that Taiwan desist from claiming an EEZ around Itu Aba or acting as if it is entitled to one. This means not fishing beyond 12 nautical miles of Itu Aba, or drilling or preventing the Philippines from drilling for oil around Reed Bank, which the tribunal determined falls within the Philippines’ EEZ.

Ultimately, Taipei must ask itself if it is worthwhile to defend a position that is indefensible in law, and that might cause open conflict with other claimants and put Taiwan at odds with its principal ally, the U.S. It isn’t too late for Taiwan to uphold its reputation as a supporter of international law. It is a reputation that has enabled Taiwan to navigate its precarious international position in the past and will help it do so into the future.

*Ms. Kuok is a nonresident fellow at the Brookings Institution and a visiting fellow at Harvard Law School.*

## Wharton Grad Trump Fails Economics



AMERICAS  
By Mary Anastasia O’Grady

Nationwide fear of the reckless and shady Hillary Clinton as the next U.S. commander in chief—and at least a 12-year streak of Democrats in the White House—means that a Republican presidential victory in November cannot be ruled out. But why, with a rival so highly unlikely, is GOP candidate Donald Trump unable to excite a wider number of voters?

One glaring problem is that Mr. Trump, who has an undergraduate

degree from the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School, fails economics. Exhibit A is his promise to shred the North American Free Trade Agreement (Nafta) on the grounds that Mexico, his favorite bête noire, is stealing American jobs. It is technology, not free trade, that is behind the shrinking number of U.S. manufacturing jobs.

Beating Nafta like a piñata worked in the Republican primary. But it is likely to hurt Mr. Trump and GOP candidates further down the ticket in the general election. Mexico is, after all, America’s third-largest trading partner and second-largest export market.

Mr. Trump’s trade tirades undermine his credibility with voters who know better. And that’s a lot of voters. Americans from every walk of life are beneficiaries of U.S. global trade.

Indiana, the home of GOP vice-presidential candidate Gov. Mike Pence, exported some \$4.8 billion of goods to Mexico in 2015, making it the state’s second-largest export market. That included \$1.5 billion in transportation equipment, \$1.4 billion in machinery and \$88 million in corn-fructose products. More than 120,000 Hoosier jobs depend on trade with Mexico.

Exports to Mexico exceeded \$1 billion in 31 states in 2015. It’s the largest export market for Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas. It ranks second for 25 other states.

To hear the Trump campaign tell it, American workers who don’t want to increase protectionism are coddled members of the “elite.” Yet the majority of people employed in today’s globally connected, tech-driven U.S. economy hail from middle-class families who made financial sacrifices to prepare them to compete in the modern workforce. It’s dispiriting to hear the GOP nominee denigrate achievers and try to pit Americans against one another.

Higher tariffs on U.S. imports will be passed on to American consumers, many of whom are already hurting economically due to the sluggish Obama recovery. Trade wars will also damage U.S. competitiveness. As former Mexican deputy trade minister Luis de la Calle explained in a conference call to investors in New

York earlier this month, Carrier Corp.’s production move to Mexico from Indiana—much-assailed by Mr. Trump—means that the company can survive Asian competition and can retain U.S. jobs in research, development, marketing and high-end components.

### Technology, not free trade, explains the loss of most middle-class jobs.

Perhaps the biggest lie that Mr. Trump peddles is that higher tariffs can restore lost U.S. manufacturing jobs. They won’t, and to suggest otherwise is a cruel hoax.

In a recent Foreign Affairs magazine essay titled “The Truth About Trade,” Dartmouth economist Douglas Irwin observes that while technology has “enabled vast productivity and efficiency improvements,” it has “also made many blue-collar jobs obsolete.” Mr. Irwin cites a study by the Center for Business and Economic Research at Ball State University, which “found that productivity growth accounted for more than 85 percent of the job loss in manufacturing between 2000 and 2010, a period when employment in that sector fell by 5.6 million.” This 85% compares, according to the study, with 13% of job losses attributed to trade during the same period. In other words, to bring most jobs back, Mr. Trump would have to outlaw mechanization. Will Mr. Pence break the

news to Indiana farmers?

In a paper published last summer in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, MIT economist David Autor unpacks the reason automation has hit the middle-class hard. He observes that in order to write code for a task, a programmer must be able to “enunciate the explicit ‘rules’ or procedures” necessary to do it. But tasks understood by humans “tacitly” aren’t easy to automate. Mr. Autor calls this constraint “Polanyi’s paradox” after the Hungarian-born chemist and economist who observed that “we know more than we can tell.”

It is “high-education” and “low-education” jobs—requiring “interpersonal interaction, flexibility, adaptability and problem solving”—that are most difficult to automate Mr. Autor notes. Traditional middle-education jobs have been the easiest to replace with technology.

Yet there is also strong evidence of adaptation in the middle of the pack. Mr. Autor cites a couple of economists who have identified evidence of new job creation for this group. The catch, he says, is that “human capital investment must be at the heart of any long-term strategy for producing skills that are complemented by rather than substituted for by technological change.”

Protectionism is populist demagoguery and will only impoverish the middle class. Many Americans see through Mr. Trump’s false promises, which is one reason he’s in a tight race despite Hillary’s high negatives.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

PUBLISHED SINCE 1889 BY DOW JONES & COMPANY

Rupert Murdoch  
Executive Chairman, News Corp

Gerard Baker  
Editor in Chief

Rebecca Blumenstein, Matthew J. Murray  
Deputy Editors in Chief

DEPUTY MANAGING EDITORS:

Michael W. Miller, Senior Deputy;  
Thorold Barker, Europe; Paul Beckett, Asia;  
Christine Glancey, Operations; Jennifer J. Hicks,  
Digital; Neal Lipschutz, Standards; Alex Martin,  
News; Ann Podd, Initiatives; Andrew Regal, Video;  
Matthew Rose, Enterprise; Stephen Wisniewski,  
Professional News; Jessica Yu, Visuals

Paul A. Gigot, Editor of the Editorial Page;

Daniel Henninger, Deputy Editor, Editorial Page

WALL STREET JOURNAL MANAGEMENT:

Trevor Fellows, Head of Global Sales;

Chris Collins, Advertising;

Suzi Watford, Marketing and Circulation;

Joseph B. Vincent, Operations;

Larry L. Hoffman, Production

Robert Thomson  
Chief Executive Officer, News Corp

William Lewis  
Chief Executive Officer and Publisher

DOW JONES MANAGEMENT:

Ashley Huston, Chief Communications Officer;

Paul Meller, Chief Technology Officer;

Mark Musgrave, Chief People Officer;

Edward Roussel, Chief Innovation Officer;

Anna Sedgley, Chief Financial Officer;

Katie Vanneck-Smith, Chief Customer Officer

OPERATING EXECUTIVES:

Jason P. Conti, General Counsel;

Nancy McNeill, Corporate Sales;

Steve Grycak, Customer Service;

Jonathan Wright, International;

DJ Media Group:

Almar Latour, Publisher; Kenneth Breen,

Commercial; Edwin A. Finn, Jr., Barron’s;

Professional Information Business;

Christopher Lloyd, Head;

Ingrid Verschuren, Deputy Head

DOW JONES  
News Corp

EDITORIAL AND CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS:  
1211 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y., 10036  
Telephone 1-800-DOWJONES