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 Negative: Taiwan joins IPEF - Bad Idea

EXTRA-TOPICALITY

1. Only 1/4 of IPEF is topical

Link: IPEF has 4 components ("pillars"). Three of them are not "trade" (1 Supply chain resilience. 2 Infrastructure, clean energy & decarbonization. 3 Tax and anti-corruption)

Doug Palmer 2022 (journalist) 23 May 2022 "Taiwan excluded from Biden's 13-nation Indo-Pacific trade plan" POLITICO (accessed 7 Oct 2022) https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-trade/2022/05/23/taiwan-excluded-from-bidens-13-nation-indo-pacific-trade-plan-00034316 (brackets added)

Still some questions: The Commerce Department is leading negotiations on three “pillars” of the proposed agreement: supply chain resilience; infrastructure, clean energy, and decarbonization; and tax and anti-corruption. USTR [US Trade Representative] is spearheading the fourth focused on fair and resilient trade, which includes digital trade, labor, environment, agriculture and other areas.

Violation: No AFF advocacy power beyond the resolution

AFF cannot advocate, because they cannot enact, policies that go beyond the wording of the resolution. The resolution exists to ensure fair and limited debate topics. Letting Affirmatives add things in addition to the resolution is abusive and should not be allowed. The most AFF could do in this round would be to invite Taiwan to do 1/4 of IPEF (the trade part). But none of their evidence talks about that, so they have no evidence to support affirming this resolution.

Impact: Negative ballot

Teaching Affirmatives to respect the resolution is an important part of team policy debate and essential to fairness in the round. The best way to teach them is to award a Negative ballot as an incentive for them to rewrite their plan so that it actually fits the resolution.

INHERENCY

1. Status Quo trade with Taiwan - doing just fine

Don't need AFF Plan: Solid and growing trade with Taiwan in Status Quo

**Yao-Yuan Yeh**, **Charles K. S. Wu**, **Fang-Yu Chen**, and **Austin Horng-En Wang 2022. (**Yao-Yuan Yeh, chair and associate prof. in the Dept of International Studies & Modern Languages at Univ of St Thomas, Houston. Charles K. S. Wu, assistant professor of political science at Univ of South Alabama. Fang-Yu Chen, assistant professor of political science at Soochow University, Taiwan. Austin Horng-En Wang, assistant professor of political science at Univ of Nevada **)** Why Was Taiwan Left Out of the US-Led IPEF? 25 May 2022 THE DIPLOMAT (accessed 7 Oct 2022) https://thediplomat.com/2022/05/why-was-taiwan-left-out-of-the-us-led-ipef/

The current Biden administration has been no less supportive of Taiwan than the previous Trump administration. For instance, in 2021, Taiwanese firms received [$200.1 billion in U.S. export orders](https://sgp.fas.org/crs/row/IF10256.pdf), an increase of close to 50 percent from just a few years ago. The U.S. is also keenly aware of the important role that Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Corporation (TSMC) plays in helping the U.S. stand out in technological competition with China. The firm provides more than [90](https://www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2022/01/01/2003770517#:~:text=TSMC%20accounts%20for%20more%20than,of%20their%20increasingly%20tense%20rivalry.) percent of global advanced semiconductor production.

2. Initiative on 21st Century Trade

Initiative on 21st Century Trade does as much, or as little, for Taiwan as IPEF would

Tori Smith 2022. (master’s degree in International Commerce and Policy with a concentration in Global Finance, Investment and Trade from George Mason University) 8 June 2022 "WHITE HOUSE’S NEW INITIATIVE WITH TAIWAN FALLS SHORT OF A FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (accessed 7 Oct 2022) "<https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/white-houses-new-initiative-with-taiwan-falls-short-of-a-free-trade-agreement/#ixzz7h5S1C3g8>

The Initiative on 21st Century Trade will cover 11 areas of economic and trade policy, ranging from agriculture regulations to standards for state-owned enterprises. Nine of the 11 areas for negotiation in this new initiative would overlap with those of the IPEF. Finally, like the IPEF, this new initiative does not include negotiations on market access, limiting the potential for substantive economic benefit from the discussions.

3. Three other initiatives with Taiwan, all doing it too

TIFA, EPPD and TTIC are all doing economic dialog with Taiwan

Tori Smith 2022. (master’s degree in International Commerce and Policy with a concentration in Global Finance, Investment and Trade from George Mason University) 8 June 2022 "WHITE HOUSE’S NEW INITIATIVE WITH TAIWAN FALLS SHORT OF A FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (accessed 7 Oct 2022) "<https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/white-houses-new-initiative-with-taiwan-falls-short-of-a-free-trade-agreement/#ixzz7h5S1C3g8>

The TIFA [Trade & Investment Framework Agreement] was established to provide a forum for removing barriers to trade and investment. The most recent TIFA talks were held by the Biden Administration in June 2021. The U.S. State Department held the second annual [U.S.-Taiwan Economic Prosperity Partnership Dialogue](https://www.state.gov/2021-u-s-taiwan-economic-prosperity-partnership-dialogue-eppd/#:~:text=The%20dialogue%20featured%20extensive%20discussions,of%20science%20and%20technology%20fields.) (EPPD) in November 2021. The purpose of the EPPD is to discuss “supply chain resiliency, countering economic coercion, promoting the digital economy, strengthening 5G network security, and advancing collaboration in a variety of science and technology fields.” Additionally, the U.S. Department of Commerce announced in December 2021 the [Technology Trade and Investment Collaboration](https://www.commerce.gov/news/press-releases/2021/12/secretary-commerce-gina-m-raimondo-holds-introductory-call-taiwan) (TTIC), which seeks to “develop commercial programs and explore actions to strengthen critical supply chains.” In short, there is no lack of forums for economic dialogue between the United States and Taiwan.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. No harm to US/Taiwan relations

Makes sense to not-invite Taiwan due to the consequences, and it won't hurt US/Taiwan relations

**Yao-Yuan Yeh**, **Charles K. S. Wu**, **Fang-Yu Chen**, and **Austin Horng-En Wang 2022. (**Yao-Yuan Yeh, chair and associate prof. in the Dept of International Studies & Modern Languages at Univ of St Thomas, Houston. Charles K. S. Wu, assistant professor of political science at Univ of South Alabama. Fang-Yu Chen, assistant professor of political science at Soochow University, Taiwan. Austin Horng-En Wang, assistant professor of political science at Univ of Nevada **)** Why Was Taiwan Left Out of the US-Led IPEF? 25 May 2022 THE DIPLOMAT (accessed 7 Oct 2022) https://thediplomat.com/2022/05/why-was-taiwan-left-out-of-the-us-led-ipef/

It is sensible that the U.S. would not want the repercussions of Taiwan’s participation to mask the goals of IPEF. However, it is incorrect to assume that we will witness a rift in Taiwan-U.S. relations because of this. The U.S. and Taiwan share numerous commonalities, especially in facing the threat of China.

SOLVENCY

1. IPEF will accomplish nothing

IPEF will not accomplish anything. It's just political talk

Tom Fowdy 2022 (British political and international relations analyst and a graduate of Durham and Oxford universities) 24 May 2022 (accessed 7 Oct 2022) " The US 'Indo Pacific' Framework Will Fail, Here's Why" https://www.yicaiglobal.com/opinion/tom.fowdy/the-us-indo-pacific-framework-will-fail-here-why

On Monday whilst visiting Japan, US President Joe Biden launched the “Indo-Pacific Economic Framework” an initiative that claims to increase American economic engagement in Asia with the undisguised geopolitical of attempting to advance geopolitical containment of China. The White House has marketed the framework as aiming to “set the rules” of the region concerning supply chains, investment, and technology. However, the proposal has already been widely criticized by numerous voices precisely because, in practice, it literally commits or promises to deliver nothing substantial at all. The IPEF is in fact an initiative that is purely rhetorical, as opposed to institutional or legal, and expects its members to make commitments against the largest economy in the Asian region in return for absolutely nothing. Based on its obviously political premise pushing against economic realities, it is obvious early on those expectations will be low and that the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework will not amount to much if anything at all.

IPEF is limited, hollow, useless, ignorant and vain

Tom Fowdy 2022 (British political and international relations analyst and a graduate of Durham and Oxford universities) 24 May 2022 (accessed 7 Oct 2022) " The US 'Indo Pacific' Framework Will Fail, Here's Why" https://www.yicaiglobal.com/opinion/tom.fowdy/the-us-indo-pacific-framework-will-fail-here-why

Given this, the IPEF will be limited in its results and not least its ability to coordinate anything, save in the unlikely event Washington is prepared to throw trillions at it. It is evident from day one countries involved in it will not sign up for Anti-China commitments or pledges. The United States recognizes it is of course losing the economic game in Asia against China but is unwilling nonetheless to make serious compromises because of the “America First” consensus ruling at home. As a result, this initiative is a bottom-of-the-barrel and face-saving compromise to try and give the impression it is committed to the region. Yet this initiative is for the most part hollow, useless, and even ignorant of regional trends in a vain attempt at geopolitics.

2. No commitments or decisions

Nobody knows what will be in IPEF, what countries will be in it, or what the negotiations will end up with

Doug Palmer 2022 (journalist) 23 May 2022 "Taiwan excluded from Biden's 13-nation Indo-Pacific trade plan" POLITICO (accessed 7 Oct 2022) https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-trade/2022/05/23/taiwan-excluded-from-bidens-13-nation-indo-pacific-trade-plan-00034316 (brackets added)

Still some questions: The Commerce Department is leading negotiations on three “pillars” of the proposed agreement: supply chain resilience; infrastructure, clean energy, and decarbonization; and tax and anti-corruption. USTR [US Trade Representative] is spearheading the fourth focused on fair and resilient trade, which includes digital trade, labor, environment, agriculture and other areas. It’s still not clear which countries are participating in which modules or whether any portion of the deal will be submitted to Congress for a vote, as would occur with a more traditional free trade agreement. “Let's see where these negotiations take us,” U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai said during a call with reporters on Sunday.

3. No tariff benefits

IPEF won't change tariffs at all, because Biden doesn't believe there's much room for improvement

Doug Palmer 2022 (journalist) 23 May 2022 "Taiwan excluded from Biden's 13-nation Indo-Pacific trade plan" POLITICO (accessed 7 Oct 2022) https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-trade/2022/05/23/taiwan-excluded-from-bidens-13-nation-indo-pacific-trade-plan-00034316

**No tariffs on the table:** Administration officials defended the administration’s decision not to include tariff cuts as part of the discussion, noting that the U.S. trade-weighted average tariff is already a low 2.4 percent so it has little more to give in that area. That figure measures the value of tariff revenue divided by total goods imports. It’s somewhat skewed because the higher the tariff on a good, the less likely it is to be imported.

4. Neutralize IPEF

Including Taiwan would motivate other countries not to participate in IPEF or distract it from effective work

**Yao-Yuan Yeh**, **Charles K. S. Wu**, **Fang-Yu Chen**, and **Austin Horng-En Wang 2022. (**Yao-Yuan Yeh, chair and associate prof. in the Dept of International Studies & Modern Languages at Univ of St Thomas, Houston. Charles K. S. Wu, assistant professor of political science at Univ of South Alabama. Fang-Yu Chen, assistant professor of political science at Soochow University, Taiwan. Austin Horng-En Wang, assistant professor of political science at Univ of Nevada **)** Why Was Taiwan Left Out of the US-Led IPEF? 25 May 2022 THE DIPLOMAT (accessed 7 Oct 2022) https://thediplomat.com/2022/05/why-was-taiwan-left-out-of-the-us-led-ipef/

The U.S. is also hedging against potential blowback from Beijing, as most Indo-Pacific nations are still trying to avoid “picking sides” in the competition. For many of China’s neighbors, especially countries in Southeast Asia, it is imperative to maintain access to China’s market. Seven of the 10 ASEAN members [joined IPEF’s launch](https://thediplomat.com/2022/05/southeast-asian-nations-roll-the-dice-on-bidens-indo-pacific-framework/); they may have thought twice if the event turned into a statement on Taiwan’s international status. Thus, including Taiwan in the first round of countries participating in IPEF could have embroiled the U.S. in a controversy over Taiwan’s representation, and the U.S. would not want the focus of the framework to be overshadowed.

Not-including Taiwan is what ensures the participation of other nations

Tori Smith 2022. (master’s degree in International Commerce and Policy with a concentration in Global Finance, Investment and Trade from George Mason University) 8 June 2022 "WHITE HOUSE’S NEW INITIATIVE WITH TAIWAN FALLS SHORT OF A FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (accessed 7 Oct 2022) "<https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/white-houses-new-initiative-with-taiwan-falls-short-of-a-free-trade-agreement/#ixzz7h5S1C3g8>

Scholars at the Center for Strategic and International Studies [suggested](https://www.csis.org/analysis/quick-take-indo-pacific-economic-framework-launch) “the island was ultimately left out of the framework to secure the participation of other South and Southeast Asian countries reluctant to antagonize Beijing.” This assessment has merit. Many of the countries included in the IPEF rely heavily on trade with China and the mainland’s willingness to deploy economic coercion measures is on their radar.

5. Can't succeed without China

IPEF's goal is to isolate China, but it's guaranteed to fail without China because it's the largest trading nation in the world

Tom Fowdy 2022 (British political and international relations analyst and a graduate of Durham and Oxford universities) 24 May 2022 (accessed 7 Oct 2022) " The US 'Indo Pacific' Framework Will Fail, Here's Why" https://www.yicaiglobal.com/opinion/tom.fowdy/the-us-indo-pacific-framework-will-fail-here-why

The IPEF is based on a premise that Beijing can simply be isolated or ignored and that its own economic clout cannot feasibly be a “rule setter” if the United States is calling the shots. This is without even considering the fact that the IPEF does not truly offer anything economically whatsoever. It pledges no investment, no market access, no institutions, no treaties, nothing. Its only substance is the manifestation of prime American arrogance and hubris, believing that China, the largest trading nation in the region, can somehow be isolated from regional chains. If there is one thing that manifests the political weakness and lack of promise from the project, it’s the fact that the US cannot even persuade its participants to admit Taiwan as a member to the body, despite its obvious Anti-China agenda, because of fear of yes… upsetting China, illustrating of course that the nations who participate in it have no intention to cross China’s red lines, because they have to live with China as a neighbour and economic partner. It also adds another dimension as to why a China-exclusive supply chain is impossible.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Ticking off China

Link: IPEF invitation would anger China

Doug Palmer 2022 (journalist) 23 May 2022 "Taiwan excluded from Biden's 13-nation Indo-Pacific trade plan" POLITICO (accessed 7 Oct 2022) https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-trade/2022/05/23/taiwan-excluded-from-bidens-13-nation-indo-pacific-trade-plan-00034316

Taiwan left out: Despite [an appeal last week from 52 senators](https://www.manchin.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/manchin-capito-lead-52-bipartisan-senators-in-pressing-biden-administration-to-include-taiwan-in-indo-pacific-economic-framework) that Taiwan be allowed to join the talks, it was left out, presumably because that would anger China and discourage other countries from participating.

Link: Trade deals with Taiwan anger the mainland China government, which sees it as promoting independence for Taiwan

Doug Palmer 2022 (journalist) POLITICO 4 July 2022 "Taiwan sees U.S. trade deal as vital to maintaining its democracy" (accessed 15 Sept 2022) https://www.politico.com/news/2022/07/04/taiwan-sees-u-s-trade-deal-as-vital-00043556

Earlier this week, the United States and Taiwan formally launched talks on the new U.S.-Taiwan Initiative on 21st-Century Trade, despite Beijing’s strong objection. “China firmly opposes all forms of official interaction between the Taiwan region and countries having diplomatic ties with China, including negotiating or concluding agreements with implications of sovereignty and of official nature,” Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Zhao Lijian said Tuesday. Taiwan’s political leaders “need to give up on the idea that they could seek independence with U.S. support. Otherwise the higher they jump, the harder they will fall,” Zhao said.

Link/Uniqueness: Status Quo specifically avoids pushing China too far on trade deals with Taiwan

Associated Press 2022 (journalists Josh Boak, Aamer Madhani and Zeke Miller) 23 May 2022 "Biden: US would intervene with military to defend Taiwan" (accessed 15 Sept 2022) https://apnews.com/article/russia-ukraine-biden-taiwan-china-4fb0ad0567ed5bbe46c01dd758e6c62b

White House national security adviser Jake Sullivan confirmed Sunday that Taiwan isn’t among the governments signed up for the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework, which is meant to allow the U.S. to work more closely with key Asian economies on issues like supply chains, digital trade, clean energy and anticorruption. Inclusion of Taiwan would have irked China.

Backup Link: Mainland China seriously wants to reunify with Taiwan, by force if necessary

Dr. Ted Galen Carpenter 2018 (contributing editor to both the National Interest and American Conservative, serves on the editorial boards of Mediterranean Quarterly and the Journal of Strategic Studies. Ph.D. in U.S. diplomatic history from Univ of Texas.) 20 Feb 2018 “Will the U.S. Go to War with China over Taiwan?” (accessed 16 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/will-us-go-war-china-over-taiwan

Chinese officials are hypersensitive about any Taiwanese trappings of independence, even though the island has never been under the PRC’s control. Australian scholar Andrew Tan aptly summarizes Beijing’s attitude: “For China, Taiwan represents unfinished business from the Chinese civil war and an emotionally charged nationalist issue that far outranks tensions in North Korea, the Senkaku Islands and the South China Sea. For a rising great power that is increasingly confident, assertive and nationalistic, the reunification of Taiwan with the mainland is its top, non‐negotiable national priority.” Indeed, the PRC passed its Anti‐Secession Law in 2005, emphasizing that China would use force if necessary to prevent any move by Taiwan toward formal independence.

Brink: US & China must reduce tensions now to avoid a potentially disastrous instability

Dr. David Keegan 2021 (Ph.D. in Chinese History; adjunct lecturer in China Studies at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; retired from the Department of State in 2012. He was Deputy Director of the American Institute in Taiwan in Taipei and served as Director of the Office of Taiwan Policy in the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs) "Strengthening Dual Deterrence on Taiwan: The Key to US-China Strategic Stability" 6 July 2021 https://www.stimson.org/2021/strengthening-dual-deterrence-on-taiwan-the-key-to-us-china-stra

As stated at the beginning, the U.S. and China have been here before, although both sides are threatening the other’s interests and values with an intensity seldom seen before. China is proclaiming its rise to great power status, co-equal or almost co-equal with the United States; President Biden has made outcompeting China the measure of his administration. The militaries on both sides have ramped up their capabilities to deter and defeat the other. The two nations have gone beyond competition to confrontation, and both have repeatedly made determining Taiwan’s future the center of that confrontation. Whether you call Taiwan a pawn or not, it is entrapped by this clash. For that very reason, reducing tensions over Taiwan could be the initial step away from a potentially disastrous instability and perhaps toward building a restrained confidence on both sides that other outstanding conflicts can be successfully addressed.

Brink: US / China tensions are increasing and coming to the brink of war

Kevin Rudd 2020. (former Prime Minister of Australia and President of the Asia Society Policy Institute in New York) 3 Aug 2020 “Beware the Guns of August—in Asia” (accessed 16 Sept 2022) https://asiasociety.org/policy-institute/beware-guns-august-asia

Unmoored from the strategic assumptions of the previous 50 years but without the anchor of any mutually agreed framework to replace them, the world now finds itself at the most dangerous moment in the relationship since the Taiwan Strait crises of the 1950s. The question now being asked, quietly but nervously, in capitals around the world is, where will this end? The once unthinkable outcome—actual armed conflict between the United States and China—now appears possible for the first time since the end of the Korean War. In other words, we are confronting the prospect of not just a new Cold War, but a hot one as well.

Impact: Global economic collapse and nuclear war with China

Prof. Hugh White 2015 (Professor of Strategic Studies in the School of International, Political & Strategic Studies at the Australian National Univ. Served as an intelligence analyst with the Office of National Assessments; from 1995 to 2000 he was Deputy Secretary for Strategy and Intelligence.) 5 May 2015 “Will America defend Taiwan?” (accessed 16 Sept 2022) <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/will-america-defend-taiwan>

US leaders must therefore ask what happens if Beijing does not back down as a crisis escalates. At what point would they back down instead? What would be the damage to US global leadership if Washington brought on a confrontation with China and then blinked first? What could happen if Washington didn't blink first? Is Taiwan's status quo worth a global economic collapse? It is worth a real risk of nuclear war with China?

Impact: US/China conflict over Taiwan would escalate and nuclear war is possible

Prof. Hugh White 2015 (Professor of Strategic Studies in the School of International, Political & Strategic Studies at the Australian National Univ. Served as an intelligence analyst with the Office of National Assessments; from 1995 to 2000 he was Deputy Secretary for Strategy and Intelligence.) 5 May 2015 “Will America defend Taiwan?” <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/will-america-defend-taiwan>

Militarily, America can no longer expect a swift and certain victory in a war over Taiwan. China's anti-access/area-denial capabilities would preclude direct US intervention unless those capabilities had first been degraded by a sustained and wide-ranging strike campaign against Chinese bases and forces. China would very likely respond to such a campaign with attacks on US and allied bases throughout Asia. The US has no evident means to cap the resulting escalation spiral, and no one could be sure it would stop below the nuclear threshold. The possibility of nuclear attacks on US cities would have to be considered.

Backup: Biden says US will go to war with China over Taiwan

Associated Press 2022 (journalists Josh Boak, Aamer Madhani and Zeke Miller) 23 May 2022 "Biden: US would intervene with military to defend Taiwan" (accessed 15 Sept 2022) https://apnews.com/article/russia-ukraine-biden-taiwan-china-4fb0ad0567ed5bbe46c01dd758e6c62b

President Joe Biden said Monday the U.S. would intervene militarily if China were to invade Taiwan, declaring the commitment to protect the island is “even stronger” after [Russia’s invasion of Ukraine](https://apnews.com/hub/russia-ukraine?utm_source=apnewsnav&utm_medium=featured). It was one of the most forceful presidential statements in support of Taiwan’s self-governing in decades. Biden, at a news conference in Tokyo, said “yes” when asked if he was willing to get involved militarily to defend Taiwan if China invaded. “That’s the commitment we made,” he added.

2. Negative economic side effects of trade agreements

Lower wages: Trade agreements put downward pressure on workers' wages in order to boost corporate profits

Prof. Joseph Stiglitz 2019 (*professor of economics at Columbia Univ., chief economist at the Roosevelt Institute. Formerly chief economist at the World Bank and was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Bill Clinton. He won the Nobel Prize in Economics in 2001*) Joseph Stiglitz: US trade deals were designed to serve corporations at the expense of workers 21 Apr 2019 (accessed 16 Sept 2022) https://www.cnbc.com/2019/04/22/joseph-stiglitz-us-trade-deals-helped-corporations-and-hurt-workers.html

It’s true that American workers have been disadvantaged — low-skilled workers in particular have seen their wages reduced, in part because of globalization. But that is partly because American negotiators got what they asked for: the problem was with how we managed globalization and with what we wanted — trade agreements simply advanced corporate interests at the expense of workers in both developed and developing countries. We as a country didn’t do what we should have to help workers whom globalization was hurting. We could have ensured that globalization benefited all, but corporate greed was just too great. The winners didn’t want to share their gains with the losers. Indeed, they liked it that wages were pressured down as American workers had to compete with workers from developing countries. It increased corporate profits all the more.

Lost jobs: If you believe AFF's claim that exports create jobs, then in total, a balanced trade agreement destroys jobs

Prof. Paul Stiglitz 2017 (*professor of economics at Columbia Univ., chief economist at the Roosevelt Institute. Formerly chief economist at the World Bank and was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Clinton. He won the Nobel Prize in Economics in 2001*) Lecture, delivered at the meetings of the National Association of Business Economists, Washington D.C., March 6, 2017 "The Overselling of Globalization" https://policydialogue.org/files/publications/Volcker\_Award\_Speech\_Paper\_1.pdf

The standard theory recognized that the opening up of trade to cheap imports would result in the loss of jobs in the import-competing sectors. But it also assumed that new jobs would be created in the export sectors—and that those new jobs would pay far better than those that were lost. Contrary to what our politicians assert(including the US Trade Representative, or USTR, which is in charge of trade policy), trade agreements are not about creating jobs. Maintaining the economy at full employment is the responsibility of monetary policy (the Federal Reserve in the US, the Bank of England in the UK, and the European Central Bank in the eurozone) and fiscal policy (the setting of taxes and expenditure). It is not the purview of trade policy. Even the narrow argument put forward by the USTR that trade agreements create jobs is unpersuasive—indeed, almost certainly fallacious. If, as the USTR claims, exports create jobs, then imports destroy jobs; and if trade is roughly balanced, what advanced countries export uses less labor than what they import. Hence, net, for advanced countries like the US, any balanced trade agreement by itself destroys jobs.

Voting Impact: We shouldn't adopt any new trade agreements without a plan in place to offset the adverse effects on those negatively affected

**[And AFF cannot propose such a plan because it wouldn’t be a foreign trade policy, but rather a set of domestic economic or social welfare policies happening separately from foreign import/export trade.]**

Prof. Paul Stiglitz 2017 (*professor of economics at Columbia Univ., chief economist at the Roosevelt Institute. Formerly chief economist at the World Bank and was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Clinton. He won the Nobel Prize in Economics in 2001*) Lecture, delivered at the meetings of the National Association of Business Economists, Washington D.C., March 6, 2017 "The Overselling of Globalization" https://policydialogue.org/files/publications/Volcker\_Award\_Speech\_Paper\_1.pdf

There is a simple lesson in all of this: economists as public servants have, of course, a responsibility to tell those that they advise of the consequences of alternative policies. But their responsibility goes further: they have to understand and explain the limits of their models and the limits of our knowledge; to articulate what we know and what we don’t. Economists might, in the end, decide that globalization’s distributive effects are outweighed by or outweigh the aggregative effects. But it was wrong not to explain its potentially large distributive effects, the large adverse effects on employment in certain locales, the consequences of imperfect risk markets and imperfections in competition, and the implications for dynamic comparative advantage. It was wrong not to accompany any globalization proposals—any new trade agreements—with a set of measures that would have ensured that large segments of the population were not worse-off as a result.

3. Lost jobs. The "Gateway to China" problem

Link: Taiwan promotes trade agreements by promising we'll get increased trade with mainland China

Maaike Okano-Heijmans, Sander Wit and Frans-Paul van der Putten 2015. (All are with the Netherlands Institute of International Relations, a.k.a. Clingendael Institute. Okano-Heijmans is a senior research fellow at the Clingendael Institute and the lead author of this report. Wit was affiliated to Clingendael as a research assistant from August 2014–January 2015. Frans-Paul van der Putten is a senior research fellow at Clingendael) March 2015 (accessed 17 Sept 2022) Cross-Strait Relations and Trade Diplomacy in East Asia Towards Greater EU–Taiwan Economic Cooperation? <https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/2016-02/2015%20-%20Towards%20Greater%20EU-Taiwan%20Economic%20C%20ooperation%20-%20Clingendael%20Report%20%28FINAL%29.pdf>

Attempts by Taiwan’s Ma administration to reap the benefits of the ECFA [China/Taiwan Economic Framework Agreement], not just in crossStrait relations but also in its relations with third countries, are not limited to the field of trade diplomacy. In particular, they are also apparent in Taiwan’s commercial diplomacy. In other words, Taiwan not only uses the ECFA to persuade others to conclude preferential trade agreements with the island; it also engages in a massive campaign to promote trade and investment in Taiwan by appealing to its attractiveness as a gateway for foreign firms into China, and even the East Asian market more broadly.95 In doing so, the Taiwanese government is pointing to the benefits provided by the ECFA, which also extend to foreign companies operating in Taiwan. These mainly relate to the confidence with which one can do business — such as higher production quality, protection of intellectual property rights, and transparent and trustworthy business procedures — which is greater in Taiwan than in China. In addition, it is appealing to the strengths of its investments in mainland China, which amount to roughly US$ 150 billion by some 80,000 companies — as well as its cultural competence — that is, its affinity with Chinese business culture — and the extremely well-networked Taiwanese business community. With about one million Taiwanese either residing or travelling in mainland China at any given time, and with Taiwan Business Associations present in almost every province or major city in mainland China, Taipei certainly seems to have a good business case.

Impact: Lost jobs. If the AFF plan works and we get more trade with China, that's bad because freer trade with China has killed 2.4 million American jobs, so far

NEW YORK TIMES 2021 (journalist Ana Swanson) published 17 March 2021, updated 3 Nov 2021 "In Washington, ‘Free Trade’ Is No Longer Gospel" <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/17/business/economy/free-trade-biden-tai.html> (accessed 26 June 2022)

David Autor, an economist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said economic theory had never claimed that trade made everybody better off — it had said trade would raise overall economic output, but lead to gains and losses for different groups. But economists and politicians alike underestimated how jarring some of those losses could be. Mr. Autor’s [influential research](https://www.nber.org/papers/w21906) shows that expanded trade with China led to the loss of 2.4 million American jobs between 1999 and 2011. China’s growing dominance of a variety of global industries, often accomplished through hefty government subsidies, also weakened the argument that the United States could succeed through free markets alone.