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### File Overview

This affirmative argues that China should be formally invited to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). The TPP is a free trade agreement that was recently negotiated between 12 countries on the Pacific Rim, including the United States, Japan, Australia, Vietnam, Mexico, and others. In the status quo, the TPP has largely been justified as a measure to curtail Chinese influence in the Asia-Pacific region. While China is not barred from entering into the agreement, they perceive that they are unwelcome.

The first advantage argues that using the TPP as a method to contain China hurts US-China relations, and could potentially spill over into other areas of US-China cooperation such as climate change or even foster the conditions for military conflict. Inviting China into the TPP would signal to the Chinese that we do not intend to use the trade agreement as a weapon against them and would give the US and China and opportunity to work together towards a common goal.

The second advantage argues that including China in the TPP would help bolster free trade globally. Protectionism, i.e. anti-free trade measures, are on the rise again, and successfully creating a trade agreement that unites two of the world’s great powers, the US and China, as well as a number of other countries, would reverse that trend. It also would signal strong US leadership on the issue and would potentially create momentum for other free trade agreements. Absent free trade, this risk of conflict in a number of different areas rises, as states are more likely to fight over resources instead of sharing with each other and creating mutually beneficial bonds.

The third advantage argues that including China in the TPP will help create a framework for regional cooperation across the board. Instead of creating opposing trade blocs, including China in the TPP would foster regional integration and provide a forum where a significant number of East Asian nations can come together to work on problems. By working together through the TPP, these nations will be less likely to have their conflicts escalate, because they will have a mutual economic interest in de-escalating tensions.

Finally, the solvency contention argues that the plan can indeed boost relations, global trade, and regionalism, and that China will agree to join the TPP if asked. It is important to note that the Pilling evidence in the 1AC Inherency contention provides some evidentiary support for the argument that China will agree to the plan, even though the evidence is being used for inherency instead of solvency.

### Glossary

Anthropogenic: Resulting from human activity.

Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB): An international financial institution that aims to support the building of infrastructure in the Asia-Pacific region.

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC): A forum for 21 Pacific Rim member economies that promotes free trade throughout the Asia-Pacific region.

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN): A regional organization comprising ten Southeast Asian states which promotes intergovernmental cooperation and facilitates economic integration amongst its members. Its members are Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Brunei, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar (Burma), and Vietnam.

Beijing: The capital of the People's Republic of China

Beijing Consensus: The Beijing Consensus is the political and especially economic policies of the People's Republic of China that are thought to have contributed to China's growth over two decades. The phrase "Beijing Consensus" was coined by Joshua Cooper Ramo to pose China's economic development model as an alternative — especially for developing countries — to the Washington Consensus of market-friendly policies promoted by the International Monetary Fund, World Bank and U.S. Treasury.

Bilateral Trade: Trade exclusively between two countries.

Constructive Engagement: A policy of having political and business relationships with a country, while at the same time supporting political and social change within that country. (MacMillan Dictionary)

Containment: A military strategy to stop the expansion of an enemy. It is best known as the Cold War policy of the United States and its allies to prevent the spread of communism abroad.

Counterbalance: The actions that a particular state or group of states take in order to equalize the odds against more powerful states; that is to make it more difficult and hence less likely for powerful states to exert their military advantage over the weaker ones.

Doha Round: The latest trade-negotiation round of the World Trade Organization (WTO) which commenced in November 2001. Its objective was to lower trade barriers around the world.

Export: Selling goods and services produced in the home country to other markets.

Flashpoint: An area or dispute that has a strong possibility of developing into a war.

Free Trade: A system of trade between nations in which there are no special taxes placed on imports. (Merriam-Webster)

Free Trade Area: The region encompassing a trade bloc whose member countries have signed a free trade agreement (FTA).

Free Trade Agreement (FTA): An agreement involving cooperation between at least two countries to reduce trade barriers – import quotas and tariffs – and to increase trade of goods and services with each other.

Free Trade Area of the Asia Pacific (FTAAP): A free trade area for countries in the Asia Pacific, proposed by the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). The idea is currently being studied by the organization but no action has been taken to make it reality.

Geopolitics: A method of studying foreign policy to understand, explain and predict international political behavior through geographical variables. These include area studies, climate, topography, demography, natural resources, and applied science of the region being evaluated.

Great Power: A sovereign state that is recognized as having the ability and expertise to exert its influence on a global scale.

Great Recession: a period of general economic decline observed in world markets during the late 2000s and early 2010s. The International Monetary Fund concluded that it was the worst global recession since World War II.

Hanoi: The capital of Vietnam.

Import: A good brought into a jurisdiction, especially across a national border, from an external source.

Import Quota: A limit on the quantity of a good that can be produced abroad and sold domestically. It is a type of protectionist trade restriction that sets a physical limit on the quantity of a good that can be imported into a country in a given period of time.

Intellectual Property (IP): Creations of the intellect for which a monopoly is assigned to designated owners by law. Some examples are trademarks, copyright, and patents.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC): A scientific and intergovernmental body under the auspices of the United Nations dedicated to the task of providing the world with an objective, scientific view of climate change.

Investor-to-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS): An independent court set up by free trade agreements that grants an investor the right to use that court in proceedings against a country's government instead of the regular courts of that country.

Liberalization: A relaxation of government restrictions, usually in such areas of social, political and economic policy.

Mercantilism: An economic theory and practice, dominant in modernized parts of Europe during the 16th to the 18th century, that promoted governmental regulation of a nation's economy for the purpose of augmenting state power at the expense of rival national powers.

Multilateral Trade: Trade between three or more countries.

Multilateralism: Multiple countries working in concert on a given issue.

### Glossary

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO): An intergovernmental military alliance in Europe between the United States and other European nations whereby member states agree to mutual defense in response to an attack by any external party. The alliance was created in response to the perceived threat of the Soviet Union after World War II.

Pacific Rim: The lands around the rim of the Pacific Ocean.

People’s Republic of China (PRC): China, officially the People's Republic of China (PRC), is the world's most populous state, with a population of over 1.381 billion. Located in Asia, the state is governed by the Communist Party of China based in the capital of Beijing.

Pragmatism: A practical approach to problems and affairs. (Merriam-Webster Dictionary)

Protectionism: The economic policy of restraining trade between countries through methods such as tariffs on imported goods, restrictive quotas, and a variety of other government regulations.

Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP): A proposed free trade agreement (FTA) between the ten member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Brunei, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam) and the six states with which ASEAN has existing FTAs (Australia, China, India, Japan, South Korea and New Zealand). RCEP negotiations were formally launched in November 2012 at the ASEAN Summit in Cambodia. RCEP is viewed as an alternative to the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement, which includes the United States but excludes China.

Realpolitik: Politics or diplomacy based primarily on considerations of given circumstances and factors, rather than explicit ideological notions or moral and ethical premises.

Regionalism: The formation of interstate associations or groupings on the basis of regions.

Silk Road: Generally, this term refers to an ancient network of trade routes that for centuries were central to cultural interaction through regions of the Asian continent connecting the West and East from China to the Mediterranean Sea. In the context of the evidence in this packet, Silk Road refers to the land-based component that together with the oceanic Maritime Silk Road forms One Belt, One Road, a Chinese government economic development framework for primarily integrating trade and investment in Eurasia.

Smoot-Hawley Tariff: A Congressional act to raise U.S. tariffs on over 20,000 imported goods to record levels which was signed into law in 1930.

State Owned Enterprises (SOE): A legal entity that is created by the government in order to partake in commercial activities on the government's behalf.

Status Quo: A Latin phrase meaning the existing state of affairs, particularly with regards to social or political issues.

Tariff: A tax on imports or exports.

Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP): A recent trade agreement among twelve Pacific Rim countries; the United States, Australia, Japan, Singapore, Brunei, New Zealand, Chile, Peru, Vietnam, Malaysia, Mexico, and Canada. The finalized proposal was signed on 4 February 2016 in Auckland, New Zealand, concluding seven years of negotiations. It is currently awaiting ratification to enter into force.

Trade Promotion Authority (TPA): The authority of the President of the United States to negotiate international agreements that Congress can approve or deny but cannot amend or filibuster. Also known as fast-track, this negotiating authority is an impermanent power granted by Congress to the President. It has been granted to President Obama for the passage of TPP.

Trade Bloc: A type of intergovernmental agreement, often part of a regional intergovernmental organization, where regional barriers to trade, (tariffs and non-tariff barriers) are reduced or eliminated among the participating states.

Trade Regime: The word regime refers to a set of conditions, most often of a political nature, such as a government. In this context, it refers to the rules under which trade occurs between two or more nations.

Trade War: Two or more states raising or creating tariffs or other trade barriers on each other in retaliation for other trade barriers.

Washington Consensus: A broad set of free market economic ideas, such as free trade, floating exchange rates, free markets and macroeconomic stability.

World Trade Organization (WTO): An intergovernmental organization which regulates international trade. The WTO deals with regulation of trade between participating countries by providing a framework for negotiating trade agreements and a dispute resolution process aimed at enforcing participants' adherence to WTO agreements.

WTO Accession: The process of becoming a member of the WTO.

\*\*All definitions sourced from Wikipedia, except where otherwise noted

# 1AC – China TPP

### 1AC – Inherency

#### Contention One is Inherency:

#### China is not currently included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership

Wang 16 (Fei-Ling, 2-10-2016, Professor of International Affairs at the Georgia Institute of Technology, “China and the Trans-Pacific Partnership: Significant Challenges and Profound Opportunities”, http://studies.aljazeera.net/en/reports/2016/01/2016127134617824774.html)

Several countries around the Pacific like Russia and North Korea are not in the TPP. South Korea insisted that it was already in via its free trade treaty with the U.S. and later asked to join the TPP formally. (4) A few others in or near the region such as Bangladesh, Colombia, India, Laos, the Philippines, Taiwan, and Thailand have also expressed interest in joining the TPP. Most conspicuous and intriguing, however, is that the TPP does not include China, the People’s Republic of China (PRC), which is a genuine Pacific nation and also world’s largest exporter. Other than some wishful murmurs, there is no sign that the PRC will be a part of the TPP anytime soon.

#### Public proclamations aside, China has never been formally invited to join TPP, but hurdles to inclusion are not impossible to overcome

Pilling 15 (David, 10/7, staff @ Financial Times, “The ‘anyone but China’ club needs a gatecrasher”, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/62613e6a-6b5a-11e5-aca9-d87542bf8673.html#axzz47uiteo1h)

Throughout the years of arcane and secretive talks that culminated in this week’s Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, participants have brushed aside the notion that the TPP was designed to exclude China. This was not, its advocates protested loudly, an “anyone but China club”. Perhaps too loudly. Those assertions strained credulity. When their guard slipped, the TPP’s cheerleaders often spoke of the new pact not in terms of economics but of geopolitics. The TPP in its realpolitik guise was the economic complement to Washington’s military pivot to Asia, a means of binding the US more closely to its Asian allies in the face of a resurgent China. In a much-discussed recent paper for the Council on Foreign Relations, Robert Blackwill and Ashley Tellis wrote that the TPP should be seen as part of “grand strategy” to push back against China’s rise. By signing preferential trade deals with allies, Washington could help stop China from freeriding on the international trading system and counter what they called Beijing’s “geoeconomic power”. Even this week, Barack Obama, the US president who has pinned much hope on the TPP’s legacy-burnishing effects, could not resist a dig at Beijing. “We can’t let countries like China write the rules of the global economy,” he said. Now that the TPP framework has been agreed, if not yet ratified, member states should make good on their word that their club is not barred to Chinese entry. They should invite Beijing to join. China should go one better still. It should call everyone’s bluff by starting negotiations to do just that. The idea is not as outlandish as it sounds. From Beijing’s perspective, there are good reasons to be inside the TPP tent. True, the TPP — less of a trade pact and more of a behind-the-borders exercise in protecting investments and standardising regulations — has faults aplenty. It goes too far in strengthening corporate clout by allowing companies to sue sovereign powers accused of eroding their profits. True, too, the TPP contains provisions against state exercise of economic power that seem almost designed with China in mind. Even so, the aims of the TPP and those of China’s hoped-for economic transformation are roughly aligned. In the late 1990s, Zhu Rongji, then premier, led China’s last great economic overhaul by using its 2001 accession to the World Trade Organisation to push domestic change. Today the TPP could play a similar role. Take the TPP’s prohibition of preferential treatment of state-owned enterprises. China falls short of that standard, supplying its behemoth SOEs with everything from cheap credit to cheap electricity. Yet Beijing has explicitly said it wants to stop such practices by forcing its mostly inefficient SOEs to operate on a more commercial basis. Similarly, the TPP has strict provisions on intellectual property covering trademarks, copyrights and patents, all areas flouted by Chinese companies. Yet China’s leaders know this has to change too. As their own companies, some of them heavy spenders on research and development, move up the value chain, Beijing will want to protect their innovations rather than encourage a promiscuous attitude towards intellectual property. The TPP has environmental provisions to prevent countries from attracting investments through trashing their own ecosystem. Again, China is moving gingerly in this direction as it seeks to clean up the environmental wreckage its early-stage industrialisation has caused. On labour issues too, China’s domestic reform agenda and TPP provisions are in sync. China wants to see a higher proportion of output in the pockets of its workers, who would then have more money to spend. Certainly, Beijing would be wary of unleashing genuinely independent trade unions. But it may at least be able to pay lip service to the idea of collective bargaining in the country’s own economic interests. The US reached agreement this week with Japan and 10 other Pacific Rim economies on a Trans-Pacific Partnership. Gideon Rachman discusses the scope of the pact and what it will mean for those who have signed up, and those left out, with Shawn Donnan and Geoff Dyer The TPP might be good for China, then, by kick-starting its stalled economic transformation from state-led manufacturing to private-led services. But could it possibly be allowed to join? The hurdles may not be as high as they seem. Other countries, such as Vietnam, are TPP members. Vietnam is a one-party state with coddled SOEs and an attitude towards intellectual property every bit as cavalier as China’s. If Hanoi can join, surely Beijing can make the grade as well. Shinzo Abe, Japan’s prime minister, has been one of the most explicit in envisioning the TPP as a geopolitical organisation. Yet this week he appeared to open the door to Chinese membership, saying the TPP would have more “significant strategic meaning if China joined”. Mr Abe is right. Without China, the TPP looks like a containment strategy in disguise. With China on board, it could help ease Beijing into a post-WTO world. The TPP might then begin to resemble the forward-looking trade pact its advocates pretend it always was.

### 1AC – US-China Relations Advantage

#### Contention ( ) is the US-China Relations Advantage:

#### First, anti-China rhetoric promoting TPP alienates China

Ye 15 (Min, 5/15, assistant professor of international relations at Boston University, “China Liked TPP — Until U.S. Officials Opened Their Mouths”, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/05/15/china-liked-trans-pacific-partnership-until-u-s-officials-opened-their-mouths-trade-agreement-rhetoric-fail/)

After a brief but frightening setback for proponents, U.S. congressional leaders looked set on May 13 to pass legislation for an eventual up-or-down (“fast-track”) vote on what would be one of the world’s largest trade accords, the U.S-led Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). The accord, a project behind which U.S. President Barack Obama has thrown his full support, would originally join together 12 countries bordering the Pacific Ocean. Significantly, China isn’t on that list; in fact, in the months leading up to fast-track voting, U.S. officials have been selling the pact internationally and domestically as a deal to counter Chinese influence. But whether TPP becomes reality or not, China has already moved on. And the anti-China rhetoric the United States has deployed has ultimately done more harm than good. TPP is more than just a trade agreement, at least to hear the Obama administration tell it. In recent months, U.S. officials seeking to win domestic support among skeptical Democrats have promoted it as a geostrategic cudgel to fend off a rising China. In an interview with The Wall Street Journal on April 27, President Barack Obama asserted, “If we do not write the rules, China will write the rules out in that region,” meaning the Asia-Pacific. “We will be shut out.” When Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe met President Obama to discuss TPP, their explicit and implicit messages were “all about China,” according to Patrick L. Smith, a long-time correspondent in Tokyo. By continuing and intensifying the anti-China rhetoric in TPP discourse, administration officials have only made it more likely that the trade regime, if it becomes reality, will alienate China.

#### This heightens the risk of military conflict – the status quo TPP sends a signal of containment and undermines relations overall

Kroeber 15 (Arthur, managing director of GaveKal Dragonomics and editor of China Economic Quarterly, “What Will the TPP Mean for China?”, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/10/07/china-tpp-trans-pacific-partnership-obama-us-trade-xi/)

The TPP illustrates a dilemma for U.S. policy in the Asia-Pacific. On one side, Washington seeks to counterbalance China’s rising power by strengthening its military relationships with its regional allies, tilting in favor of southeast Asian countries in their maritime disputes with China, discouraging its friends from participating in Chinese initiatives such as the AIIB, and pursuing a massive trade agreement that leaves out the region’s and the world’s biggest trading nation. On the other side, American leaders reiterate that they have no desire to contain China (rightly seeing such a strategy would fail), and argue that deeper engagement, rather than confrontation, is the right way forward in U.S.-China relations. This stance is borderline incoherent, and it’s understandable why many Chinese see it as duplicitous. Washington’s words are all about constructive engagement, but its deeds mostly smack of containment. At the root is a deep ambivalence about whether or not the United States should accept China as an equal. If it does, then it must also accept that China will build a sphere of influence and regional arrangements that exclude the United States. If it does not, then it must accept that in fact if not in name it is pursuing a strategy of containment. Such a strategy heightens the risk of armed conflict. For the moment, China and the United States still mostly conduct their relations on a basis of economic pragmatism rather than strategic rivalry. But the ground is rapidly shifting. The completion of the TPP sharpens the question of how the United States and China will share power in the Asia-Pacific, but provides no answer.

#### Declining US-China relations will impede climate change solutions, harm the world economy, and could ultimately lead to war

Ash 15 (Timothy, 10/16, historian, political writer and Guardian columnist, “If US relations with China turn sour, there will probably be war”, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/oct/16/us-relations-china-war-america)

What is the biggest challenge facing the next president of the United States? How to deal with China. The relationship between the emerging and the enduring superpower is the greatest geopolitical question of our time. If Washington and Beijing do not get it right, there will probably be war somewhere in Asia some time over the next decade. Vladimir Putin’s neo-imperialist Russia and the brutality of Islamic State are medium-sized regional challenges by comparison. Climate change and the world economy cannot be managed without American-Chinese cooperation. All this demands a bipartisan American grand strategy for the next 20 years, but US politics seems incapable of generating anything more than a partisan

soundbite for the next 20 minutes.

### 1AC – US-China Relations Advantage

**Climate change is real, anthropogenic, and a threat to human survival – world powers must act now to avoid catastrophic collapse**

Dr. David **McCoy** et al., MD, Centre for International Health and Development, University College London, “Climate Change and Human Survival,” BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL v. 348, 4—2—**14**, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g2510>, accessed 8-31-14.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has just published its report on the impacts of global warming. Building on its recent update of the physical science of global warming [1], **the IPCC’s new report should leave** the world in no doubt **about the** scale **and** immediacy **of the threat to** human survival**,** health, and well-being. The IPCC has already concluded that **it is “**virtually certain **that human influence has warmed the** global **climate system**” **and** that **it is “**extremely likely **that more than half of the** observed **increase in** global average surface **temperature** from 1951 to 2010” **is anthropogenic** [1]. **Its** new **report outlines the** future **threats of** further global **warming: increased scarcity of food and** fresh **water; extreme weather** events; **rise in sea level**; **loss of biodiversity**; **areas becoming** uninhabitable; **and mass** human **migration, conflict and violence.** Leaked drafts talk of hundreds of millions displaced in a little over 80 years. This month, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) added its voice: “**the well being of** people of **all nations [is] at risk**.” [2] Such comments reaffirm the conclusions of the Lancet/UCL Commission: that **climate change is “the** greatest threat **to human health** of the 21st century.” [3] The changes seen so far—massive arctic ice loss and extreme weather events, for example—have resulted from an estimated average temperature rise of 0.89°C since 1901. **Further changes will depend on how much we continue to heat the planet**. The release of just another 275 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide would probably commit us to a temperature rise of at least 2°C—an amount that could be emitted in less than eight years. [4] “Business as usual**” will increase carbon dioxide concentrations** from the current level of 400 parts per million (ppm), which is a 40% increase from 280 ppm 150 years ago, to 936 ppm by 2100, with a 50:50 chance that this will deliver global mean temperature rises of more than 4°C. It is now widely understood that such a rise is “incompatible with an organised global community.” [5]. **The IPCC warns of “**tipping points” in the Earth’s system, **which, if crossed, could lead to a** catastrophic collapse **of interlinked human and natural systems**. The AAAS concludes that **there is now a “real chance of** abrupt,unpredictable **and potentially** irreversible **changes with** highly damaging **impacts** on people around the globe.” [2] And this week a report from the World Meteorological Office (WMO) confirmed that extreme weather events are accelerating. WMO secretary general Michel Jarraud said, “There is no standstill in global warming . . . The laws of physics are non-negotiable.” [6]

### 1AC – US-China Relations Advantage

#### War between the US and China has a unique potential to go nuclear – safeguards won’t prevent escalation

Wittner 11 – (11/28/11, Lawrence, PhD in history from Columbia University, Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany, “COMMENTARY: Is a Nuclear War with China Possible?” http://www.huntingtonnews.net/14446)

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.

### 1AC – US-China Relations Advantage

#### The plan solves – inviting China to join the TPP sends a signal of cooperation which improves relations, and economic integration ensures small problems don’t escalate to major conflict

Posen 14 (Adam, president of Peterson Institute for International Economics, 6/13, “A Win-Win-Win Solution for the TPP”, http://english.caixin.com/2014-06-13/100690432.html)

The security tensions between China and the United States are spilling over rapidly into economic ones. Some outreach from both sides is required, not just to try to keep things from unnecessarily escalating, but to maintain the mutual benefits of the economic relationship. A potential key to serving both goals would be to integrate China into the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations. The economic benefits are clear. According to Peterson Institute calculations, a TPP that included the current members negotiating plus China would increase national income by 4.7 percent over a decade for China, 1.6 percent over 10 years for the United States and 4.4 percent over the same period for Japan. It would be a win, win, win. And this underestimates the ongoing productivity benefits to China, of making the requisite high-standard trade commitments advances the proposed domestic reforms. Furthermore, the interests of all the major countries involved are only served by having the TPP proceed. On our estimates, were the TPP to be concluded without China joining quickly, trade diversion from China would be only one-tenth as large as the potential gain (minus 0.5 percent of income over 10 years), so there is no threat to China from the TPP to trumpet, just an opportunity to miss. The gains for Japan would be nearly halved to 2.4 percent of GDP and the gains for the United States would be cut by two-thirds to 0.5 percent of GDP, so they both gain by TPP either way, but gain far more with China. This fits with the basic logic of economic integration among large economies. There are hesitations on both sides of the Pacific about having China part of the TPP. Some in the United States wish the prospective trade pact to be a supplement to a broader alliance and therefore include the democracies on China's coast without including China. Others who bear China no ill will fear its entry to the talks might give it the opportunity to intentionally slow them down or water down their content. On China's side, those fears are shared but an additional concern crops up. Some in the country view the process of World Trade Organization and permanent normal trade relations accession of the 1990s as embarrassing. They do not want China to go cap in hand. They feel it should be involved in setting of any new trade standards from the start. Both of those groups are missing the point. TPP officially and in fact is an example of open regionalism. Anyone in the region who is ready to negotiate in good faith to a high standard agreement will be admitted. This is not a fake. As noted, it is in every country in the region's interest to have China be part of this potentially high-quality agreement. It also makes the agreement that much more likely to be accepted and meaningful if it bridges the United States, China and Japan. More importantly, some Chinese observers' concern about repeating the accession experience, and some American observers' concern about utilizing trade as a means of exclusion, hurt their own countries' interests for mere imagery. Trade negotiations, like all international negotiations, are best conducted in a spirit of compromise and for that matter mutual discovery. Neither side should let egotism or the current suspicion interfere with the peaceful co-development that should occur. A TPP that takes China into account, and gets it on a path to a deeper Asian integration, would serve both U.S. foreign policy and economic true interests. Even if China cannot join immediately because of other countries' legitimate concerns about state-owned enterprises (SOEs), for example, or intellectual property rights, knowing it was en route to joining would give it significant voice in the talks and the standards being set. And over the coming years, having protections for Chinese developed intellectual property and restrictions on subsidized competition from SOEs in Southeast Asia, will be in an increasingly wealthy China's own self-interest. Therefore, a practical step would be for the United States to explicitly and publicly invite China to join the TPP talks at the upcoming Strategic & Economic Dialogue. As preparation for that participation, China and the United States should agree on the proposal for an official observer status for Chinese trade negotiators in the current negotiations. There will of course be fears on both sides, but particularly in the United States, that such an observer from China would take confidential negotiating positions and possibly use them to interfere with the progress of TPP or pursue side bargains. I believe that by giving China an explicit and open observer status in TPP, the Chinese government would find its own self-interest to play fairly and respectfully with all the negotiating partners. The underlying suspicions and actual disputes between China and the United States will not be solved by trade alone, let alone a future-oriented trade agreement. There is no automatic link between expanding trade relations and good relations and broader relations overall. If there was, the trillions of dollars of Chinese goods purchased by the United States over the last three decades would have assured mutual bliss. In the absence of outright conflict, however, deeper economic integration can act as a counterweight to escalating overreaction to and spillover of what should be manageable tensions. More importantly, an economically reformed and open China serves both Chinese reform and American interest. Let us move this forward.

### 1AC – Trade Advantage

#### Contention ( ) is the Trade Advantage:

**The global trade order is on the brink of collapse – protectionism is rising**

**Ezell** **14** (Stephen, Senior Analyst with the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF), with a focus on innovation policy, international information technology competitiveness, trade, and manufacturing and services issues, 10-29, <http://www.innovationfiles.org/trade-promotion-authority-a-vital-component-of-u-s-trade-policy/>, )

1. Regarding the first point, make no mistake: **there is currently** a fight for the soul of the global trading system. The years **since the Great Recession have seen a** dramatic increase **in** countries’ use of innovation **mercantilist policies**—such as forcing local production as a condition of market access, subsidizing exports, stealing intellectual property, or manipulating currencies and standards—**which** seek to **favor domestic enterprises at the expense of foreign competitors.** **Viewing with envy China’s rapid economic growth, dozens of other countries**—from Brazil and India to Malaysia and South Africa—**have enacted similar mercantilist policies**, giving rise to an emerging “Beijing Consensus” (i.e., innovation mercantilism). In fact, as evidence of this, **the W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization **reported** that **the number of technical barriers to trade reached an all-time high in 2012**. And **as this emerging “Beijing Consensus” gains strength, it comes at the expense of the long-dominant, but now exhausted, “Washington Consensus” which has believed in the unalloyed benefits of free trade**, even when it is one-sided, and that has fretted that **robust enforcement of trade rules may ignite a** trade war. As such, **we need a new consensus**, one **that holds that trade and globalization remain poised to generate lasting global prosperity**, but only if all countries share a commitment to playing by a strong set of rules that foster shared, sustainable growth. And **that’s what the U**nited **S**tates **is doing in seeking to negotiate TPP** and T-TIP **agreements as model, 21st century compacts that set the bar and lay the foundation upon which a** stronger **set of future global trade rules can be built**. **If America doesn’t successfully conclude and pass through Congress** these next-generation trade **agreements**—and let’s be clear, it will be much more difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish this without TPA—**America risks** losing **out on** the **ability to set the agenda and standards for a more robust and** liberalized global trade system going forward.

### 1AC – Trade Advantage

#### The TPP is critical to restart the push for global free trade – Chinese inclusion is key

Alden 15 (Edward, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, and was co-director of the CFR Independent Task Force on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy, 12/7, “The TPP Is the Last, Best Opportunity for New Global Trade Rules”, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/17373/the-tpp-is-the-last-best-opportunity-for-new-global-trade-rules)

The fate of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement—the recently concluded mega-regional deal linking the United States, Japan and 10 other Pacific Rim countries—will likely decide whether the historic project of building better global rules for trade continues, or collapses under its own weight. The TPP, which has been under negotiation for nearly a decade and now awaits difficult ratification battles in each member country, offers the best hope for restarting a global push for trade liberalization after more than two decades of stagnation. After the end of World War II, the United States was the great champion of multilateral trade liberalization. Reducing tariffs and other trade barriers on a global basis offers the greatest economic benefits by encouraging investment to follow business opportunities rather than preferential rules. With rare exceptions, such as its free trade deal with Israel in 1985 and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with Canada and Mexico in 1993, the U.S. was long willing to set aside the political advantages of special deals for the global economic gains of a multilateral approach. The TPP has the potential to restart a global effort at trade liberalization. But the U.S. strategy changed dramatically following the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. The Uruguay Round agreement that launched the WTO was the biggest and most complex ever negotiated, covering everything from government subsidies to intellectual property to special rules for textile trade. It also proved to be the last of its kind. Over the first five rounds of global trade negotiations beginning in 1947, the negotiations never took more than a year. The more ambitious Kennedy Round in the 1960s took almost three years, while the Tokyo Round in the 1970s took more than six years. The Uruguay Round required more than seven years to complete. Since then, U.S. efforts to pursue a new global trade deal have been stymied—partly by the staunch opposition of powerful developing countries like China, India and Brazil, and partly by Washington’s own reluctance to move on politically difficult issues like curbing subsidies to large farmers. The Doha Round is now 14 years old and counting, and its one substantive accomplishment, a trade facilitation deal concluded in Bali in 2013, has yet to be ratified by enough countries to come into force. Instead, the U.S. and most other countries have pursued a variety of bilateral and regional trade arrangements, hoping to keep up in the race to gain small advantages on their competitors. At one level, the TPP is simply the most ambitious of these regional deals yet negotiated. It includes countries that account for nearly 40 percent of global economic output, and would put in place some innovative new rules in areas such as e-commerce, small business exports and state-owned enterprises. But unlike any of the hundreds of smaller trade deals negotiated over the past two decades, the TPP has the potential to restart a global effort at trade liberalization. Two scenarios are imaginable. The first is that the TPP itself becomes both the catalyst and the building block for a new set of trade rules that covers much of the world. The TPP has already provided a push to talks between the U.S. and European Union on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). Those negotiations have predictably been tougher than anticipated over thorny issues like regulatory cooperation, but the TPP is a powerful incentive for the EU to close the deal and not be left behind. In addition, the TPP, unlike NAFTA, is an open agreement that other countries can join. South Korea is already eagerly awaiting the next round, and Indonesia and the Philippines have voiced their interest. The big prize would be China. While China has been pursuing its own set of regional trade arrangements in Asia, it has shown growing interest in the TPP. With growth slowing, China can ill-afford to be left outside of an arrangement that will provide economic advantages to companies that choose to invest instead in Japan, Vietnam or Malaysia, all TPP members. The second, and better, outcome is that the conclusion of TPP might reinvigorate the multilateral system. The big losers in the first scenario would be the large emerging markets—India, Brazil, South Africa and a handful of others—that have also been the biggest obstacles to concluding the long-running Doha Round. It is unlikely that either the TPP or the TTIP could ever stretch far enough to include such countries. If they want to be part of a new, more ambitious set of trade rules, the only viable path remains the multilateral process in Geneva, where the WTO is headquartered. These countries may eventually adopt a more accommodating stance in the Doha Round, rather than going it alone in a world of mega-regional deals. And the U.S. could then return to its historic role as a champion of multilateral trade.

### 1AC – Trade Advantage

**Protectionism is a disaster for the globe – reductions in trade risk World War III**

**Panzer 8** Michael J. Panzner, Faculty – New York Institute of Finance. Specializes in Global Capital Markets. MA Columbia, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition [Paperback], p. 137-138

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth **protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill**. **Introduced at the start of the Great Depression**, it **triggered a series of** tit-for-tat **economic responses**, **which** many commentators believe helped **turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating** global disaster**.** But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, **fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost** certainly intensify.Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and **protectionism will bring about** ever more **heated arguments and** dangerous confrontations **over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities** **as well as factors of production that must**, out of necessity, **be acquired from less-than-friendly nations**. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, **efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply**. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and **pollution of the** **environment and natural resources will become** more commonplace. Around the world, such **tensions will give rise to** full-scale military encounters**,** **often with** minimal provocation. In some instances, **economic conditions will serve as a** convenient pretext **for conflicts** **that stem from** cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, **nations may look to** divert attention **away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures**. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, **terrorist groups will likely boost the** frequency and scale **of their horrifying attacks,** bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. **Turbulent conditions will encourage** aggressive saber rattling **and interdictions by rogue nations running amok.** Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. **China will likely assume an increasingly** belligerent posture **toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on** overt colonization **of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts**. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. **Long-simmering resentments could also** degenerate quickly, **spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering** genocidal acts**.** **Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause** widespread destruction. **Many will interpret** **stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a ne**w world war.

### 1AC – Regionalism Advantage

#### Contention ( ) is the Regionalism Advantage:

#### Excluding China makes regional integration impossible, but inclusion brings China back into the fold

Cheong 13 (Inkyo, fellow @ Asian Dev’t Bank Inst., “Negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement: Evaluation and Implications for East Asian Regionalism”, http://www.eaber.org/sites/default/files/documents/2013.07.11.wp428.trans\_.pacific.partnership.east\_.asian\_.regionalism.pdf)

The TPP is at a crossroads as a building block. It could result in the establishment of economic integration in Asia and the Pacific, or it could trigger creation of two large trade blocs in the region. If “open regionalism” is chosen under the TPP, and the PRC is not excluded, it will contribute to regional integration. Exclusion of the PRC could encourage Beijing to develop its own Sino-centric trade bloc. Baldwin (2011) argues that, assuming the TPP can pursue complete liberalization, “the great hope [of the TPP] is that the signing of the agreement will trigger a domino effect which draws in all APEC members (except perhaps [the PRC] and [Taipei,China]).” Lewis (2011) notes that “the TPP agreement has the potential to become a new paradigm for trade agreements, to help the US reassert its position in the Asia-Pacific, and to begin the process of defragmenting international trade.” A similar argument was made by Bergsten (2011), who wrote that the TPP will have “near-term expansion of its coverage to at least Japan and [the Republic of] Korea and the resultant pressure that this will put on the rest of Asia, including [the PRC], could enable the TPP to realize its ultimate goal of becoming a Free Trade Area in the Asia Pacific by 2020.”

#### Shifting from competition to cooperation is critical to Asian multilateralism which solves multiple flashpoints for conflict

Huang & Katz 14 (Yan-Ying, PhD candidate at the Institute of East Asia Studies, NCCU Taiwan, Daniel, PhD candidate in Strategic Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), “Toward a Unified Asian Regional Order”, http://csis.org/files/publication/Pac1446.pdf)

The Asia-Pacific region is at a turning point. After several decades of robust economic growth in Southeast and Northeast Asia, the region is home to many of the largest and most dynamic economies in the world. This increased economic power has driven the growth of military capabilities in a region dotted with flashpoints that could spark interstate conflict. All countries in the region are attempting to redefine their relationships along political, economic, and security dimensions in an increasingly contested regional landscape. Although a consensus exists about the need to maintain a peaceful and stable Asia, a binding, overarching institutional framework does not yet exist that can manage the region’s many challenges. Whether Asia will prosper or fall victim to interstate conflict depends at least in part on the evolution of effective, successful multilateral institutions. What is driving this redefinition of Asian regional dynamics? The 2008 global financial crisis led to the perception among some that a power transition was underway. The robust performance of the Chinese economy contrasted with the sluggish US economy, seemingly validated this perception. However, a US recovery – combined with slowing Chinese growth – may be changing the outlook. Increased trade flows between Asia and its neighbors are critical to development and prosperity. Countries are searching for an acceptable trade architecture by which to realize their national visions. The negotiations of two large-scale regional free trade agreements, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), are underway. The absences of China from the TPP and the US from the RCEP create doubts about the ultimate efficacy of either framework. Notwithstanding, countries acknowledge that progress must be made on regional trade. Thus, convergence between TPP and RCEP would best serve the interests of all countries in the region. Competitive trade architectures will be counterproductive. In particular, passage of TPP and RCEP should not become a proxy for US-China economic competition. As the world’s two largest economies with high interdependency, the US and China must work together to forge an effective regional trade architecture.

### 1AC – Regionalism Advantage

#### Asian instability risks nuclear escalation

Campbell 8 (Kurt M, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Dr. Campbell served in several capacities in government, including as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asia and the Pacific, Director on theNational Security Council Staff, previously the Chief Executive Officer and co-founder of the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), served as Director of the Aspen Strategy Group and the Chairman of the Editorial Board of the Washington Quarterly, and was the founder and Principal of StratAsia, a strategic advisory company focused on Asia, rior to co-founding CNAS, he served as Senior Vice President, Director of the International Security Program, and the Henry A. Kissinger Chair in National Security Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, doctorate in International Relation Theory from Oxford, former associate professor of public policy and international relations at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Assistant Director of the Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, member of Council on Foreign Relations and  International Institute for Strategic Studies, “The Power of Balance: America in iAsia” June8, <http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CampbellPatelSingh_iAsia_June08.pdf>)

Asian *investment* is also at record levels. Asian countries lead the world with unprecedented infra­structure projects. With over $3 trillion in foreign currency reserves, Asian nations and businesses are starting to shape global economic activity. Indian firms are purchasing industrial giants such as Arcelor Steel, as well as iconic brands of its once-colonial ruler, such as Jaguar and Range Rover. China’s Lenovo bought IBM’s personal computer We call the transformations across the Asia-Pacific the emergence of “iAsia” to reflect the adoption by countries across Asia of fundamentally new stra­tegic approaches to their neighbors and the world. Asian nations are pursuing their interests with real power in a period of both tremendous potential and great uncertainty. iAsia is: *Integrating:* iAsia includes increasing economic interdependence and a flowering of multinational forums to deal with trade, cultural exchange, and, to some degree, security. *Innovating:* iAsia boasts the world’s most successful manufacturing and technology sectors and could start taking the lead in everything from finance to nanotech to green tech. *Investing:* Asian nations are developing infrastruc­ture and human capital at unprecedented rates. But the continent remains plagued by: Insecurity: Great-power rivalry is alive in Asia. Massive military investments along with historic suspicions and contemporary territorial and other conflicts make war in Asia plausible. Instability: From environmental degradation to violent extremism to trafficking in drugs, people, and weapons, Asian nations have much to worry about. Inequality: Within nations and between them, inequality in Asia is more stark than anywhere else in the world. Impoverished minorities in countries like India and China, and the gap in governance and capacity within countries, whether as back­ward as Burma or as advanced as Singapore, present unique challenges. A traditional approach to Asia will not suffice if the United States is to both protect American interests and help iAsia realize its potential and avoid pitfalls. business and the Chinese government, along with other Asian financial players, injected billions in capital to help steady U.S. investment banks such as Merrill Lynch as the American subprime mortgage collapse unfolded. Chinese investment funds regional industrialization, which in turn creates new markets for global products. Asia now accounts for over 40 percent of global consumption of steel 4 and China is consuming almost half of world’s available concrete. 5 Natural resources from soy to copper to oil are being used by China and India at astonishing rates, driving up commodity prices and setting off alarm bells in Washington and other Western capitals. Yet Asia is not a theater at peace. On average, between 15 and 50 people die every day from causes tied to conflict, and suspicions rooted in rivalry and nationalism run deep. The continent harbors every traditional and non-traditional challenge of our age: it is a cauldron of religious and ethnic tension; a source of terror and extrem­ism; an accelerating driver of the insatiable global appetite for energy; the place where the most people will suffer the adverse effects of global climate change; the primary source of nuclear proliferation; and the most likely theater on Earth for a major conventional confrontation and even a nuclear conflict. Coexisting with the optimism of iAsia are the ingredients for internal strife, non-traditional threats like terrorism, and traditional interstate conflict, which are all magnified by the risk of miscalculation or poor decision-making.

### 1AC – Regionalism Advantage

#### Regional integration averts a tension-ridden economic split

Jiji Press 15 (9/2, Jiji Press English News Service, “East Asian Community Should Be Balanced by Trans-Pacific FTA: Bergsten”, p. 1, proquest)

Efforts for a trans-Pacific economic integration should be reinvigorated to prevent a split between East Asia and the United States, Fred Bergsten, director of the Institute for International Economics, said Friday. "The East Asian bloc and the American bloc could lead to drawing a line down the middle of the Pacific that would produce disintegration, rather than integration, of the Asia-Pacific region and a fundamental split between East Asia and the United States," Bergsten told a press conference at the Japan National Press Club. Bergsten believes that such a scenario is coming closer to reality as East Asian countries are moving toward the formation of an East Asian Community, a regional economic bloc based on ASEAN Plus Three--the 10-member Association of Southeast Asian Nations, together with China, Japan and South Korea. Noting that past attempts for economic regionalism in East Asia were aimed against the United States, he warned that any divisive motive on the part of East Asia would produce "disastrous effects on both security and economic relations across the Pacific." East Asian countries should not expect the United States to continue to provide security for them while blocking U.S. exports from the region, Bergsten said. To avoid such a trans-Pacific divide, he proposed that an Asia- Pacific free trade area evolve simultaneously with an East Asian free trade area. "For Japan, as well as (South) Korea and other key U.S. allies in the region, it would avoid any risk of having to choose between China, the inevitable leader over time of any East Asian group, and the United States," Bergsten said. Such an arrangement would also help defuse political and economic tensions between China and the United States, he argued.

### 1AC – Plan

#### Thus the Plan: The United States federal government should formally invite the People’s Republic of China to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### Contention ( ) is Solvency:

#### The plan cements US-China relations

Mendis & Balazs 4/26 (Patrick, Rajawali senior fellow of the Kennedy School of Government’s Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard University, Daniel, Tongji University, “When the TPP and One Belt, One Road meet”, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/04/26/when-the-tpp-and-one-belt-one-road-meet/)

Although China is excluded from the TPP at the moment, Beijing’s bilateral economic agenda shows striking convergence with the US-led trade package. Beijing has signed bilateral investment treaties with several TPP members, including Australia and South Korea, and there are on-going trade negotiations with Japan. A US–China bilateral investment treaty is also in the making, while the forward-looking, newly-established Shanghai Free Trade Zone attempts to make the Hong Kong financial district history. From a strictly commercial point of view, China’s entrance into the TPP would be an act with mutual benefits. Beijing would significantly increase the gains of the TPP through technology proliferation while also providing advantages in the US market for Chinese exports and investment opportunities. This could be a decisive factor in favour of cooperation if both China and the US choose to prioritise commerce above political complications. Certainly, the history of hegemonic shifts in international relations projects gloomy times ahead for Sino–American relations. It would be naive to expect China and the United States to avoid collision out of pure benevolence. Yet it may not be inherently conflictual for the two countries to act according to their self-interest, if these interests lie in economic growth. If we add the growth of commercial bonds between the United States and China to the international trade puzzle, it becomes plausible that political ideologies will be trumped in favour of commercial prosperity. Given the commercial interdependence of China and the United States, and their national commitments to economic growth, the TPP and OBOR are likely to be drawn under a common scheme for mutually assured prosperity. In such a scheme, cooperative growth will matter more than the political ideologies of the past.

#### Negotiations alone are a sufficient confidence building measure

Greenberg & Bergsten 14 (Maurice, chairman and CEO of C.V. Starr & Co., Inc. and former chairman and CEO of American International Group, Inc., C. Fred, senior fellow and director emeritus of the Peterson Institute for International Economics and former assistant secretary of the Treasury, “The U.S. Needs a Free-Trade Deal With China”, 12/19, p. A15)

The negotiations themselves, while they will undoubtedly be arduous, are beneficial. They create a forum for addressing and settling disputes that can deepen mutual trust and confidence between the two countries. They also offer opportunities to reach agreement on some of the less intractable trade issues, the "low hanging fruit," perhaps incorporating the current effort to achieve a bilateral investment treaty. And they help ensure that U.S. companies do not lose ground to foreign competitors. We suggest that China and the U.S. each appoint three representatives to explore the benefits and problems in negotiating and implementing such an agreement.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### Clear signals on inclusion are critical to trade

Greenville 16 (Stephen, visiting fellow at the Lowy Institute for International Policy in Sydney and a consultant on East Asian financial issues, 12/10, “Include China in the TPP to augment its benefits”, http://asia.nikkei.com/magazine/20151210-ARE-THINGS-GOING-SOUTH-for-KOREA/Viewpoints/Stephen-Grenville-Include-China-in-the-TPP-to-augment-its-benefits)

As a general principle, it is better to have larger trade groupings rather than smaller: There is less likelihood of trade diversion, whereby imports from fellow members of the group displace imports from outside, even though nonmembers may offer cheaper prices. Multilateral trade is, of course, optimal, but the World Trade Organization shows no signs of being able to make progress. Plurilateral agreements such as the TPP will still have distortional effects, but with 12 members and one-third of world trade, the TPP will cause less diversion than the bilateral preferential trade agreements that have become so common. What are the benefits of a larger grouping? Econometric modeling by Peter Petri, Michael Plummer and Fan Zhai, published by the Honolulu-based East-West Center with the support of the prestigious Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington, indicates that the TPP by itself will have modest benefits, but a similar framework for a group covering the entire Asia-Pacific region would generate much greater benefits. They estimate the TPP would raise annual world income by $295 billion in its existing form, but by $1.9 trillion if an all-inclusive Asia-Pacific grouping could be achieved. To put this in perspective, the world will gain about 0.3% of gross domestic product by implementing the TPP, but an Asia-Pacific agreement would raise incomes by nearly 2%. One can argue about the methodology of these model-based results, but the message is powerful. Stop at the current membership and there is only a modest benefit; widen the membership and the benefits are dramatically multiplied. There are some prospects that other Asian countries will join. This would be easiest for South Korea, which concluded a bilateral trade pact with Canada relatively recently. Indonesian President Joko Widodo expressed some interest when he visited America earlier this year, although there would be strong domestic resistance. The obvious omission is China. While the U.S. worked assiduously to encourage countries such as Indonesia to join, U.S. rhetoric in relation to China has been ambivalent, even unwelcoming. President Barack Obama "sold" the TPP to Congress by styling it as an opportunity for the U.S. to make Asia's trade rules rather than allowing China to do so. "China wants to write the rules for the world's fastest-growing region," he said. "That would put our workers and our businesses at a disadvantage. Why would we let that happen? We should write those rules. We should level the playing field." While denying that the TPP is part of a process of containing China, Obama offered Beijing something much less than an open invitation to membership: "And by the way, there's been some suggestion that by doing TPP we're trying to contain or disadvantage China. We're actually not. What we are trying to do is make sure that rather than a race to the bottom in the region there's a reasonable bar within which we can operate. And we hope that then China actually joins us in not necessarily formally being a member of TPP but in adopting some of the best practices that ensure fairness in operations." At the same time, U.S. Defense Secretary Ashton Carter said that "passing TPP is as important to me as another aircraft carrier." This view, made in the context of America's Asian "rebalancing," presents the TPP in a combative rather than cooperative mode. This adversarial view is widespread. The New York Times saw the pact as "a win for the United States in its contest with China for clout in Asia." Of course, the U.S. is not going to kowtow to China, or put in place a set of trading rules that reflect an authoritarian command economy rather than its own market-based approach. But there is an alternative -- a consistent policy that pushes back where China is challenging, as in the South China Sea, while at the same time offering China the opportunity to become a full "responsible stakeholder" in a rules-based international economic order. There might have been a case for excluding China during the negotiation phase in order to simplify negotiations and develop a set of rules that suited America's market-based orientation. With the rules now in place, China would have to accept them if it joined, just as it accepted WTO rules when it joined in 2001. This narrow exclusionary mindset needs to be addressed. The Petri study notes that: "Given China's scale and strategic role in the region, it is difficult to envision the future of the Asia-Pacific trading system without a central role for China." The argument that China's economy is not ready for the "platinum standard" rules of the TPP is simply fatuous. Of course China is an authoritarian command economy with many state-owned enterprises. Vietnam, already accepted as a member, has the same issues. These are being accommodated within the TPP rules, just as Malaysia and Brunei are being accommodated through less demanding foreign-exchange reporting requirements. For its part, China has shown no great offense at being excluded. Perhaps Beijing has felt that it is better not to seem too anxious to join a club that would reject its overtures. There would, however, be advantages for China in joining. Not only would membership open up trading opportunities, but the "platinum standard" rules would push China in a direction in which many of its reformers want to travel anyway. China might make good use of the Petri study to remind the world, and U.S. commentators, that preferential trade agreements are distortional -- the TPP is estimated to cost the Chinese economy 0.3% in annual GDP through trade diversion, according to the study. The way forward is to offer a less ambivalent welcome to China, encouraging it to begin a dialogue with the TPP partners that would lead toward the greatly augmented benefits that come from wider membership. The problem is that there is very little enthusiasm among key players for enlarging the membership. Neither the U.S. nor Japan seems likely to initiate this more welcoming attitude.

# Containment Advantage Extensions

### TPP = Containment – US Intentions

#### TPP promotes Chinese containment

Hearn & Myers 15 (Adrian & Margaret, fellows @ Inter-American Dialogue, “CHINA AND THE TPP: Asia-Pacific Integration or Disintegration?”, http://www.thedialogue.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CLA-TPP-Report-final-web.pdf)

China watchers, national and foreign, have painted a somber picture of the TPP, noting that trade is already relatively open between its members and that it is therefore likely to harbor ulterior motives. According to the Director of the APEC Research Center at the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, Cai Penghong, “It seems that the U.S. is using the TPP as a tool as a part of its Asia Pacific Strategy to contain China” (Cai 2011). The agreement is also described as a U.S.-led plan to undermine ASEAN+3, an institution that has leveraged China’s growth to consolidate East Asian economic integration (Li 2012). A prominent foreign contributor to Chinese official media, John Ross (2011), argues that the TPP aims “to reorient trade discussion in the Pacific away from the most dynamic market, China, to the less dynamic one of the U.S. by setting terms which exclude China.” Similarly, according to K.V. Kesavan and Kartikeya Khanna (2012), “the partnership serves to compete with China’s economic interests rather than be complementary.”

### TPP = Containment – Chinese Perception

#### Chinese officials see the TPP as a security threat – they fear it will include Taiwan, their key strategic interest, and undermine Chinese flexibility and economic goals; it’s not inevitable, but exclusivity creates perceptions that are hard to counter

Hearn & Myers 15 (Adrian & Margaret, fellows @ Inter-American Dialogue, “CHINA AND THE TPP: Asia-Pacific Integration or Disintegration?”, http://www.thedialogue.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CLA-TPP-Report-final-web.pdf)

Interviews conducted in Beijing between 2012 and 2015 by the authors of this report confirm that Chinese researchers and policy advisors are uncomfortable with the TPP. For instance, Han Feng, deputy director of the Asia-Pacific Institute at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, described a concern among Chinese foreign policy advisors that the TPP may seek to eventually incorporate Taiwan and therefore pose a threat to Chinese sovereignty. Wang Honggang, deputy director of U.S. Studies at the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations, noted a widely shared suspicion that the U.S. government is using the TPP negotiations to limit China’s international expansion. Similarly, Di Dongsheng, deputy director of the Renmin University Center for Chinese Foreign Strategy Studies, suggested that the TPP’s high but unrealistic standards are supportive of U.S. economic goals and afford China only a “take it or leave it” option. Pan Wei, director of the Center for Chinese and Global Affairs at Peking University, asserted that influential TPP signatories such as Australia should advocate the redrafting of controversial chapters of the agreement to facilitate China’s membership. In general, Chinese officials are worried that the TPP will entrench divisions between Asia-Pacific nations favorable to U.S. interests on the one hand and those sympathetic to China on the other. Despite these concerns, economist Jianmin Jin finds in our forthcoming book that the TPP may not be entirely problematic for China because it coincides somewhat with the Xi administration’s efforts to introduce market reforms into the Chinese economy. These efforts are evident in the Shanghai Free Trade Zone, the State Council’s announcement that a negative list will be applied to foreign investors in China’s health services sector, and nascent Chinese investment agreements with the United States and the European Union. The TPP therefore constitutes an external justification for the government to carry out its domestic reform agenda. The end-game for Beijing is a robust domestic economy that underpins a regional leadership position capable of withstanding prospective foreign challenges. Jin notes the resulting paradox: “cooperating with the United States over the long term will reduce the capacity of a U.S.-led alliance to contain China.” We find no hard evidence that the TPP seeks to contain China, though its unusually broad remit and apparent resonance with U.S. strategic priorities have understandably provoked suspicions in Beijing. Prior to visiting Japan and South Korea, U.S. Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated that, “Passing TPP is as important to me as another aircraft carrier…it would help us promote a global order that reflects both our interests and our values” (2015). Intentionally or not, the statement implies coercive unilateralism, playing into the hands of TPP critics. As Sam Roggeveen of the Lowy Institute for International Policy writes, “It’s a sound-bite tailor made for those Beijing sceptics who see the TPP as a device which deliberately excludes them, and which functions as the economic component of a US-led China containment strategy” (2015).

### TPP = Containment – Chinese Perception

#### China views the TPP as containment, but still wants to join

Gordon 14 (Bernard, Professor of Political Science Emeritus at the University of New Hampshire, 4/11, “Bring China Into TPP”, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/bring-china-tpp-10227?page=2)

Nevertheless, the belief that America seeks primacy in Asia took hold in China, and visitors have found that Chinese specialists cite precisely those Western arguments to support their view. The upshot has been China’s belief that the TPP is anti-China, which led to its coldness to the TPP, and its sponsorship of the “RCEP” (Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership), an Asian trade group that specifically excludes the U.S. China will not soon drop that RCEP plan, but more important is the about-face it has begun toward the TPP. Japan’s participation may have contributed to the wake-up, but in any case an early sign came last May, when China’s Commerce Ministry announced “a serious study of the TPP,” and in June new President Xi raised the issue with President Obama at their “Sunnylands” summit. It was, however, at China’s Third Plenum last November that the new direction became most evident. Party leaders called for basic reforms to better connect China with the global economy, and famously declared the “market will be decisive.” President Xi gave an important signal the new direction would be taken seriously when he kept in place the reformist Governor of the Bank of China, Zhou Xiaochuan, despite a mandatory age-based retirement. Zhou is well-known to American officials for his strong commitment to opening China’s economy, and Xi’s action assures that a powerful like-minded reformer stays at the Bank’s helm. China’s TPP turnaround has three features: (1) China is no longer dismissive about the TPP; it is instead exploring how best to become involved; (2) China’s leaders recognize that the TPP will set the rules for the next phase in how the global economy develops, and believe Beijing cannot afford to be left out of that process; (3) as in the U.S., Chinese officials have lost patience with the WTO. When the WTO’s most recent meeting ended in December with little to show, the Commerce Minister broadly hinted “we’re also open-minded towards other negotiations.” A trade specialist at China’s WTO Studies Institute was more blunt: echoing Deng Xiaoping’s famous “black cat, white cat” remark, he said “We are trying everything we can, Plurilateral, bilateral, the WTO, as long as it works.” There is even some urgency in the most recent Chinese commentary about TPP participation. In January a very prominent Peking University economist reported that “an increasing number of policy advisors are now urging the government to apply to join the TPP negotiations as early as possible.” And as if to illustrate the point, China’s former World Bank Senior Vice President, speaking in late February just days after the Singapore TPP talks failed to reach agreement, openly called for Beijing to participate in the TPP, and added that the U.S. should welcome the idea.

### Relations Spill-Over

#### Conflict over the TPP tanks cooperation with the U.S. across-the-board

Yu 15 (Peter, professor of law and co-director of the Center for Law and Intellectual Property at Texas A&M University, 10/19, “How China's exclusion from the TPP could hurt its economic growth”, http://fortune.com/2015/10/19/china-exclusion-tpp-economic-growth/)

Third, in view of the TPP, China may reassess its cooperation with the U.S. For those embracing a growing G-2 partnership between the two countries, the TPP could provide a major setback to U.S.-China cooperation in areas such as climate change, nuclear nonproliferation and cybersecurity. China may also develop a closer relationship with the E.U., considering that the latter was equally left out of the regional pact.

#### Trade issues shape security issues – economic interdependence is critical

Acharya 1/24 (Amitav, 2016, UNESCO chair in Transnational Challenges and Governance and professor of international relations at the School of International Service, American University, “Building Asian security”, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/01/24/building-asian-security/)

A principal challenge to Asian security today is that the various approaches to the security order seem to be working at cross-purposes. Take the United States and China. Washington insists that its rebalancing strategy enhances regional stability. Sure enough, it is possible to see the military dimension of rebalancing as crucial to maintaining the military balance of power in the region. But the economic aspect of rebalancing — the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) — excludes China and challenges United States–China economic interdependence. Similarly, China professes a deep interest in enhancing regional economic interdependence. But its own initiatives, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and One Belt One Road, challenge long-standing modalities of regional economic cooperation. These developments call for a major rethink of existing approaches to security in Asia. The new approach to Asian security might be called security pluralism.

#### Trade and security are fundamentally linked – exclusive trade agreements undermine critical security cooperation

Acharya 1/24 (Amitav, 2016, UNESCO chair in Transnational Challenges and Governance and professor of international relations at the School of International Service, American University, “Building Asian security”, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/01/24/building-asian-security/)

The architecture of security pluralism can be likened to an ecosystem. The components support each other and the loss or weakening of one would damage the others and endanger overall stability. For instance, economic interdependence acts as a check on security competition, contributes to state consolidation and regime legitimation, as well as encourages strategic and ideological accommodation. Interdependence also necessitates and supports regional institutions, which not only help to manage frictions, but also dampen great power rivalry. Contrary to a popular understanding, ecosystems are not self-sustaining. Their stability requires careful and cooperative management. The following suggestions, though not exhaustive, deserve consideration as a source of policy ideas, from which specific recommendations can be derived. First, it is essential to maintain the openness and inclusiveness of regional economic arrangements. More specifically, this means ensuring that the AIIB and TPP do not undermine economic interdependence and engender conflict. A forum of economics and security officials under the auspices of the East Asia Summit (EAS) and the Asia–Pacific Economic Cooperation — which would include the United States — could be useful for this purpose.

### War Impact Extensions

#### Anti-China trade rhetoric could escalate to full blown conflict

Lim 15 (Linda, 12/16, Professor of Strategy at the Stephen Ross School of Business, University of Michigan, “The myth of US-China economic competition”, <http://www.straitstimes.com/opinion/the-myth-of-us-china-economic-competition>) \*\*this evidence edited to remove offensive language

Market forces may be non-transparent and scary, but not any more so than government policy actions, especially when, as in China's case recently, they are accompanied by a strict clampdown on information and its purveyors. This suggests that economic problems might be worse than they appear, and that policy can aggravate them by retarding (limiting)(sic) reforms, increasing uncertainty, and paralysing (freezing)(sic) both state actors and private investors. No doubt the US and China have their differences, and compete for global influence. But politicians and pundits on both sides of the Pacific should ratchet down their rhetoric that privileges domestic political myth over international economic reality. If not, a rising risk of conflict over the other's hegemonic aspirations that each rails against, might make the rest of us both poorer, and less secure.

**The threat of nuclear war is not an exaggeration – a recent academic report found that the scenario is plausible**

William Lowther, "Taiwan Could Spark Nuclear War: Report," TAIPEI TIMES, 3--16--13, p. 3.

**Taiwan** is the most likely potential crisis that **could trigger a** nuclear war **between China and the US**, a new academic report concludes. “Taiwan remains **the** single most plausible **and dangerous source of tension and** conflict between the US and China,” says the 42-page report by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Prepared by the CSIS’ Project on Nuclear Issues and resulting from a year-long study, the report emphasizes that Beijing continues to be set on a policy to prevent Taiwan’s independence, while at the same time the US maintains the capability to come to Taiwan’s defense. “Although tensions across the Taiwan Strait have subsided since both Taipei and Beijing embraced a policy of engagement in 2008, the situation remains combustible, complicated by rapidly diverging cross-strait military capabilities and persistent political disagreements,” the report says. In a footnote, it quotes senior fellow at the US Council on Foreign Relations Richard Betts describing Taiwan as “the main potential flashpoint for the US in East Asia.” The report also quotes Betts as saying that neither Beijing nor Washington can fully control developments that might ignite a Taiwan crisis. “This is a classic recipe for surprise, miscalculation and uncontrolled escalation,” Betts wrote in a separate study of his own. The CSIS study says: “For the foreseeable future **Taiwan is the contingency in which nuclear weapons would** most likely **become a major factor, because the fate of the island is intertwined** both **with the legitimacy of** the Chinese Communist Party and the reliability of US defense commitments in the Asia-Pacific region.” Titled Nuclear Weapons and US-China Relations, the study says disputes in the East and South China seas appear unlikely to lead to major conflict between China and the US, but they do “provide kindling” for potential conflict between the two nations because the disputes implicate a number of important regional interests, including the interests of treaty allies of the US. **The danger posed by flashpoints such as Taiwan**, the Korean Peninsula and maritime demarcation disputes **is** magnified **by the potential for mistakes,** the study says. “**Although Beijing and Washington have agreed to a range of crisis management mechanisms**, such as the Military Maritime Consultative Agreement and the establishment of a direct hotline between the Pentagon and the Ministry of Defense, **the bases for miscommunication and misunderstanding remain and draw on deep historical reservoirs of suspicion**,” the report says. For example, it says, it is unclear whether either side understands what kinds of actions would result in a military or even nuclear response by the other party. To make things worse, “**neither side seems to believe the other’s** declared policies and **intentions, suggesting that escalation management, already a very uncertain endeavor, could be especially difficult in any conflict**,” it says. Although conflict “mercifully” seems unlikely at this point, the report concludes that “it cannot be ruled out and may become increasingly likely if we are unwise or unlucky.” The report says: “**With both sides possessing and looking set to retain formidable nuclear weapons arsenals, such a conflict would be tremendously dangerous and** quite possibly devastating.”

### TPP Helps Climate

#### TPP is great for the environment – it has the strongest standards of any US trade deal

Chittooran 16 (Jay, At Third Way, Jay works on the development and promotion of economic policies that foster middle-class prosperity. His portfolio includes trade policy, with particular attention to the Trans-Pacific Partnership and Trade Promotion Authority. He works on cross-commodity strategy as a part of trade analysis. Jay previously served in positions focused on energy economics at the Council on Foreign Relations, Google, Goldman Sachs and West Point. 4-15-16, "TPP in Brief: Environmental Standards" Third Way) www.thirdway.org/memo/tpp-in-brief-environmental-standards

Here are 10 major environmental provisions in TPP: Laws on the Books. TPP countries are required to maintain and effectively enforce their current environmental laws. This specifically targets the concern that a country—particularly a developing country—would weaken their environmental laws and agreements in an effort to encourage more trade and investment. Endangered Species and Wildlife Conservation. The market for the illegal wildlife trade is estimated to be $20 billion per year.1 TPP takes a series of steps, including levying sanctions and other penalties against individuals or entities engaged in this activity, to combat and prevent the illegal trade of wild flora and fauna. Further, TPP requires additional protections for endangered species, such as rhinoceroses and elephants, and stipulates that countries work to protect the wetlands and other natural areas.2 This trade deal also mandates that all countries adopt laws that fulfill their obligations under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), a multilateral environmental agreement signed by 182 countries that protects against illegal trade in wildlife. Fishing. TPP is the first trade agreement to ever address sustainable fishing practices. Overfishing causes fish stocks to drop, which can lead to severe ecological, environmental, and economic impacts. In fact, it is estimated that reduced fish populations lead to global losses as large as $23 billion annually.3 To address this, TPP promotes responsible fishing through a fisheries management system. TPP also stipulates that, first, countries are required to stop subsidies that negatively affect fish stocks in areas that are already being overfished. Second, countries must stop subsidizing fishing vessels engaged in illegal fishing.4 Both types of subsidies must be stopped within three years of TPP entering into force—a fast timetable considering that the World Trade Organization has been working, without resolution, to eliminate fishing subsidies for over a decade. Marine Conservation. TPP requires countries to promote the long-term conservation of sharks, whales, dolphins, sea turtles, sea birds, and other marine species. To accomplish this, TPP requires countries to institute conservation measures like “catch limits,” which lay out what and how much can be caught, as well as “bycatch mitigation protections,” which limit the accidental capture of non-targeted animals (i.e., a tuna-fishing boat accidentally catching sea turtles).5 Logging. TPP countries account for about 25% of global timber and pulp production and nearly 75% of the value of global trade in this area.6 Through TPP and as part of their CITES obligations, countries have committed to fight illegal logging and associated trade as well as promote sustainable forestry. This is done through greater communication and information sharing as well as cooperation and consultation with non-governmental entities.7 As a source of the illegal timber, a transit point in the distribution chain, or a source of demand for the timber products, all TPP countries can see the benefit of these illegal logging provisions. Ozone. TPP recognizes that “emissions of certain substances can significantly deplete and otherwise modify the ozone layer in a manner that is likely to result in adverse effects on human health and the environment.”8 As part of this, TPP protects the ozone layer by limiting the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances that are banned by the Montreal Protocol, an international agreement designed to protect the ozone layer. These substances include refrigerants, coolants, and aerosol-can propellants. TPP also promotes cooperation between countries to increase the development of cost-effective, low-emissions technologies and alternative, clean, and renewable energy sources.9 Marine Pollution. TPP also includes provisions to prevent marine pollution from ships by restating their obligations under the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), an international agreement to prevent marine pollution, to which all TPP countries are a signatory. TPP also encourages cooperation to prevent marine pollution, including limiting emissions from ships and ensuring adequate port waste reception facilities.10 Green Products. TPP eliminates tariffs on numerous environmentally-beneficial goods. For instance, tariffs on wind turbines will immediately go from 5% to duty free, and parts for solar panels to Brunei will eventually drop from a 20% tariff to duty free.11 Cooperation. Because all aspects in this chapter require support and action from all countries, TPP directly encourages greater and better environmental cooperation in a variety of areas—from energy efficiency, to accidental ship pollution, to deforestation. Further, an environmental committee, with a representative from each country, will regularly meet and will oversee the implementation of the environmental provisions within TPP.12 Enforcement. If a country doesn’t meet the commitments in TPP, it is subject to a dispute settlement mechanism.13 Failure to comply can include monetary fines and trade sanctions. How Do Past U.S. Trade Deals Compare with TPP on the Environment? Since 2002, the United States has enacted trade deals with 16 countries. So how do these deals compare on environmental issues? In short, environmental standards in modern U.S. trade deals have become stronger with each successive deal, with TPP having the strongest standards. While environmental protections were an afterthought in deals like NAFTA and not a part of the actual trade text, modern trade deals handle these issues very differently. And all these provisions would have to be met by any country that joins TPP down the road.

### Climate Impact Extensions

**Climate change threatens human survival – it will collapse the biosphere through feedback loops**

Dennis **Pamlin and**, Executive Project Manager, Global Challenges Foundation and Dr Stuart **Armstrong**, James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School & Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford. “12 Risks that threaten human civilization” Published February **2015** by Global Challenges Foundation http://globalchallenges.org/wp-content/uploads/12-Risks-with-infinite-impact-Executive-Summary.pdf

As for all risks there are uncertainties in the estimates, and warming could be much more extreme than the middle estimates suggest. Feedback loops could mean global average temperatures increase by 4°C or even 6°C over pre-industrial levels. Feedbacks could be the release of methane from permafrost or the dieback of the Amazon rainforest. The impact of global warming would be strongest in poorer countries, which could become completely uninhabitable for the highest range of warming. Mass deaths and famines, social collapse and mass migration are certainly possible in this scenario. Combined with shocks to the agriculture and biosphere-dependent industries of the more developed countries, this could lead to global conflict and possibly civilisation collapse. Further evidence of the risk comes from signs that past civilisation collapses have been driven by climate change.

#### Scientific consensus is on our side

Hansen 6

(Jim. Director of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Adjunct Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Columbia University’s Earth Institute. “The Threat to the Planet” The New York Review of Books. Pages 11-12. http://www.pdfdownload.org/pdf2html/pdf2html.php?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.astro.columbia.edu%2F~roban%2Flab\_2006\_fall%2Fhansen.pdf&images=yes )

Why are the same scientists and political forces that succeeded in controlling the threat to the ozone layer now failing miserably to deal with the global warming crisis? Though we depend on fossil fuels far more than we ever did on CFCs, there is plenty of blame to go around. Scientists present the facts about climate change clinically, failing to stress that business-as- usual will transform the planet. The press and television, despite an overwhelming scientific consensus concerning global warming, give equal time to fringe "contrarians" supported by the fossil fuel industry. Special interest groups mount effective disinformation campaigns to sow doubt about the reality of global warming. The government appears to be strongly influenced by special interests, or otherwise confused and distracted, and it has failed to provide leadership. The public is understandably confused or uninterested. I used to spread the blame uniformly until, when I was about to appear on public television, the producer informed me that the program "must" also include a "contrarian" who would take issue with claims of global warming. Presenting such a view, he told me, was a common practice in commercial television as well as radio and newspapers. Supporters of public TV or advertisers, with their own special interests, require "balance" as a price for their continued financial support. Gore's book reveals that while more than half of the recent newspaper articles on climate change have given equal weight to such contrarian views, virtually none of the scientific articles in peer-reviewed journals have questioned the consensus that emissions from human activities cause global warming. As a result, even when the scientific evidence is clear, technical nit-picking by contrarians leaves the public with the false impression that there is still great scientific uncertainty about the reality and causes of climate change.

### A2: China Doesn’t Care

#### China does care – the TPP inflicts outsider status on China and materially harms them through economic diversion

Yu 15 (Peter, professor of law and co-director of the Center for Law and Intellectual Property at Texas A&M University, 10/19, “How China's exclusion from the TPP could hurt its economic growth”, http://fortune.com/2015/10/19/china-exclusion-tpp-economic-growth/)

From its inception, the TPP has been considered by many as a strategic instrument to isolate or contain China. Given the country’s ambitions, its leaders are understandably concerned about the concerted effort by the U.S. and other Asia-Pacific countries to curtail its economic growth and geopolitical influence. China’s outsider status could also be seen as an indictment of its inadequacies, such as limited intellectual property protection and a lack of government procurement standards. The exclusion of China not only has caused the country to lose face, but has also provided a painful reminder of its continued struggle to gain an equal status in the international community. Finally, the lack of TPP membership will prevent China from enjoying new tariff reduction and preferential market access. If this regional pact is to operate according to design, it will divert trade and manufacturing from China to TPP members.

#### Chinese statements to the contrary are disingenuous

Jee 15 (Man-soo, a research fellow of the Korea Institute of Finance, “'TPP will spur erosion of China’s manufacturing edge’”, http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20151224001190)

China’s basic position is that trade issues should be handled within the framework of the World Trade Organization -- a regime to strengthen the global free trade -- and that an exclusive economic bloc should not be created. China sees the TPP as an attempt to forge a U.S.-led economic bloc that excludes China, and thus it does not welcome it -- although Beijing, on the surface, claims to support moves to foster global free trade.

#### Even if technically China can join the TPP now, they feel as if the structure is closed to them

Ria Novosti 5/6 (Russian newspaper, 2016, “Russia, China feel TPP and TTIP are closed structures – Naryshkin”, https://rbth.com/news/2016/05/06/russia-china-feel-tpp-and-ttip-are-closed-structures-naryshkin\_590837)

Russia and China see both the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) as closed structures, which may try to replace the World Trade Organization (WTO) in the future, Sergei Naryshkin, the speaker of the State Duma (Russian lower house of parliament) said on May 5. “We shared [with our Chinese counterparts] our positions on the formation of several regional trade agreements such as TPP and TTIP,” Naryshkin said. “In our opinion, they are closed structures. Moreover, the formation of the agreements is in the atmosphere of secrecy. These structures, according to our estimates, will be trying to substitute the rules and regulations of the WTO. This is something we don’t agree with.”

### A2: Not “Real” Containment

#### Perception of exclusion is a political problem regardless of the reality of U.S. intent

Choong 13 (William, fellow @ Int’l Inst of Strategic Studies, “William Choong: Trade for growth?”, http://www.iiss.org/en/iiss%20voices/blogsections/iiss-voices-2013-1e35/july-2013-a513/trade-for-growth-a267)

More significantly, the RCEP and TPP – which are led by China and the United States respectively, and as a result, seen as competing blocs – would be affected by the relations between Beijing and Washington. This is where geopolitics intrudes into the rational and pragmatic business of FTAs. The United States has said that it is not ideologically opposed to China joining the TPP, but Chinese officials think that the TPP – touted as a ‘high quality’ FTA – is explicitly set up to exclude and ‘contain’ China.

### A2: Too Late

#### It’s not too late to engage China on the rebalance to reverse perceptions of containment; the alternative is all-out war

Lai 15 (David, Ph.D., Research Professor at the Strategic Studies Institute of the US Army War College, “China’s Strategic Moves and Counter-Moves”, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/Parameters/Issues/Winter_2014-15/5_LaiDavid_> ChinasStrategicMovesCounter-Moves.pdf)

China has long held that since it has shown signs of rising, the United States has sought to contain China. Many of the US moves around China, especially the strategic rebalance, have been perceived by the Chinese as attempts to encircle China (by the way, encirclement is a signature feature of Go). Since that is the case, the United States might as well play Go for real and make some well-intended Go moves on China. Moreover, US national leaders have arguably learned much from Sun Tzu’s Art of War and should be able to apply Sun Tzu’s tactics to deal with his Chinese descendants. The US strategic rebalance is likely to continue regardless which party is in charge in Washington. To do it right in what may be called the “US Strategic Rebalance 2.0,” the United States should set the strategic rebalance priority straight—engaging the emerging great powers, especially China (not “including China”), should be at the top of the agenda.39 In addition, the United States should follow the Go strategy to put stones inside China as new efforts to engage China. These future moves will take Black’s moves 11 and 13 in Figure 1 as stepping stones. In Go terms, those future (United States) moves will reduce the size of White's (China’s) posturing. In geostrategic terms, those moves will be enhanced by US efforts to shape China’s rise. At this time, China is still open to US engagement and persuasion. Washington should seize the opportunity to engage Beijing before that window of opportunity slips away. Whether China and the United States play chess or Go in the Asia-Pacific is not a trivial matter. Chess is a force-on-force game that relies heavily on maneuver of pieces with different values and capabilities. Moreover, chess is a zero-sum game in that there is usually only one winner (as shown in Figure 3), though it sometimes ends in a draw. The implication of this aspect is very problematic in the context of US-China relations. If guided by the mindset of chess, China and the United States would seek a clear victory over the other. The price would be unattainable and unbearable.

# Trade Advantage Extensions

### Global Trade Low

**Protectionism is rising – the TPP is the world’s best shot**

**Suominen 14.** [Kati, Visiting Assistant Adjunct Professor at UCLA Anderson School of Management, Adjunct Fellow at CSIS, Ph.D. Political Economy from UC San Diego, Aug 4 2014, “Coming Apart: WTO fiasco highlights urgency for the U.S. to lead the global trading system,” katisuominen.wordpress.com/2014/08/04/coming-apart

Two **threats** are emerging. The first is disintegration of the trading system. The core of the system until the mid-1990s, **the WTO is utterly dysfunctional: deals require unanimity** among 160 members, **making** any cantankerous player like India **a veto.** Aligning interests has been impossible, turning all action in global trade policymaking to free trade agreements (FTAs), first kicked off by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994. By now, 400 FTAs are in place or under negotiation. FTAs have been good cholesterol for trade, but the overlapping deals and rules also complicate life for U.S. companies doing global business. One single deal among all countries would be much preferable to the “spaghetti bowl” of FTAs, but it is but a pie in the sky. So is deeper liberalization by protectionist countries like India.¶ **The U.S.-led talks for “mega-regional” agreements** with Europe and Asia-Pacific nations, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), **are the** best solution yet to these problems**. They free trade and create uniform rules among** countries making up two-thirds of the world economy. Incidentally, they would create a million jobs in America. Yet **both hang in balance** thanks to inaction on Capitol Hill to pass the Trade Promotion Authority (TPA), the key piece of legislation for approving the mega-deals, now stuck in a bitter political fight as several Democrats and Tea Party line up in opposition. TPA is key for the Obama administration to conclude TPP and TTIP talks: Europeans and Asians are unwilling to negotiate the thorniest topics before they know TPA is in place to constrain U.S. Congress to voting up or down on these deals, rather than amending freshly negotiated texts.¶ The second threat in world trade is the absence of common rules of the game for the 21st century global digital economy. As 3D printing, Internet of Things, and cross-border ecommerce, and other disruptive technologies expand trade in digital goods and services, intellectual property will be fair game – why couldn’t a company around the world simply replicate 3D printable products and designs Made in the USA? Another problem is data protectionism – rules on access and transport of data across borders. Europeans are imposing limits on companies’ access to consumer data, complicating U.S. businesses’ customer service and marketing; emerging markets such as Brazil and Vietnam are forcing foreign IT companies to locate servers and build data centers as a condition for market access, measure that costs companies millions in inefficiencies. A growing number of countries claim limits on access to data on the grounds of “national security” and “public safety”, familiar code words for protectionism.¶ Digital protectionism risks balkanizing the global virtual economy just as tariffs siloed national markets in the 19th century when countries set out to collect revenue and promote infant industries – a self-defeating approach that took well over a century to undo, and is still alive and well in countries like India. The biggest losers of digital protectionism are American small businesses and consumers leveraging their laptops, iPads and smart phones to buy and sell goods and services around the planet. Trade policymakers however lag far behind today’s trade, which requires sophisticated rules on IP, piracy, copyrights, patents and trademarks, ecommerce, data flows, virtual currencies, and dispute settlement. The mega-regionals, especially the TTIP, are a perfect venue to start this process**.¶** Disintegration of trade **policies risk** disintegrating world markets. Just as after World War II, the global trading system rests in America’s hands. Three things are needed.¶ The first is the **approval of TPA**, which **unshackles U.S. negotiators to finalize TPP** and TTIP. Most interesting for U.S. exporters, TPP and TTIP almost de facto merge into a superdeal: the United States and EU already have bilateral FTAs with several common partners belonging in TPP – Peru, Colombia, Chile, Australia, Singapore, Canada, and Mexico to name a few. What’s more, gatekeepers to markets with two-thirds of global spending power, **TPP and TTIP will be giant magnetic docking stations to outsiders; China and Brazil**, aiming to revive sagging growth, **are interested**. Once this happens, **the TTIP-TPP superdeal will cover 80 percent of world’s output and** approximate a multilateral agreement – and have cutting-edge common trade rules that could never be agreed in one Big Bang at the WTO.

### Trade Impact Extensions

**Trade solves global hotspot escalation**

Miriam **Sapiro 14**, Visiting Fellow in the Global Economy and Development program at Brookings, former Deputy US Trade Representative, former Director of European Affairs at the National Security Council, “Why Trade Matters,” September 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2014/09/why%20trade%20matters/trade%20global%20views\_final.pdf

This policy brief explores the economic rationale and strategic imperative of an ambitious domestic and global trade agenda from the perspective of the United States. International trade is often viewed through the relatively narrow prism of trade-offs that might be made among domestic sectors or between trading partners, but it is important to consider also the impact that increased trade has on global growth, development and security. **With** that context in mind, this paper assesses the **implications of the Asia-Pacific and European trade negotiations underway**, including for countries that are not participating but aspire to join. It outlines some of the challenges that stand in the way of completion and ways in which they can be addressed. It examines whether the focus on “mega-regional” trade agreements comes at the expense of broader liberalization or acts as a catalyst to develop higher standards than might otherwise be possible. It concludes with policy recommendations for action by governments, legislators and stakeholders to address concerns that have been raised and create greater domestic support.¶ It is fair to ask whether we should be concerned about the future of international trade policy when dire developments are threatening the **security** interests of the United States and its partners in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Europe. **In the Middle East**, significant **areas of Iraq have been overrun** by a toxic offshoot of Al-Qaeda, **civil war in Syria rages** with no end in sight, and the **Israeli-Palestinian peace process is in tatters.** Nuclear negotiations **with Iran have run into trouble**, while Libya and Egypt face continuing instability and domestic challenges. **In Asia**, historic rivalries and **disputes over territory** have heightened tensions across the region, most acutely **by China’s** aggressive **moves in the** S**outh** C**hina** S**ea** towards Vietnam, Japan and the Philippines. Nuclear-armed North Korea **remains** isolated, reckless and **unpredictable**. In Africa, countries are struggling with rising terrorism, violence and corruption. In Europe, **Russia continues to foment instability** and destruction **in** eastern **Ukraine**. And within the European Union, lagging economic recovery and the surge in support for extremist parties have left people fearful of increasing violence against immigrants and minority groups and skeptical of further integration.¶ It is tempting to focus solely on these pressing problems and defer less urgent issues—such as forging new disciplines for international trade—to another day, especially when such issues pose challenges of their own. But that would be a mistake. A key motivation in building greater domestic and international consensus for advancing trade liberalization now is precisely the role that greater economic integration can play in opening up new avenues of opportunity for promoting development and increasing economic prosperity. Such initiatives **can** help stabilize key regions **and** strengthen the security of the United States and its partners.¶ The last century provides a powerful example of how **expanding trade relations can** help reduce global tensions and raise living standards. **Following World War II**, building stronger economic cooperation was a centerpiece of allied efforts to erase battle scars and embrace former enemies. In defeat, the economies of Germany, Italy and Japan faced ruin and people were on the verge of starvation. The United States led efforts to rebuild Europe and to repair Japan’s economy. A key element of the Marshall Plan, which established the foundation for unprecedented growth and the level of European integration that exists today, **was to revive trade** by reducing tariffs.1 Russia, and the eastern part of Europe that it controlled, refused to participate or receive such assistance. Decades later, as the Cold War ended, the United States and Western Europe sought to make up for lost time by providing significant technical and financial assistance to help integrate central and eastern European countries with the rest of Europe and the global economy. ¶ There have been subsequent calls for a “Marshall Plan” for other parts of the world,2 although the confluence of dedicated resources, coordinated support and existing capacity has been difficult to replicate. Nonetheless, important lessons have been learned about the valuable role **economic** development can play in defusing tensions, and how opening markets can hasten growth. There is again a growing recognition that economic security and national security are two sides of the same coin. General Carter Ham, who stepped down as head of U.S. Africa Command last year, observed the close connection between increasing prosperity and bolstering stability. During his time in Africa he had seen that “security and stability in many ways depends a lot more on economic growth and opportunity than it does on military strength.”3 Where people have opportunities for themselves and their children, he found, the result was better governance, increased respect for human rights and lower levels of conflict.¶ During his confirmation hearing last year, Secretary John Kerry stressed the link between economic and national security in the context of the competitiveness of the United States but the point also has broader application. Our nation cannot be strong abroad, he argued, if it is not strong at home, including by putting its own fiscal house in order. He asserted—rightly so—that “more than ever foreign policy is economic policy,” particularly in light of increasing competition for global resources and markets. **Every day**, he said, “**that goes by where America is** uncertain about engaging in that arena, or unwilling to put our best foot forward and win, unwilling to demonstrate our resolve to lead, is a day in which we **weaken our nation** itself.”4¶ **Strengthening America’s** economic **security by** cementing its economic alliances **is** not simply an option, but an imperative. A strong nation needs a strong economy that can generate growth, spur innovation and create jobs. This is true, of course, not only for the United States but also for its key partners and the rest of the global trading system. Much as the United States led the way in forging strong military alliances after World War II to discourage a resurgence of militant nationalism in Europe or Asia, now is the time to place equal emphasis on shoring up our collective economic security. A **failure to act** now **could** undermine international security and place stability in key regions in further jeopardy.

### Trade Impact Extensions

**Trading alliances solve war by creating a** financial incentive **for peace and protection**

Loren **Mooney 14**, citing Matthew O. Jackson, William D. Eberle Professor of Economics at Stanford, and PhD in economics from Stanford Graduate School of Business, May 28 2014, “Matthew O. Jackson: Can Trade Prevent War?” http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/insights/matthew-o-jackson-can-trade-prevent-war

How can humans stop war? Obviously there's no simple answer, but a new network model analysis of international alliances **suggests** that **trade may be** at least part of **the answer**. The model, developed by Stanford economist Matthew O. Jackson and economics Ph.D. candidate Stephen Nei, suggests that military alliances alone aren't enough to stop nations from attacking one other, and also that the addition of **multilateral economic trade creates a** more stable, peaceful world.¶ While there is considerable existing research on the effects of trade and war, much of it has looked at bilateral relationships. This model focuses on multilateral interactions and considers various incentives for countries to attack, form alliances with, and trade with one another. In an attempt to understand what's necessary to achieve a stable network with no incentive for war, Jackson and Nei first explored an alliance scenario based solely on military defense considerations, excluding trade. "The fundamental difficulty we find is that alliances are costly to maintain if there's no economic incentive," says Jackson. So networks remain relatively sparse, a condition in which even a few shifting allegiances leaves some countries vulnerable to attack. "Stability is not just a little bit elusive; it's very elusive."¶ **Economic trade**, however, **makes a significant difference**. "Once you bring in trade, you see network structures densify," he says. **Nations form a** web of trading alliances**, which creates** financial incentive **not only to keep peace with trading partners, but also to** protect them from being attacked so as not to disrupt trade. "In the context of the alliances we have analyzed, **trade motives are** essential to avoiding wars and sustaining stable networks," the authors wrote in their paper, Networks of Military Alliances, Wars, and International Trade.¶ Their **findings coincide with** two major global trends since World War II: **From 1950 to 2000, the incidence of interstate war has decreased** nearly tenfold compared with the period from 1850 to 1949. **At the same time**, since 1950 **international trade networks** have **increased nearly fourfold,** becoming significantly more dense. "In the period before World War II, it was hard to find a stable set of alliances," says Jackson. The probability of a lasting alliance was about 60%. "You have almost a coin-flip chance that the alliance won't still be there in five years," he says. In Europe in the 1870s, for example, German chancellor Otto von Bismarck sought peace with "balance of power" diplomacy, which crumbled leading up to World War I. "Then in the past 50 years or so, there's been a surprising global stability." The impact of economic interdependence is especially apparent in Europe, Jackson says, where the Eurozone has promoted not only peace and increased trade among nations, but also labor mobility.¶ Very costly wars still occur, of course, but Jackson notes that the most **war-torn places** in recent history **have tended to be those with** fewer global trade alliances. For example, the Second Congo War from 1998 to 2003 and beyond, which killed more than four million people and is the deadliest war since World War II, involved eight African nations with relatively few trade ties. "Then look at the Kuwait situation," says Jackson, referring to U.S. intervention in the first Gulf War to protect oil supplies. "Economic interest drives a lot of what goes on in terms of where nations are willing to exercise military strength."

### A2: WTO Turn

#### Only an expansive TPP can revive global trade; WTO negotiating rounds are stalled

Olson 1/26 (Stephen, 2016, research fellow at the Hinrich Foundation. He served on the U.S. negotiating team for the NAFTA negotiations. He subsequently became president of the Hong Kong-based Pacific Basin Economic Council, and vice chairman of Cairo-based ARTOC Group for Investment and Development, “The TPP and the Sputtering Global Trade System”, http://thediplomat.com/2016/01/the-tpp-and-the-sputtering-global-trade-system/)

With the death-knell of the Doha Round seemingly signaled at the recent Nairobi Ministerial, and questions about the relevancy of the WTO intensifying, anyone reflecting on the current state of the global trade system could be forgiven for feeling less than optimistic. How did we arrive at such a dour state of affairs, and what’s the path forward? Ironically, the trade system, born in Bretton Woods with the founding of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1948, can be regarded as one of the great success stories of the post-WWII era. Through a series of successive “rounds” of global trade negotiations, the GATT was immensely successful in clearing out the primary underbrush stifling trade, namely tariffs. Average worldwide tariffs were reduced from 35 percent in 1948 to 6 percent in 1986, and global trade surged. By the 1980s though, most of the “heavy lifting” in tariff cutting had been accomplished, and a new slate of more complicated issues presented themselves. Among them: barriers to trade in services, protection of intellectual property rights, and discrimination in regulatory regimes. The Uruguay Round of negotiations, concluded in 1994, subsumed the GATT into a more ambitious successor organization, the World Trade Organization, which was designed to more effectively deal with this host of new issues. The WTO was launched in 1995 with much fanfare and great expectations. Unfortunately, few could have predicted how quickly it would be swamped by a wave of fast-moving developments that would undercut much of its efficacy before the new organization could barely get out of the starting blocks. Not only did the trade agenda grow substantially more complex than could have been anticipated (Internet? What’s the Internet?), so did the number of countries around the negotiating table. And large developing countries that were previously more inclined to follow the lead of the U.S. and Europe now grew more assertive in pressing their agenda. The success of countries like China in pursuing trade policies which sometimes seemed closer to mercantilism than free trade also caused other developing countries to question the wisdom of fully buying into the traditional free trade system – especially given developed world reluctance to open markets in crucial sectors such as agriculture. All of these threads came together in the Doha Round. The complexity of the issues under negotiation, the empowerment of developing countries to stand firm, and the inability of developed countries to overcome entrenched protectionist forces domestically, all added-up to a slow-motion train wreck. Surveying the Doha debacle, it’s hard to see any credible basis for expecting another large, global round of negotiations to succeed anytime in the foreseeable future – and the appetite to even attempt it seems distinctly lacking. To be clear, the WTO itself is far from obsolete, and in fact has a number of useful roles to play. What is obsolete however is the notion of large WTO negotiating rounds a la Doha. So, if traditional global rounds are likely DOA, what’s the path forward? One possibility worth considering would be to use regional agreements as “building blocks” that could gradually be deepened and expanded, and ultimately knitted together with other regional deals. In this way, a progressively larger portion of global trade would be liberalized, and trade rules and disciplines would be extended beyond what the WTO has been able to deliver. The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is the most likely candidate to form the initial cornerstone of such an approach. Although the TPP fell short of its original goal to be a “gold standard” free trade agreement (a remarkable number of barriers remain, as do a boatload of exceptions and loopholes), it nonetheless represents the first effort to address some of the most nettlesome trade issues that have defied resolution elsewhere – things like state-owned enterprises, digital commerce, and (at least nominally) currency manipulation. Viewed as a finished product, the TPP leaves much to be desired, and does not “resolve” any of these issues in a meaningful sense. But viewing the TPP as a starting point rather than an endpoint provides a potential path forward. The TPP’s architecture allows for other countries to join (and several have already indicated an interest), and for amendments and greater disciplines to be negotiated. There has been talk that APEC might consider a similar approach in order to achieve its vision of a Free Trade Area of the Asia Pacific. The idea would be to allow the primary three sub-regionals underway (TPP, RCEP, and the Pacific Alliance) to continue on their separate tracks, and then at some point down the line, to weave them together as the basis for an Asia Pacific FTA. Shifting the focus to establishing, expanding, and ultimately merging regional agreements would bring downside risks that shouldn’t be understated. Trade blocs always run the risk of becoming more trade-diversionary than trade-creating, and can spawn unhelpful “us versus them” mentalities. Business is already struggling with the proverbial noodle bowl of overlapping trade regulations, and the situation could get worse before it gets better. Moreover, stitching together regional agreements will be extremely complicated, and in order to be useful, will have to tend towards a highest-common-denominator approach – something that may or may not be possible. These are serious issues. But it’s time to face the fact that the large global trade rounds that served us so well from the 1940s to the 1980s no longer work, and will be unable to deliver on the promises of the GATT and WTO. We need another way forward. The TPP, used as a building block, has at least the potential to serve as an imperfect bridge between the old world and whatever may be next.

### A2: WTO Turn

#### The WTO fails – Only TPP can invigorate rules-based trade expansion

Solis 15 (Mireya, 3/13, fellow @ Brookings Inst., “The geopolitical importance of the Trans-Pacific Partnership: At stake, a liberal economic order”, http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/order-from-chaos/posts/2015/03/13-geopolitical-importance-transpacific-partnership)

The United States would lose the ability to make the rules in international trade. The World Trade Organization (WTO) has been unable to update the multilateral rules on trade and investment for the past 20 years. In the meantime, global supply chains have profoundly altered patterns of international production and trade. Deep free trade agreements (FTAs) like TPP seek to provide new rules that match the realities of 21st century trade. They focus on the liberalization of services that are critical to the efficient management of dispersed production chains (telecommunications, transportation, etc.), the protection of foreign investments and intellectual property rights, and avoiding predatory market behavior of state-owned enterprises. With the stagnation of the WTO, we have moved to a system of decentralized competition where different clusters of countries seek to define the standards for economic integration. As President Obama has warned, if we don’t write the rules on trade, China will. Moreover, we will have no way to encourage China to move away from its mercantilistic practices. The rebalance to Asia will stall. TPP is the second leg (after a reorientation of military resources) of the policy of rebalancing to Asia. As such, its fate will determine whether this strategy advances or just limps along. If TPP fails, doubts about the staying power of the United States will once again rear their ugly head. The signature U.S. policy to remain vitally connected to the world’s most dynamic economic region will come to naught. Let’s not forget that prior to the advent of TPP, the United States appeared poised to be marginalized from the process of regionalism in Asia. The U.S.-Japan alliance will lose a critical pillar. Trade has in the past been a divisive issue for the two allies. If TPP fails, it will demonstrate that the United States and Japan cannot move past frictions over market access in agriculture and automobiles to work in areas such as internationalization of financial services, protection of intellectual property, and governance of the internet economy that are central to the 21st century economy. The international trade agenda will hit a dead end. If TPP fails, the most significant trade agenda in a generation will come to a grinding halt. At that point, how can the trade agenda move forward? The WTO is not institutionally fit to advance a deep integration agenda. If a group of 12 countries that have self-selected are unable to wrap up an agreement, what other alternatives are there? The collapse of the TPP talks will greatly undermine the chances of success of the transatlantic trade negotiations and the East Asian trade deals are unlikely to generate deep integration commitments.

# Regionalism Advantage Extensions

### Regional Integration Extensions

#### Perception of exclusivity leads to divisive Asian trade

Das 2/6 (Sanchita, Fellow and Lead researcher (Economics) at the ASEAN Studies Centre and Coordinator of the Singapore APEC Study Centre, both based at ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute, 2016, “Trade agreements are in ASEAN’s best interests”, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/02/06/trade-agreements-are-in-aseans-best-interests/)

Economics aside, what do each of these trade agreements mean for the United States, China and ASEAN from a strategic perspective? The United States and China view trade agreements like the TPP, RCEP and FTAAP as ways to limit each other’s ability to compete in their respective areas of interest. China, as a growing economic power, has an interest in leading the East Asian institutional architecture and needs to ensure that neither the United States nor Japan will dominate the region. The United States’ interest lies in making sure that China’s economic rise does not lead to a reduction of US influence in East Asia. Even worse, from a US perspective, is the possibility of East Asian countries coming together to exclude the United States from the region, as in the ASEAN+3 and ASEAN+6 arrangements. ASEAN wants both the United States and China to be engaged in the region, while maintaining its centrality in the broader Asian architecture.

#### Exclusivity is the key question in trade regionalization

Hamanaka 14 (Shintaro, Dec, fellow @ Asian Dev’t Bank, “Trans-Pacific Partnership versus Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership: Control of Membership and Agenda Setting”, http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/152753/reiwp-146.pdf)

This paper argues that the formation of regional integration and cooperation frameworks can be best understood as a dominant state’s attempt to create its own regional framework where it can exercise some exclusive influence. In this context, it is important to observe not only which economies are included in a regional framework, but also which economies are excluded from it. The distinct feature of TPP is that the PRC is excluded, and that of RCEP is that the United States is excluded (Azis 2013, p. 31; Petri 2013, p. 340). While economists tend to emphasize membership, namely who is in the group, what is politically more important in understanding group formation is exclusion. This is because the exclusion of rival states is necessary for countries seeking to assume leadership. This paper puts special emphasis on exclusion, rather than inclusion, in analyzing trade regionalism, which is an approach adopted by some political science literature.

#### A TPP that excludes China undermine regional integration

Devadason 14 (Evelyn, Associate Professor at the Faculty of Economics and Administration, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Journal of Contemporary China, 2014 Vol. 23, No. 87, 462–479, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2013.843890>, ebsco)

The TPP agenda, which currently includes a majority of Asian participants, ironically appears to disconnect with the regional initiatives for the following reasons. First, the TPP does not include China, which is a powerhouse central to the existing regional trading relationships. Arguably, China’s positioning in Asia may not represent the centre – periphery relationships in the traditional sense of hierarchy, but she is said to occupy a geographically central position.25 Second, the TPP is unfortunately not pointed in the direction of the soft Asian integration style. Though some question this approach on the grounds that it may constrain instead of consolidate China’s relations with her Asian partners in the long run, it is maintained that this is a preferred approach shared by China and many East Asian countries. Therefore, the TPP still appears to be in conflict with the pre-existing links that have been established and at risk of attaining the long-term goal of an FTAAP. The success of regional integration (in a wider context based on the TPP) is likely to be riddled with difficulties without the cooperation of China. China’s role in Asia is clearly rooted, with the ASEAN þ 1 and other potential economic configurations, namely the ASEAN þ 3 and the ASEAN þ 6. Six of the nine participants of the TPP are party to at least one of the afore-mentioned blocs. In fact, the existing FTAs already link many of the TPP partners with China, either at bilateral or sub-regional levels. For example, China has concluded agreements with ASEAN10, Singapore, New Zealand, Chile and Peru and is engaged in negotiations with Australia. Therefore China has access to these markets through other agreements. Such pre-existing links also suggest that there will be, at best, moderate economic benefits for China in joining the deal. Therefore, the American engagement in Asia through the TPP, though it may exacerbate China’s concerns about ‘containment’,26 is not likely to isolate, or pose a threat and undermine China’s regional identity, especially given her leverage vis-a`-vis the US through East Asian cooperation. Having said that, China’s regional rise is not devoid of problems. China’s relations with some of her neighbours are recently strained over the disputed maritime territories in the South China Sea. This in turn is encouraging some form of ‘soft balancing’27 of these Asian neighbours as they seek to hedge against China’s rise by seeking US leadership.28 These countries seek the US presence in Asia as a balancing power, but certainly not as a primary power.

### Regional Integration Impacts

#### Regional integration solves conflict

Chia 13 (Slow Yue, Singapore Institute of International Affairs, “The Emerging Regional Economic Integration Architecture in East Asia”, Asian Economic Papers 12:1, p. 1-46, ebsco)

The ASEAN experience shows the significance of economic cooperation and integration in reducing geopolitical tensions and conflicts. Additionally, a large East Asian grouping would increase the East Asian voice in international organizations and forums. The Joint Expert Group on EAFTA Phase II Study (2009) argues that EAFTA would increase awareness of common destiny, institutionalize dialogues and contacts, and increase mutual understanding and cooperation. A larger region-wide grouping confers larger economic benefits in terms of larger static welfare effects from trade creation, less trade diversion, and the dynamic effects from economies of scale and better utilization of economic resources. A region-wide FTA would optimize regional production networks and lower costs associated with ROO. A region-wide FTA holds possibilities for harmonization or mutual recognition of product classifications, tariff schedules, and sensitive and exclusion lists; ROO and accumulation rules; product and technical standards and conformance requirements; customs procedures and issuance of Certificates of Origin; and dispute settlement.

### Asia War Impact Extensions

#### Asia war is likely – arms buildup and no mechanisms to control escalation

**Adams 14** – Shar Adams, Reporter for the Epoch Times, Citing Desmond Ball, Professor in the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre at the Australian National University, “Asian Cold War: Escalating Conflict in North-East Asia Bigger Threat Than War on Terror”, Epoch Times, 10-13, http://m.theepochtimes.com/n3/1014683-asian-cold-war-escalating-conflict-in-north-east-asia-bigger-threat-than-war-on-terror/

The world may be focused on the “war on terror”, but the arms build up in North-East Asia poses a far greater threat to global stability, says Professor Desmond Ball, a senior defence and security expert at the Australian National University (ANU). A former head of ANU’s Strategic & Defence Studies Centre, Professor Ball is no lightweight when it comes to security concerns. It is Professor Ball’s expertise in command and control systems, particularly in relation to nuclear war, that underlies his concerns about North-East Asia. “North-East Asia has now become the most disturbing part of the globe,” Prof Ball told Epoch Times in an exclusive interview. China, Japan and South Korea – countries that are “economic engines of the global economy” – are embroiled in an arms race of unprecedented proportions, punctuated by “very dangerous military activities”, he says. Unlike the arms race seen during the Cold War, however, there are no mechanisms in place to constrain the military escalation in Asia. “Indeed, the escalation dynamic could move very rapidly and strongly to large scale conflict, including nuclear conflict,” said Prof Ball. “It is happening as we watch.” Arms Race Military spending in Asia has grown steadily over the last decade. According to a 2013 Stockholm International Peace Research Institute report, China is now the world’s second largest military spender behind the United States, spending an estimated $188 billion in 2013. Japan and South Korea are also among the world’s top 10 military spenders. When North Korea and Taiwan are included, North-East Asian countries constitute around 85 per cent of military spending in Asia. But what is more disturbing, Prof Ball says, is the motivation for the acquisitions. “The primary reason now for the acquisitions, whether they are air warfare destroyers, missiles or defense submarines, is simply to match what the other [countries] are getting,” he said. While he believes it is likely that Japan would have embarked on military modernisation, he says it is China’s military provocation of countries across Asia that is fuelling the build-up. Since China lay claim to all of the South China Sea, it has escalated territorial disputes with Vietnam, the Philippines and Malaysia. What started with skirmishes between locals and Chinese fishing boats or navy vessels has now become territorial grabs – island building on contested rocky outcrops. In a sign of things to come, the South China Morning Post reported in June: “China is looking to expand its biggest installation in the Spratly Islands into a fully formed artificial island, complete with airstrip and sea port, to better project its military strength in the South China Sea.” According to Filipino media, the artificial island falls within the Philippines’ 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone. Prof Ball says China’s behaviour in the South China Sea is provocative, but “in the scale of what we are talking about, that is nothing” compared with conflicts in North-East Asia, where China and Japan are contesting claims over the Tokyo-controlled Senkaku Islands (claimed as the Diaoyus by China). Of the Senkakus conflict, Prof Ball says: “We are talking about actual footsteps towards nuclear war – submarines and missiles.” Chinese and Japanese activity in the Senkakus region has escalated to the point where sometimes there are “at least 40 aircraft jostling” over the contested area, he said. Alarm bells were set off near the Senkakus in January last year when a Chinese military vessel trained its fire-control radar on a Japanese naval destroyer. The incident spurred the Japanese Defense Ministry to go public about that event and reveal another incident from a few days prior, when a Chinese frigate directed fire-control radar at a Japanese military helicopter. Fire-control radars are not like surveillance or early warning radars – they have one purpose and that is to lock onto a target in order to fire a missile. “Someone does that to us, we fire back,” Prof Ball said. Counter Measures Needed Prof Ball is recognised for encouraging openness and transparency, and for his advocacy of multilateral institutions. He has been called one of the region’s “most energetic and activist leaders in establishing forums for security dialogue and measures for building confidence”. In his experience visiting China over the years, however, Prof Ball says gaining open dialogue and transparency with Chinese military leaders is difficult. He recounted a private meeting with a Chinese admiral shortly after the fire-control radar incident. Prof Ball had seen direct evidence of the encounter – “tapes of the radar frequencies, the pulse rates and the pulse repetition frequencies” – and wanted to know what had happened on the Chinese side and why it took place. “In a private meeting, I asked the admiral why … and he denied it to my face,” Prof Ball said. The Chinese admiral would not even concede that an incident had happened. “I don’t see the point of this sort of dialogue,” he added. With so many players in the region and few barriers against conflict escalation, the North-East Asian nuclear arms race is now far more complex and dangerous than the Cold War, he says. In the Cold War, there were mechanisms at each level of potential confrontation, including a direct hotline between the US and Soviet leaders. “Once things get serious here, [there is] nothing to slow things down. On the contrary, you have all the incentives to go first,” he said.

### A2: China/TPP Hurts Integration

#### Including China solves the risk that TPP causes multilateral fragmentation

Solis 4/1 (Mireya, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center for East Asia Policy Studies Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies, Brookings Inst., 2016, “The high stakes of TPP ratification: Implications for Asia-Pacific and beyond”, http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2016/03/high-stakes-tpp-ratification-solis)

The release of the TPP text has clarified a very important point: membership can be extended not only to APEC economies but also to other countries that are willing to meet TPP disciplines. Enlargement will be critical to avoid the above-mentioned risks of fragmentation and exclusion by helping disseminate TPP standards. In the short and medium term, the conclusion of the TPP talks is expected to have two main effects: increase the list of potential applicants, and encourage a higher level of ambition among on-going trade negotiations. The number of economies expressing an interest in joining the TPP has grown to include South Korea, Taiwan, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Colombia, and Costa Rica, among others. Regarding the second wave of accession the key issue will be readiness to undertake the ambitious liberalization commitments of the TPP, and the list of prospective applicants shows wide variation on this score. The conclusion of TPP talks also creates an incentive for the updating of existing FTAs and/or scaling up the level of ambition in ongoing trade negotiations, as countries outside the TPP want to secure export markets, attract foreign direct investment, and embed their companies in global supply chains. In the long run, the key challenge will be to devise an effective strategy to engage emerging economies, such as China, India, and Brazil. This is still the gaping hole in the U.S. plans to develop trans-Pacific and trans-Atlantic trade groupings. Certainly, putting in place the TPP and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership is the first step in such strategy since it changes the incentive structure for these countries to entertain further market liberalization. But at the end of the day, these emerging economies must reach the determination that it is in their national interest to abide by these economic standards, and find the political will to tackle vested interests. This is a tall order indeed. The most pressing question may well be how China will position itself vis-à-vis the TPP. Can we expect it to act on past precedent and seek TPP accession just as in the past it used WTO membership to advance economic reforms? Or will it choose instead to champion the negotiation of a Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific (FTAAP) after both the TPP and RCEP materialize, in order to play a more proactive role in the international economic architecture—more in conformance with the recent launch of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank?

#### TPP expansion is critical to avoiding multilateral fragmentation – Multilateralism alone fails

Solis 4/1 (Mireya, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center for East Asia Policy Studies Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies, Brookings Inst., 2016, “The high stakes of TPP ratification: Implications for Asia-Pacific and beyond”, http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2016/03/high-stakes-tpp-ratification-solis)

With a TPP deal in hand there is greater hope that we can manage the tectonic changes in international trade governance. The transformation of the trade agenda (increasingly about regulatory matters) and the limitations of the WTO as a negotiation forum, have called into question the pure multilateral ideal—one set of binding rules for 150+ countries. Instead, the center of action is now on what we call “variable geometry” arrangements where subsets of countries negotiate next-frontier rules: the plurilaterals in the WTO and the preferentials through mega trade agreements. The emerging system for trade governance is not risk-free, and much effort will be required to forestall potential dangers: fragmentation (if TPP-like standards do not disseminate widely) and exclusion (if less developed countries are bypassed by the FTA wave).

# Solvency Extensions

### Containment Solvency

#### Clearly inviting China in solves both relations and the economy

Gross 13 (Donald, senior associate at the Pacific Forum of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), 7/9, “Welcoming China to the Trans-Pacific Partnership”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/donald-gross/trans-pacific-partnership-china\_b\_3562801.html)

By inviting China to join the negotiations for the TPP at the Strategic and Economic Dialogue, the United States would strengthen the likelihood of the U.S. benefiting both from China’s long-term economic growth and its support for international institutions on which the U.S. relies. As Professor John Ikenberry of Princeton University puts it: The “United States cannot thwart China’s rise, but it can help ensure that China’s power is exercised within the rules and institutions that the United States and its partners have crafted ... that can protect the interests of all states in the more crowded world of the future.” Most importantly, including China in the TPP would advance crucial objectives of American economic policy — obtaining greater access to the Chinese market for U.S. goods and services, significantly reducing the Chinese government’s role in the private sector, protecting intellectual property, and fostering greater foreign investment in both China and the United States. This week’s Strategic and Economic Dialogue is an opportune time to make it manifestly clear the United States welcomes Beijing’s participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and, in so doing, resolve an issue that has hurt U.S. relations with China for far too long.

#### Diplomatic negotiations over TPP enhance mutual trust – this spills over into broader strategic relations

Zhou 14 (Andi, translating Piin-Fen Kok, Dir. Of the China, East Asia, & U.S. program @ The East-West Inst., “Piin-Fen Kok Discusses U.S.-China Cooperation”, http://www.eastwest.ngo/idea/pii-fen-kok-discusses-us-china-cooperation)

Kok stated that China and the U.S. must first build strategic trust in order to develop cooperation in a number of areas. In recent years, China has been suspicious of the U.S. “pivot” towards Asia, and the two U.S. initiatives of strategic rebalancing in the Asia-Pacific and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). China views these policies as methods to contain China’s rise. On the other hand, the U.S. sees China as taking an assertive stance on its maritime disputes, especially through military activity seemingly aimed toward U.S. allies. This aggression, coupled with recent unusually close encounters between U.S. and Chinese military planes, has left the U.S. unable to decipher China’s intentions. Despite the latter’s proposal for a new major-power relationship without conflict and confrontation, China’s behavior is perceived by the U.S. as raising the risk of conflict. Kok suggests that if the two countries can sit down for honest discussions and agree that the parties are not engaged in a zero-sum game and that peaceful cooperation can clear confusions about the other’s true intentions, then the two powers could reach consensus on a number of issues. After all, the U.S. has affirmed that it has no intention to contain China, and China has declared it will not push the U.S. out of the Asia-Pacific region. From this foundation, the two sides could cooperate on a common strategic vision for the Asia-Pacific, and honestly raise their respective concerns. There is a wide range of issues the U.S. and China can work together to address, such as the North Korea nuclear issue, climate change, counter-terrorism and infectious disease control and prevention. Their recent collaboration in training young Afghan diplomats was a good start, and demonstrated that the two sides can find common ground about how to solve bilateral and regional problems. If both sides can maintain that spirit to establish mutual trust, it would be a blessing for the people of Asia, and the Pacific will become more peaceful.

### Trade Solvency

#### Explicit inclusion of China would ratchet up to Asia-wide trade integration

Solis & Vaisse 13 (Mireya & Justin, Sr Fellows @ Brookings Inst., 1/17, “Free Trade Game Changer”, http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/free-trade-game-changer)

The TPP is the most ambitious trade initiative currently under negotiation. In essence, it promises to do what no other FTA has done before: to liberalize without exemptions and to tackle systematically vexing non-tariff barriers by generating trade disciplines in areas such as intellectual property, regulatory convergence, and state-owned enterprises. With the TPP, your administration can shape an Asia-Pacific economic integration platform with the potential to generate substantial economic and political payoffs. According to reliable estimates, a TPP 13 (one that includes Japan and South Korea) would generate annual income gains for the United States in the neighborhood of $78 billion dollars. Furthermore, an expansive TPP can also achieve the important political benefit of disseminating high-quality trade and investment rules through a ratcheting-up effect. Other trade initiatives will then feel compelled to raise their standards to remain competitive (e.g. ASEAN’s Regional Economic Partnership) and more countries will seek TPP membership, perhaps even China in the future. Indeed, you should explain to your Chinese counterparts that this is by no means the economic equivalent of a containment strategy; it is rather an enticement strategy that recognizes the benefits of a strong Chinese economy in an interdependent world, and aims to codify best practices on international trade and investment rules that could help China deepen its market reforms.

#### Reversing US exclusivity avoids a trade war with China and unites regional integration

Chengjiao 15 (Li, Senior Chinese diplomat, 3-4, “U.S.-China Trade Rivalry in Asia Is Overhyped”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/li-shengjiao/uschina-trade-rivalry-in-\_b\_6801320.html)

As the TPP negotiations are nearing completion, opposition from both tea party Republicans and rank-and-file Democrats has emerged. Tea party lawmakers, who have a long history of mistrust of Mr. Obama, could have been expected to balk at the president’s request for more power to fast-track the TPP deal through Congress; while resistance from Democrats has proved broad and deep. Hyping China’s trade dominance in Asia is merely a political gimmick to win domestic support for the TPP. The FTAAP is a joint effort by APEC economies and has the potential to incorporate the TPP and other existing free trade arrangements, not necessarily conflicting with the TPP. While the TPP is not attractive to several APEC economies because of its U.S. dominance, the proposed FTAAP, which embraces all of the 21 APEC economies, is meant to be an all-inclusive, all-win trade initiative that “represents the largest single liberalization in history,” as the renowned American economist C. Fred Bergsten himself put it. The United States should walk the talk and work with China to take the leadership role to truly facilitate global economic integration instead of waging a trade war with China and only trying to have a narrow interest that barely a certain number of countries could benefit from. As long as the two parties seek collaboration over conflict, there is reason to believe that the China-U.S. trade engagement in the Asia-Pacific could be a win-win game.

#### Inviting China to join TPP solves the motive for splitting into trade blocs

Goto 15 (Shihoko 3/23, program associate for Northeast Asia at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, “Keeping China In or Out? Beijing Vs. Washington on TPP”, http://www.theglobalist.com/keeping-china-in-or-out-beijing-vs-washington-on-tpp/)

Following that same logic, Beijing has put a back-up plan into the works. It has taken the lead in establishing alternative trade regimes to the TPP, including the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership agreement that includes key TPP member states — but not the United States. In short, diplomacy in Asia – including in the domain of international financial institutions and trade regimes – is becoming much more multi-faceted. China is making its weight felt – and expects, yes, proper accommodation. The White House’s best bet to remain a key player in establishing new rules in Asia may actually be to encourage Beijing to join TPP down the line, so that the momentum for any alternative Chinese visions lose steam. Failure to do so might backfire in the long run and put Washington out in the cold.

### China Says Yes – General

#### Even if China won’t join, inviting them is sufficient to solve negative perceptions

Burkhart 13 (Ryan, 11/1, staff @ The Diplomatic Courier, “The U.S., China, and the Trans Pacific Partnership”, http://www.diplomaticourier.com/the-u-s-china-and-the-trans-pacific-partnership/)

China does have political reasons not to join the TPP. First of all, many of the rules and regulations would benefit American companies. Also, many prominent voices in China perceive the TPP as an American effort to contain China’s rise. After the “shirtsleeve summit”, both U.S. and Chinese leaders recognized that cooperation is extremely necessary for the future of Sino-American relations. Some have even called for increased economic integration in order to create “mutually assured economic destruction.” Regardless, the U.S. should be transparent as possible with the TPP and invite China to observe the next round of talks. Furthermore, Chinese leaders should prime their economy to eventually join the TPP or similar trade agreement in the future.

#### Chinese views on TPP are changing to support joining

Dasgupta 4/22 (Saibal, Voice of America news staff, “China Edging Closer to Accepting TPP Reality”, http://www.voanews.com/content/china-edging-closer-to-accepting-tpp-reality/3298082.html)

At the same time, there is a sharp realization among many in China that it makes more sense to be part of the TPP regime if it becomes a reality instead of spending a huge amount of effort to counter it. Beijing has obtained some success in its efforts to create an alternative trade block under the banner of the Silk Road and Maritime Silk Road programs, in addition to the AIIB. About 65 countries have agreed to join at least one of them. The AIIB also recently entered into a co-financing deal with the World Bank. "The World Bank decision will upgrade the status of AIIB. It is already causing a lot of excitement across the world. I am sure the U.S. will begin to notice its importance soon," Wang said. China has also proposed a free trade route with interconnected ports and roads, both existing and planned projects, running through Asia and Europe. It has also offered financial support and extended its construction muscle to many of the planned projects. The ultimate goal to is ease the movement of Chinese goods and counter challenges like the TPP, observers said. But the initial success on AIIB and the Silk Road program is closely linked to China's ability to buy goods and services from different countries and finance projects in those regions. Beijing's ability on this score has been weakened recently by its domestic economic slowdown. In fact, government economists have been closely looking at the possibility of joining the TPP for a long time, even as efforts progressed for the alternative "Silk" free trade route. "China should keep paying close attention and at an appropriate time, in accordance with progress on domestic reform, join the TPP, while limiting the costs associated to the greatest degree," the Communist Party's Study Times journal said in October last year. "China is currently working with the U.S. to discuss bilateral investment agreements in order to access the 'national treatment before admission + Negative List' mode as the basis for negotiations, in line with TPP requirements," it said.

#### Their older evidence no longer applies – Chinese views have changed

Dasgupta 4/22 (Saibal, Voice of America news staff, “China Edging Closer to Accepting TPP Reality”, http://www.voanews.com/content/china-edging-closer-to-accepting-tpp-reality/3298082.html)

After nearly three years of concentrated efforts to counter the U.S.-sponsored Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and build an alternative trade block, China is now seriously considering the possibility of joining the TPP regime. "I think it does not make sense to have a world divided by different trade blocks. The U.S. should join the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank [AIIB], and China should become part of the TPP," said Wang Huiyao, the president of the Center for China and Globalization, and an advisor to the Chinese government. “The two sides should stop creating trade bottlenecks and join hands for the expansion of free trade,” Wang told VOA. He added that both China and the U.S. have a lot to gain if they worked within one trade regime. As the second biggest international trader, China can make a lot of difference to the emerging TPP mechanism, analysts said. At present, 12 countries have agreed to join the TPP.

### China Says Yes – A2: Standards

#### China will join despite problems with standards

EAF 2/17 (East Asia Forum, 2016, “Does the TPP Need China, and Vice Versa?”, http://www.economywatch.com/features/Does-the-TPP-Need-China-and-Vice-Versa0217.html)

There are many reasons for China not to join: China is unlikely to accept the TPP’s labour and environmental standards, its higher intellectual property standards or the entailed reforms of its state-owned enterprises. These objections all have weight, but perhaps not as much as might be first thought. China is no longer the lowest-cost location for labour and so comparatively modest provisions on labour standards are less of a problem for China. In addition, with water and air pollution posing major health concerns, tackling environmental problems has become a high priority. What’s more, tilting the metaphorical ‘balance’ in intellectual property protection even further in favour of owners is no longer a major concern for China. China’s warm embrace of intellectual property systems continues to be revealed by the cold statistics: its patent office is the largest in the world in terms of applications and since 2010, it has accounted for more than half the annual increases in trademark filing activity worldwide. China will also have to reform its state-owned enterprises even if it does not join the TPP. Such reforms are part of creating a dynamic internal market that will continue to attract investors despite fluctuations and crises in global growth. Obviously, China would have to negotiate with the United States to join the TPP. This would likely be a long and difficult process. However, China has already been through a WTO accession. It knows what to expect. There is perhaps one more reason for China to think about the TPP. The 17th National Congress of the Communist Party of China in 2007 committed China to the concept of an ‘ecological civilization’. China will need to acquire much greater regulatory capacity if it is to implement the goals implicit in this idea. Scandals linked to poor regulation — such as the contamination of milk powder by the toxic compound melamine, which affected an estimated 300,000 infants — have drastically reduced consumer confidence. Within China, there will likely be a technocratic constituency that will see the TPP as a source of external pressure for improving domestic regulatory standards in areas such as food and environmental regulation. Groups within China may welcome the TPP if it helps China to adopt international best practice, since this will generally be an improvement on current regulatory standards. In addition, this could provide the best defence against investor–state actions.

#### China will see entry as inevitable and meeting standards earlier is easier than adapting to new, higher standards

Chunding & Whalley 16 (Jan/Feb, Li, Institute of World Economics and Politics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, John, Department of Economics, Western University, “Possible Chinese Strategic Responses to the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement”, China Economist 11.1, 23-46, proquest)

Some of TPP rules will challenge China. For example, the agreement's government procurement standards would alter the structure and operation of Chinese state-owned enterprises. The TPP electronic commerce standards could also deeply affect China's censorship and information control policies. But we argue that, if China does want to enter the TPP, it is better for China to enter as early as possible, before many other countries join. The more countries are involved in the TPP, the more difficult the negotiations will become. We argue that the present TPP rules and provisions are not that high-standard, and it is feasible for China to potentially accept the agreement. If China were to take part in the TPP, China should go beyond the present TPP and negotiate more beneficial terms for China, namely the security of market access and antidumping measures.

#### China can meet standards

Greenville 12/10 (Stephen, visiting fellow at the Lowy Institute for International Policy in Sydney and a consultant on East Asian financial issues, 2016, “Include China in the TPP to augment its benefits”, http://asia.nikkei.com/magazine/20151210-ARE-THINGS-GOING-SOUTH-for-KOREA/Viewpoints/Stephen-Grenville-Include-China-in-the-TPP-to-augment-its-benefits)

The argument that China's economy is not ready for the "platinum standard" rules of the TPP is simply fatuous. Of course China is an authoritarian command economy with many state-owned enterprises. Vietnam, already accepted as a member, has the same issues. These are being accommodated within the TPP rules, just as Malaysia and Brunei are being accommodated through less demanding foreign-exchange reporting requirements. For its part, China has shown no great offense at being excluded. Perhaps Beijing has felt that it is better not to seem too anxious to join a club that would reject its overtures. There would, however, be advantages for China in joining. Not only would membership open up trading opportunities, but the "platinum standard" rules would push China in a direction in which many of its reformers want to travel anyway.

### China Says Yes – A2: Environmental & Labor Standards

#### High standards won’t prevent China from joining TPP

Dasgupta 4/22 (Saibal, Voice of America news staff, “China Edging Closer to Accepting TPP Reality”, http://www.voanews.com/content/china-edging-closer-to-accepting-tpp-reality/3298082.html)

Even if Beijing makes a formal decision to join the TPP, it will be a challenging task for it to meet some of the stiff environmental and labor standards laid out in the agreement. A vast section of Chinese industry has grown without any regard to environmental damage, and are often accused of denying workers some of their rights. But Diane Farrell, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Asia at the U.S. Department of Commerce, does not agree. She explained the TPP is elastic enough to accommodate the different conditions of different countries, and give each new member sufficient time to adjust to the standards. "The TPP has been designed to accommodate economies at different stages of development. The standards have to be implemented in a phased manner, and every country will get sufficient time to implement them. This is why Malaysia is in it," Farrell said.

### China Says Yes – A2: State-Owned Enterprises Standards

#### SOE reforms are acceptable to China

Yun 16 (Mikyung, School of International Studies, The Catholic University of Korea, March, “An Analysis of the New Trade Regime for State-Owned Enterprises under the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement”, Journal of East Asian Economic Integration, 20.1, 3-35, p. proquest)

Although at first glance the TPP SOE provisions seem onerous for China, it may in fact serve to help China carry its state sector reforms to the next level. For example, it may be more reasonable for China than China's WTO Accession Protocol, which has been criticized on many accounts.21 The Protocol already contains high levels of obligations for SOEs that are comparable to TPP SOE obligations, including non-discrimination and commercial consideration, as well as the requirement that subsidies to Chinese SOEs will be construed to be "specific." On the other hand, the TPP SOE discipline would apply to all members and therefore not as discriminatory as the China-specific Protocol of the WTO. It also provides various exemptions and exceptions to allow for domestic subsidies, financial prudence, and resolution of failed financial institutions and corporate bankruptcies. These exceptions have been probably incorporated to meet the needs of current members in dealing with the aftermath of recent financial crisis, but they would also serve China well in enhancing its state sector reforms and continued privatization, of which rules in the Protocol may not be so amenable because it precludes exceptions in the SCM Agreement which had been guaranteed to other developing countries and transition economies to deal with privatization and reform.

### China Says Yes – A2: Intellectual Property Standards

#### Intellectual property standards won’t prevent Chinese adherence

EAF 2/17 (East Asia Forum, 2016, “Does the TPP Need China, and Vice Versa?”, http://www.economywatch.com/features/Does-the-TPP-Need-China-and-Vice-Versa0217.html)

China might even see some longer-term advantages in embracing some intellectual property standards, including patent standards, given China’s dominance in the manufacture of active pharmaceutical ingredients. While, the compliance of Chinese manufacturers with regulatory standards is variable, it is foreseeable that a Chinese industry with ambitions in pharmaceutical innovation could emerge.