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### File Overview

This file provides the negative responses to the China TPP Affirmative.

In response to the Containment Advantage, the negative argues that China doesn’t perceive the TPP as a containment measure, that relations between the US and China are resilient, that the affirmative arguments about the potential nuclear consequences of US-China war are grossly exaggerated, as are the affirmative’s doomsday climate change scenarios, and that the TPP actually undermines US-China progress on climate change because of lax environmental standards.

In response to the Trade Advantage, the negative argues that protectionism is not on the rise, and that global trade is actually at an all-time high; that investing more time and resources into expanding the TPP actually trades off with other global trade initiatives through the World Trade Organization (WTO) that are better for trade overall, and finally, that trade does not contribute significantly to world peace.

In response to the Regionalism Advantage, the negative argues that including China in the TPP will lead to confusion and disagreements, as it is difficult to agree on a standard set of rules for economies as large as China’s and as small as, say, Brunei’s. This will make it unlikely for small nations to join in the future, which would hurt regional integration. The TPP also imposes US standards on the region, which many nations do not want to agree to. Finally, war between countries in East Asia is not nearly as likely as the affirmative claims, and there are many factors that make escalation unlikely.

In response to Solvency, the negative argues that China will never agree to join the TPP, because the standards set by the treaty on a variety of issues (including environmental laws, intellectual property, and state-run companies) are too stringent for them to meet.

Note: See the China TPP Affirmative for a glossary of relevant terms for this file.

## Containment Advantage Answers

### 1NC Containment Answers

#### 1. China doesn’t see TPP as containment

Bradsher 15 (Keith, 4/28, staff @ New York Times, “Once Concerned, China Is Quiet About Trans-Pacific Trade Deal”, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/29/business/international/once-concerned-china-is-quiet-about-trans-pacific-trade-deal.html?\_r=0)

As the deal has come to the forefront again, the Chinese government has changed its view. Some of China’s leading trade policy intellectuals now say that they have few concerns about the agreement. They also say that the pact could even help China, by making it easier for Beijing to pursue its own regional agreements without facing criticism that it should instead pursue ambitious global free trade pacts that would require significantly opening its markets to Western competition. “We don’t think T.P.P. is a challenge to China — we will watch and study,” said He Weiwen, a former Commerce Ministry official who is now the co-director of the China-United States-European Union Study Center in Beijing. “We are more or less neutral because we have our own agenda, pushing forward Asean plus six and the Silk Road,” he said, referring to two of China’s own regional initiatives. He added that China would make sure its regional pacts complied with global free trade rules on such deals.

#### 2. Relations won’t collapse

Chia 15 (Sue-Ann, 12/28, staff @ World Today, “Great Sino-US power game could shatter peace in Asia”, http://www.todayonline.com/year-end-special/great-sino-us-power-game-rivalry-and-mistrust-rule)

Yet, other analysts also believe that cool heads will prevail and both sides will not let tensions spiral out of control. “With many other policy priorities, neither the US nor China will allow the South China Sea issue to jeopardise overall bilateral relations,” said researcher Angela Poh from the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), in an RSIS commentary. “What we see, therefore, are the US and China walking a very fine line, and engaging in diplomatic signalling, mixed with friendly gestures to manage the situation.”

#### 3. China war won’t go nuclear

Fravel 15 (M. Taylor, Associate Professor Department of Political Science Security Studies Program Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “The Future of U.S.-China Strategic Stability”, 4/30/15, https://nuclearconference2015.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/cunningham\_fravel\_nsri\_2015.pdf)

Chinese assessments of crisis stability in the U.S.-China relationship are optimistic. Chinese strategists see a low risk of nuclear escalation, both intentional and unintentional, at present and into the future. These assessments contradict the theoretical expectations of Western scholars about the current risks of intentional escalation. They also contradict the concerns of the U.S. policy community about the future risks of unintentional nuclear escalation posed by the AirSea Battle Concept. At present, Chinese optimism about crisis stability is premised on a belief that the stakes in any U.S.-China conflict would be low.126 As a result, neither state would risk the possibility of nuclear escalation from a more intense conflict. If a more intense conflict did occur, Chinese strategists expect that U.S. conventional superiority and China’s no first-use policy would prevent either side from escalating to nuclear threats. As a hedge, China is allowing limited ambiguity over its no first-use policy to deter the United States from any temptation to use its conventional superiority to attack China’s nuclear arsenal. In the future, China’s strategic community does not expect recent developments in U.S. strategic capabilities to change the risks of intentional nuclear escalation. With some exceptions, most Chinese strategists see a low risk of unintentional escalation at present. They do not share U.S. concerns about the novel unintentional escalation risks posed by the AirSea Battle Concept in the future. But even if Chinese analysts accurately assess the nuclear risks present in a U.S.-China contingency, their optimism about crisis stability may be unwarranted if it is not shared by the United States.

### 1NC Containment Answers

#### 4. TPP undermines US-China progress on climate change

AFL-CIO 15 (American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, U.S. labor union, “The U.S.-China Economic Relationship: The TPP is Not the Answer”, http://www.aflcio.org/content/download/156731/3897641/TPPChinaReport.pdf)

In summary, the key provisions of the TPP are not “high standards” in relation to key U.S. policy goals or in relation to the U.S. broader policy objective of ensuring shared prosperity in our nation and in the world economy. Moreover, even if China were subject to them, they would not push China in the direction that the United States has stated it wishes China to go. In the area of climate change and carbon emissions, the TPP’s silence is a step backward from the U.S.-China bilateral agreement.14 In the area of currency, China could join the TPP and continue its current policy of currency manipulation. And the ISDS provisions of the TPP likely would be used by global firms to slow efforts to regulate China’s economy in the public interest.

#### 5. Climate change won’t cause extinction

Hsu 10 (Jeremy, staff @ Live Science,“Can Humans Survive?”, 7-19, <http://www.livescience.com/9956-humans-survive.html>)

His views deviate sharply from those of most experts, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the worst-case scenarios discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change don't foresee human extinction. "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, a geochemist and renowned climate scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker remained skeptical that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

### Ext. #1 – No Containment Perception

#### China doesn’t care if it’s excluded from TPP; it doesn’t promote a material reaction from China

Yu 15 (Peter, professor of law and co-director of the Center for Law and Intellectual Property at Texas AandM 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/)

Nevertheless, four reasons exist to explain why China may not care much about its being left out of the TPP. First, China continues to actively engage its neighbors and trading partners. Indeed, many Asian countries – including those involved in the TPP negotiations – fear that they will have to pick between China and the U.S. As policymakers from Australia and New Zealand have reportedly told their U.S. counterparts in the early stages of the negotiations, their countries would withdraw if the TPP were designed to contain China. Without containment, however, countries can still negotiate other bilateral or regional trade agreements with China. Second, that the U.S. and other like-minded countries have gone outside the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other multilateral fora to negotiate new rules has set an important precedent for China to undertake similar maneuvers. From China’s perspective, such maneuvers could come in handy when the country needs to avoid multilateral intervention in sensitive matters such as those involving Taiwan, Tibet and the South China Sea. Third, China continues to face myriad challenges within its own economy, which include massive urban migration, widespread unemployment and an enormous gap between the rich and the poor. Although China has worked hard in the past two decades to ensure compliance with WTO rules, the country may not be ready for new and higher trade standards. These standards can be particularly burdensome in view of the recent downturn of the Chinese economy. Finally, China is unlikely to be able to join the TPP unless some of its standards are substantially revised. For example, the agreement’s government procurement standards would drastically alter the structure and operation of Chinese state-owned enterprises. The TPP electronic commerce standards could also deeply affect the country’s censorship and information control policy.

#### China has dropped its blanket objections to TPP; any impact is long-term because they’re taking a “wait and see” approach

Naughton 15 (Barry, So Kwanlok Chair of Chinese International Affairs at the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies at the University of California, San Diego, 10/7, “What Will the TPP Mean for China?”, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/10/07/china-tpp-trans-pacific-partnership-obama-us-trade-xi/)

What does TPP mean for China? Until about three years ago, China routinely denounced the TPP, holding that it was part of an effort to contain China. However, China has more recently dropped its blanket opposition, and taken a more nuanced “wait and see” attitude. On a number of occasions, Chinese spokesmen have indicated that although they were not ready to meet the demanding requirements of a potential TPP agreement today, they might be ready and willing to join in a few years. Nevertheless, the actual conclusion of a TPP agreement — assuming it is in fact ratified by the main parties — will confront China with a series of new challenges and opportunities.

#### China is not concerned about the U.S. containing it with trade

de Jonquieres 15 (Guy, senior fellow at the European Centre for International Political Economy, “What Will the TPP Mean for China?”, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/10/07/china-tpp-trans-pacific-partnership-obama-us-trade-xi/)

Obama’s claims that the TPP will enable the United States to set the rules for global trade also look more than a touch hyperbolic for other reasons, too. For one thing, to do so would require China’s assent. But why should China sign up to U.S.-prescribed rules on labor or environmental standards, with no guarantee of obtaining reciprocal trade benefits from the U.S. that Washington would undoubtedly find politically difficult to deliver? For another, to be truly global, rules would require the acquiescence of the European Union. Yet attempts by Washington and Brussels to achieve common regulatory ground in negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership are progressing very slowly, and in some areas the gaps between the U.S. and Europe appear to be widening, not narrowing. For all these reasons, China may feel it can afford to take a relaxed attitude to TPP. In any case, it now believes initiatives such as One Belt One Road, the China-led AIIB and Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), its own regional trade plan, have given it options. In addition to which, as Arthur points out, it is far from obvious that Washington has a coherent strategic vision of how the TTP fits into its concept of its relations with China.

### Ext. #2 – Relations Resilient

#### China doesn’t overreact to U.S. political statements

Zhenghui 15 (Deng, 4/1, Director for Research, China Energy Fund Committee International Center, “Origins of misperceptions between China and the US”, http://csis.org/publication/pacnet-19-origins-misperceptions-between-china-and-us)

On China’s side, China cannot fully understand and properly deal with problems originating from the US political system. In a liberal democratic system where politicians face pressures from constituents, exaggerated remarks by individuals and even some statements passed by the Congress have no substantial meaning. In addition, the US president must be smart about how he uses limited political capital. He may have to appeal to Congress on some issues to win compromise on other issues, which may lead to decisions that are detrimental to the China-US relationship, including arms sales to Taiwan. It is natural for China to react to that, but China needs to respond in ways that don’t further damage the base of the bilateral relationship. For a long time China’s sometimes emotional overreactions created a vicious circle. Fortunately, we are seeing improvement here, including President Xi’s decision to visit the US this September just before the 2016 presidential campaign begins in earnest. China’s restrained reaction to US arms sales to Taiwan last December is another positive example.

#### Relations are resilient

Russel 14 (Daniel, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations”, http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rm/2014/06/228415.htm)

Mr. Chairman, there are those who argue that cold war-like rivalry is inevitable and that the United States and China are condemned to a zero-sum struggle for supremacy, if not conflict. I reject such mechanistic thinking. As anyone who has served in government can tell you, this deterministic analysis overlooks the role of leaders who have the ability to set policy and to shape relationships. It gives short shrift to the fact that our two economies are becoming increasingly intertwined, which increases each side’s stake in the success of the other. It undervalues the fact that leaders in Washington and Beijing are fully cognizant of the risk of unintended strategic rivalry between an emerging power and an established power and have agreed to take deliberate actions to prevent such an outcome. And it ignores the reality of the past 35 years – that, in spite of our differences, U.S.-China relations have steadily grown deeper and stronger – and in doing so, we have built a very resilient relationship.

#### US/China relations are high over trade and security issues

Morrison 1/3 (Charles, President, East-West Center, 2016, “2015: A Year of China-US Competition and Cooperation”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/eastwest-center/2015-a-year-of-china-us-c\_b\_8914260.html)

China’s international infrastructure thrust could potentially complement the U.S. trade approach for an economic win-win for the region. But on the security side, China’s assertive maritime claims and construction projects have raised troubling questions. Geography has blessed China with a central land position in East Asia but confined it to limited maritime space. By laying claim to every rock, sandbar and reef that it can, even if close to neighboring countries, China looks narrowly self-interested and threatening, undercutting its diplomacy. China’s artificial island-building program in the South China Sea alarmed neighbors and compelled the U.S. to conduct a freedom of navigation operation to show that such structures are not acceptable as a basis for territorial claims. Yet despite this and some exaggerated rhetoric, Chinese and American military-to-military engagement continues to expand. In fact, overall it was a successful - almost dramatic - year in China-U.S. cooperation. The annual China-U.S. Strategic and Economic Dialogue in June and President Xi’s September state visit resulted in dozens of new agreements and initiatives. Visas have been liberalized and student and business interaction is growing remarkably. Chinese investment is pouring into U.S. localities. The Paris climate change conference outcome was enabled by commitments China and the U.S. made to each other beginning in late 2014. The two countries chaired an Afghanistan aid conference at the UN, and even such thorny issues as cybersecurity are being discussed. Despite many differences in areas such as human rights and freedom of expression, the two countries have many motivations for cooperating, especially on global issues.

### Ext. #3 – No China War

**US-China war will never happen**

**Keck, 13** (Zachary – Assistant Editor of The Diplomat, 7/12, “Why China and the US (Probably) Won’t Go to War”, The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2013/07/12/why-china-and-the-us-probably-wont-go-to-war/>)

But while trade cannot be relied upon to keep the peace, a **U.S.-China war is** virtually unthinkable **because of** two other factors: **nuclear weapons and geography**. The fact that both the **U.S. and China have nuclear weapons is the most obvious reason**s why **they won’t clash**, even if **they remain fiercely competitive**. This is because war is the continuation of politics by other means, and nuclear weapons make war extremely bad politics. Put differently, **war is fought in pursuit of policy ends**, **which cannot be achieved through** a **total war between nuclear-armed states**. This is not only because of nuclear weapons destructive power. As Thomas Schelling outlined brilliantly, nuclear weapons have not actually increased humans destructive capabilities. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that wars between nomads usually ended with the victors slaughtering all of the individuals on the losing side, because of the economics of holding slaves in nomadic “societies.” **What makes nuclear weapons different**, then, **is not just** their **destructive power but** also the **certainty and immediacy** of it. While extremely ambitious or desperate leaders can delude themselves into believing they can prevail in a conventional conflict with a stronger adversary because of any number of factors—superior will, superior doctrine, the weather etc.— none of this matters in nuclear war. With nuclear weapons, countries don’t have to prevail on the battlefield or defeat an opposing army to destroy an entire country, and **since there are no adequate defenses for** a **large-scale nuclear attack**, **every leader** can be absolute certain that **most of their country** **can be destroyed** in short-order in the event of a total conflict. Since no policy goal is worth this level of sacrifice, **the only possible way for** an all-out **conflict to ensue is** for a **miscalc**ulation of some sort to occur. **Most of these can** and should **be dealt by Chinese and the U.S. leaders holding regular**ly **senior level dialogues like** the ones of the **past month**, in which frank and direct talk about redlines are discussed. These can and should be supplemented with clear and open communication channels, which can be especially useful when unexpected crises arise, like an exchange of fire between low-level naval officers in the increasingly crowded waters in the region. While this possibility is real and frightening, **it’s** hard to imagine **a** plausible scenario **where it leads to** a **nuclear exchange between China and the** United States. After all, at each stage **of the crisis leaders know** that **if it is not properly contained**, **a nuclear war could ensue**, and the **complete destruction of a leader’s country is** a more frightening possibility **than losing cred**ibility **among hawkish elements of society**. In any case, measured means of retaliation would be available to the party wronged, and behind-the-scenes **diplomacy could** help **facilitate** the process of finding mutually acceptable **retaliatory measures. Geography** is the less appreciated factor that **will mitigate** the **chances of** a **U.S.-China war**, but it could be nearly as important as nuclear weapons. Indeed, **geography has a history of allowing countries to avoid** the **Thucydides Trap**, **and works against a U.S.-China war** in a couple of ways. First, both the United States and China are immensely large countries—according to the Central Intelligence Agency, the **U.S. and China are the third and fourth largest countries in the world** by area, at 9,826,675 and 9,596,961 square km respectively. They also have difficult topographical features and complex populations. As such, **they are** virtually unconquerable by another power. This is an important point and differentiates the current strategic environment from historical cases where power transitions led to war. For example, **in** Europe where many of the **historical cases** derive from, each **state genuinely had to worry** that **the other side could increase** their **power** capabilities to such a degree **that they could** credibly **threaten the other** side**’s** national **survival**. **Neither China nor the U.S. has to realistically entertain** such **fears**, and **this will lessen** their insecurity and therefore **the security dilemma** they operate within. Besides being immensely large countries, **China and the U.S. are** also **separated by** the **Pacific Ocean**, **which will** also **weaken** their **sense of insecurity** and threat perception towards one another. **In many** of the **violent power transitions of the past**, starting with Sparta and Athens but also including the European ones, the **rival states were located in close proximity** to one another. By contrast, **when great power conflict has been avoided**, **the states have** often **had considerable distance between them**, as was the case for the U.S. and British power transition and the peaceful end to the Cold War. The reason is simple and similar to the one above: **the difficulty of projecting power across large distances**—**particularly** bodies of **water**s— **reduces each side’s concern** that the **other will threaten its** national **survival** and most important strategic interests. True, the U.S. operates extensively in China’s backyard, and maintains numerous alliances and partnerships with Beijing’s neighbors. This undeniably heightens the risk of conflict. At the same time, the British were active throughout the Western Hemisphere, most notably in Canada, and the Americans maintained a robust alliance system in Western Europe throughout the Cold War. **Even with the U.S. presence in Asia**, then, **the fact that** the **Chinese and America**n homelands **are separated by** the **largest body of water in the world is** enormously important **in reducing** their **conflict potential**, **if history is any guide** at least.

### Ext. #4 – TPP Bad for Climate

#### TPP empowers ISDS to challenge environmental and labor laws

AFL-CIO 15 (American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, U.S. labor union, “The U.S.-China Economic Relationship: The TPP is Not the Answer”, http://www.aflcio.org/content/download/156731/3897641/TPPChinaReport.pdf)

What the TPP does appear to include, according to press accounts and U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) statements, is investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS). This mechanism undermines the rule of law by granting foreign investors unique abilities to challenge efforts by TPP member governments to protect the public interest. Foreign investors, who are not party to the agreement and take no responsibilities under it, can access private arbitration tribunals directly, without first seeking the approval or consent of their own governments. The grounds the TPP gives foreign investors to challenge government measures at the federal, state and local levels go far beyond actual expropriations or discriminatory measures. Even when measures apply equally to domestic and foreign companies, they can be challenged as violations of broad and ill-defined rights, such as the right to “fair and equitable treatment,” a standard that does not exist under U.S. law.10 Even the libertarian Cato Institute has judged that “investment agreements [that include ISDS] go beyond non-discrimination in ways that no one seems to be able to define clearly, opening up the floodgates for litigation as creative lawyers look for new ways to characterize government actions as inconsistent with international law.”11 By contrast, for example, all provisions for the enforcement of labor rights require action by member governments; neither workers nor unions can enforce the labor rights provisions on their own. The TPP’s ISDS provisions too easily can be used by multinational firms to challenge efforts by TPP member countries, and perhaps eventually by the Chinese government, to develop modern regulatory states in areas such as financial, environmental, public health and labor regulations. ISDS is a provision that tilts the playing field away from workers and consumers and toward business. If applied to China, it could undermine the central U.S. policy goal of encouraging rising incomes and consumption in China.

#### TPP undermines climate change controls

Stiglitz 3/28 (Joseph, 2016, Nobel prize winning economist, “TPP’s Hidden Climate Costs”, http://rooseveltinstitute.org/tpps-hidden-climate-costs/)

President Obama has said that “no challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change.” Yet the word “climate” is conspicuously missing from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). Worse, many provisions of the proposed trade agreement between the United States and 11 Pacific Rim countries could undermine critical policies and initiatives needed to contain global climate change. All the evidence suggests that in order to limit global warming to the 2 degrees Celsius that scientists see as critical to avert the worst effects of climate change, we must retrofit global economic structures for production, investment, and trade. Instead, TPP would cement in place a system that treats the environment as distinct from and subordinate to international trade and investment. Though trade negotiators may treat commerce and climate as separate problems, the emissions giving rise to climate change are in fact an unaccounted cost of the goods and services exchanged in our increasingly complex and globally integrated production and consumption chains. Not paying for these large social costs of pollution in production and global shipping delivers a hidden subsidy to the corporations polluting our global atmosphere. Any good trade agreement would seek to do away with distorting subsidies to producers. One cannot have fair trade if firms are not required to pay the environmental costs they impose on society, which also present an existent threat to life on this planet. TPP does nothing to prohibit these typically hidden subsidies or others, such as subsidies for fossil fuels, buried within the tax system. TPP is worse still because it creates the risk of lengthy lawsuits and sizable cash awards to investors for government actions that would rein in many of the current hidden subsidies for greenhouse gas pollution or ban climate-imperiling products and production methods. For instance, under TPP rules, government policies to incentivize more environmentally sustainable goods and services—even with voluntary labeling—can be challenged as illegal “technical” trade barriers unless the government has requested a specific policy exception in the existing agreement. Countries that lose such cases will face millions in sanctions unless they eliminate the policy favoring more socially and environmentally sustainable conditions. Arguably, the countries party to TPP may not launch such attacks on each other’s climate policies, but the agreement’s expanded investor rights empower polluters to do so directly. TPP’s investor–state dispute settlement (ISDS) system allows foreign investors to sue governments for actions perceived as violating new rights afforded by the agreement and to demand compensation for expected future profits undercut by such policies. This threat creates an explicit obstacle to many government actions to reduce carbon emissions or other forms of climate pollution. When investors bring disputes, they will be heard in private international tribunals stacked in favor of business interests. Arbitrators in such tribunals have repeatedly interpreted agreements like TPP to mean that changes to the policy environment harming their bottom line violate investor rights and deserve compensation, sometimes amounting to billions of taxpayer dollars. Corporations in carbon-intensive resource extraction and electric utility industries are some of the biggest users of these ISDS mechanisms. <<card continues>>

### Ext. #4 – TPP Bad for Climate

<<card continues>> In January, the energy company TransCanada launched such a challenge against President Obama’s decision to reject the Keystone XL pipeline, demanding $15 billion in compensation using the North American Free Trade Agreement’s (NAFTA) investor arbitration system. TPP would expand the scope of this system. The threat cuts both ways: Currently the American firm Lone Pine is challenging Canada’s moratorium on hydrofracking under the St. Lawrence River. Unlike NAFTA, TPP explicitly would extend actionable investor rights to cover government contracts for the “exploration, extraction, refining, transportation, distribution or sale” of government-controlled natural resources like “oil, natural gas, … and other similar resources.” Other seemingly arcane implications of TPP could also have big consequences for climate change. Current U.S. law requires the Department of Energy (DOE) to assess the economic impact and public interest before approving exports of liquid natural gas (LNG). However, the law also instructs the DOE to approve “without modification or delay” exports to any country with which we have a trade agreement. DOE assessments make clear that exporting gas benefits gas companies (who can charge higher prices) while harming consumers and other businesses (who will pay more for gas and electricity). But more gas exports will also incentivize intensified hydrofracking, a natural gas extraction technique that is itself associated with significant greenhouse gas emissions. While shifting foreign consumers away from dirtier coal energy would be good, the worry is that the carbon-intensive costs of liquefying, transporting, and then reconstituting gas will more than offset carbon savings. A full public interest analysis might attempt to assess whether that is the case, but if TPP were enacted, U.S. officials would lose the right to review all LNG exports to TPP nations. Crafted in secrecy with the help of corporate lobbyists, and with an eye to courting votes in a Republican-controlled Congress where climate change denial trumps science, no one should be surprised that TPP falls short of the “gold standard for 21st century international agreements” touted by the Obama administration. President Obama is reaching for a legacy on trade, but TPP’s harmful climate impact could dwarf his other laudable achievements.

#### China won’t meet TPP environmental standards

Sonnad and Horwitz 15 (Nikhil and Josh, staff @ Quartz news, “What China will have to do to join the Trans-Pacific trade club”, http://qz.com/517905/what-china-will-have-to-do-to-join-the-trans-pacific-trade-club/)

Environmental protection is another core part of the TPP. A leak of the draft environment chapter from 2013 highlights the importance of curbing climate change by reducing carbon emissions. It also has several sections devoted to wildlife conservation. China’s leaders have acknowledged pollution reduction as a high priority, both domestically and internationally. It recently pledged to the UN it would cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 60% per unit of GDP by 2020. But it’s not clear if China has the might to win the war on pollution on its own shores, let alone commit to goals and standards set by outsiders. Despite pollution levels falling by an estimated 11% last year, China’s environmental ministry reported that 66 of China’s 74 major cities still fall below the acceptable national standards for air quality. China has also struggled to prove its commitment to conservation. The TPP singles out overfishing as a key area for focus. While conclusive data remains unavailable, research suggests that China is responsible for much of the overfishing in Asia and Africa. As it prepared for an IPO, one fishery even wrote in its prospectus that didn’t fear international restrictions on overfishing because it knew the Chinese government wouldn’t enforce them. China likely remains sincere about its commitment to improving the country’s environment, but only to the extent that public discontent threatens social stability. When it comes to the environment’s relationship to the economy, the latter tends to take precedence.

### Ext. #5 – No Climate Impact

**The impacts from climate change are slow and adaptation solves**

**Mendelsohn 9** – Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: <http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf>

**These statements are** largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, **society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences**. The **science and economics** of climate change **is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences**. The **severe impacts** predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) **of no mitigation**. Many of the **predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation**. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of **the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these** “**potential” impacts** will never occur because people will adapt. **It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks**. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

**Species extinction from warming is exaggerated**

Carter et al 14(Dr. Craig D. Idso, Dr. Sherwood B. Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. Robert M. Carter, Emeritus Fellow, Institute of Public Affairs and Dr. S. Fred Singer, Science and Environmental Policy Project, CLIMATE CHANGE RECONSIDERED II: BIOLOGICAL IMPACTS, Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, 2014, p. 569.

**Real-world observations reveal plants have many ways of adjusting to changes in climate in addition to their ability to spread from places of rising warmth to cooler habitats, and these observations suggest the planet’s current assemblage of plants is likely to be around a** good deal longer than **many theoretical models have predicted. One of the great horror stories associated with predictions of CO2-induced global warming is of warming so fast and furious that many species of plants will not be able to migrate towards cooler regions—poleward in latitude, or upward in elevation—quickly enough to avoid extinction.** Real world observations **of plants show they have** many ways of adjusting **to changes in climate in addition to their ability to move from places of rising warmth to cooler habitats.** These observations suggest the planet’s current assemblage of plants is likely to be around longer than many theoretical models have predicted. **Under-yielding species appear to be** buffered from extinction **because growth enhancements of smaller plants tend to diminish the relative biomass advantages of larger plants in crowded conditions, and when species are rare in a local area, they have a higher survival rate than when they are common, resulting in the enrichment of** rare species **and** increasing diversity **with age and size class in complex ecosystems.** In addition, **diversity should increase as a group of individuals ages, because more common species are selectively removed by pathogens and predators, especially those commonly associated with them.** Also, individuals of a species compete more intensively with conspecifics than with individuals of other species, and diversity may increase if an individual benefits nearby non-conspecifics, as such facilitation makes interspecific interactions more positive than intraspecific interactions and thus provides an advantage to locally rare species. Similarly, **common trees growing closer together are more prone to deadly infections, and they may also face stiffer competition for certain resources, whereas rarer trees, by depending on slightly different sets of resources, may not have this problem.**

## Trade Advantage Answers

### 1NC Trade Answers

#### 1. Protectionism is declining – world trade is at an all-time high

Bhagwati 14 (Jagdish, Columbia U. IR Pf., Pravin Krishna, Johns Hopkins University and NBER Arvind Panagariya, Columbia University, ‘Trade and Flag: The Changing Balance of Power in the Multilateral Trading System’, IISS Conference 6 – 8 April, 2014 FIRST SESSION: The World Trade System: Trends and Challenges)

The multilateral trading system has had great success in the last two decades. World trade in goods and services is much freer today than in the pre-WTO world. Tariff barriers and nontariff barriers have been significantly reduced with tariff protection against industrial products at historically lowest level in almost all countries.1 Developed countries have bound virtually all their tariffs, while developing countries have bound a substantial proportion of their tariff lines. Further, applied tariffs have dropped to their lowest levels in the recent history. In developed countries, simple average tariffs uniformly stands below 5 %. India, which is often depicted as a highly protected country, has applied tariffs averaging around 10 %, while the corresponding figure in China stands even lower at 8.7 %. Even Latin America, where tariffs are higher, now averages below 15 %. Furthermore, the proportion of applied tariff rates exceeding 15% is also generally low. In the developed countries, the proportion is uniformly below 3%, with Canada being the major exception. Remarkably, this proportion in India stands at 6.7 % and is significantly below the 11.6 % in China. Trade outcomes have mirrored this liberalisation, with goods as well as services trade expanding at accelerated pace. The simple average of annual growth rates of world merchandise exports rose from 5.6 % during 1981-94 to 8.9 % during 1995-10.2 Trade has grown faster than GDP (which grew globally at an n annual average of 2.2 % annually during both periods). Further, merchandise exports have shown remarkable growth in the three major regions of the world: Europe, North America and Asia. In Europe, they have more than doubled and in Asia, they have almost tripled during the last decade. Growth in North America has been slower but still impressive with exports rising from $1225 billion in 2000 to $1965 billion in 2010. Remarkably, though exports are much smaller in magnitude, export growth in the remaining three regions—Africa, Middle East and Commonwealth of Independent States—has been as impressive as in Asia. In each case, merchandise exports have more than tripled during the decade. Growth in the exports of commercial services has been similarly spectacular. In North America, they have almost doubled; in Europe, they have more than doubled; and In Asia, they have more than tripled between 2000 and 2010. The remaining three regions have also seen their commercial services exports nearly or more than tripled. Thus, from the viewpoint of facilitating trade, the WTO has been a huge success. A key function of the WTO is to implement the existing agreements among member countries. When the WTO replaced GATT on January 1, 1995, it replaced the relatively weak dispute settlement system of the GATT with a binding system backed by the right to retaliate on the part of the damaged party in case of non-compliance by the offending party. Davey (2012) discusses in detail the functioning of WTO dispute settlement and concludes that despite some shortcomings, it has lived up to expectation. First, after an initial surge, the number of cases brought for consultations has been cut to half of their level in the 1990s. The number of cases has been reasonably steady during the 2000s suggesting that a steady state may have been reached. Second, only relatively few cases have experienced delays (the two massive subsidy cases involving Airbus and Boeing being the major examples). Third, rulings in almost all cases have been implemented, even if with some delay. Finally, developing countries in general and smaller countries in particular have been able to access to the system and use it effectively to protect their trading rights. It is also noteworthy that despite the major financial crisis, which created prolonged high levels of unemployment in the major industrial economies that continue till today, trade disruption has been minimal. This was in contrast to the Great Depression when similar dislocations led to a virtual trade war between Europe and the United States that led to the enactment of the infamous Smoot-Hawley tariffs in the latter. On the whole, trade has recovered relatively quickly in the aftermath of the crisis.

### 1NC Trade Answers

#### 2. The plan trades-off with the Doha Round, undermining the WTO

Mu 14 (Zhonghe, fellow @ Stanford Center for Int’l Dev’t, “TPP’s Impacts and China Strategies in Response”, http://scid.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/490wp.pdf)

At the same time, the negative impacts of the current TPP negotiations on the Doha Round negotiations are also obvious. First, it shakes the confidence of WTO members in the multilateral trading system. Since the global financial crisis of 2008, trade protectionism has been growing. Under this background, the stagnant Doha Round negotiations have forced more members to turn to bilateral or regional FTAs, which have become a serious challenge to the multilateral trading system. Under these conditions, the U.S chose to transfer its negotiating resources from the Doha Round negotiations to the TPP. As a result, it will probably further damage the credibility of the multilateralism and make the vulnerable Doha Round even more difficult. Secondly, it will lead to a diversion of negotiation resources. The success of trade negotiation relies not only on the determination of politicians but also on the huge inputs of negotiation resources such as the negotiators’ labor and financial support. There is no doubt that the Doha Round negotiations will not be concluded successfully unless tremendous negotiation resources are invested into it. During the current critical period, however, the U.S has transferred its negotiation resources to the TPP and impelled many APEC countries to conduct a similar shift. Consequently, the Doha Round will very likely become more difficult and the time required for its conclusion will be prolonged. Thirdly, closely related to resource diversion, it will also divert attention from successfully concluding the Doha round. Taking advantage of the opportunity to host the APEC summit in 2011, President Obama announced the conclusion of the TPP broad outlines, attracting attention from all over the world and diverting people's minds from the Doha Round negotiations. Imaginably, the Doha round’s successful conclusion will be more uncertain as the attention of those WTO members is deconcentrated by the TPP.

### 1NC Trade Answers

#### 3. The Doha Round is uniquely inclusive of developing countries and their inclusion is critical to overall global trade

Bhagwati 14 (Jagdish, Columbia U. IR Pf., Pravin Krishna, Johns Hopkins University and NBER Arvind Panagariya, Columbia University, ‘Trade and Flag: The Changing Balance of Power in the Multilateral Trading System’, IISS Conference 6 – 8 April, 2014 FIRST SESSION: The World Trade System: Trends and Challenges)

While special and differential treatment for developing countries continues at the WTO, developing countries today participate much more effectively in the activities of the WTO. This is observed in three principle dimensions. First, developing country membership has increased considerably over time. Over 30 countries have joined the system after the WTO was formed and over 20 countries are currently negotiating accession. A number of interrelated factors have contributed to this development. Developing countries have become major exporters of manufactures and have thus favoured an outward orientation. The establishment of the WTO has resulted in a number of changes requiring additional participation by developing countries. The WTO covers a variety of new areas, such as services, standards, intellectual property rights and it has been engaging in a number of on-going negotiations in the liberalisation of different sectors which require continuous active involvement by member countries. Second, the extent of the engagement of developing countries in multilateral negotiation, i.e., the Doha Round, has been a far more substantial than it was in the past. To begin with, the Doha round, billed the Doha “development” round, has focused significant attention on a sector that is of key importance to developing countries, i.e., agriculture, thus automatically increasing developing interest in effectively representing their interest in the proceedings. The emergence of the G-20 grouping prior to the 2003 WTO ministerial meeting and its success in getting the developed countries to drop three of the four “Singapore issues” from the Doha negotiating agenda, offers one example of their involvement in the negotiating process. Their continued involvement at Hong Kong ministerial meeting in 2005 and then again in the 2008 negotiations in Geneva that produced a deadlock between developed and developing countries offers another example of the intensity and relevance of their engagement. Third, developing countries have also come to use the dispute settlement body (DSB) to assert and defend their trading rights. Hoekman (2012), who makes this point cogently, points out that while developing countries were defendants in only 8 % of the cases under the GATT, under the WTO, they have been defendants in 35% of the cases. Developing countries have also emerged as complainants, accounting for one-third of all cases brought to DSB during 1995-11. Even more interestingly, as many as 44 % of the developing country cases have been against other developing countries. In a highly visible case, India challenged the EU’s GSP plus program in 2003 with adverse implications for the neighbouring Pakistan who benefited from the program. In another similar case, Brazil challenged the EU export subsidy on sugar that had benefited the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries through guaranteed access to the highly protected EU market. Finally, we note that although nearly all developing countries have moved away from antitrade policies of the 1950s and 1960s, there are vast differences among them in their trade interests and in their approaches towards trade policy. At one extreme, we have the least developed countries (LDCs) that still insist on, and enjoy, overwhelming one-way trade preferences without offering reciprocal liberalisation. They have tariff-free access to the internal EU market under “everything but arms” (EBA) initiative. Developing countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, vast majority of them also LDCs, enjoy significant one-way preferences in the United States market under the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). At the other extreme, larger developing countries such as China, Brazil, India and Indonesia have become vocal demanders of concessions in the negotiations. Cairns Group developing countries including Brazil, Argentina, Indonesia and Colombia played an important role in bringing agriculture into the negotiations even under the Uruguay Round. This emergence of developing countries as significant players in the world trade system and the heterogeneity of interests among them have had their own impact on the multilateral process, as we will discuss in greater detail in Section V.

### 1NC Trade Answers

#### 4. No impact to trade

Miller 14 (Charles Miller, lecturer at ANU’s Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, “Globalisation and war,” April 2014) <http://www.aspistrategist.org.au/globalisation-and-war/>)

John O’Neal and Bruce Russett’s work is perhaps the best known in this regard—and Steven Pinker cites them approvingly in his book The Better Angels of Our Nature. Analysing trade and conflict data from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries, they found that trade flows do have a significant impact in reducing the chances of conflict, even when taking a variety of other factors into account. But their conclusions have in turn been questioned by other scholars. For one thing, their model failed to take three things into account. First, it’s quite possible that peace causes trade rather than the other way around—no company wants to start an export business to another country if it anticipates that business linkages will be cut off by war further down the line. Second, conflict behaviour exhibits what’s called ‘network effects’— if France and Germany are at peace, chances are Belgium and Germany will be too. And third, both the likelihood of conflict and the level of trade are influenced by the number of years a pair of countries has already been at peace—because prolonged periods of peace increase mutual trust. Take any of these factors into account, and studies have shown (here and here) that the apparent relationship between trade flows and peace disappears. Perhaps, though, conceiving of globalisation solely in terms of trade flows is mistaken. Alternative indicators of globalisation include foreign direct investment, financial openness and the levels of government intervention in economic relations with the rest of the world. Data on those variables is less extensive than on trade flows, usually dating back only to the post World War II period. But some analysts, such as Patrick McDonald and Erik Gartzke, have argued that a significant correlation can be found between them and a reduction in the probability of conflict. Those findings, newer than O’Neal and Russett’s, haven’t yet been subjected to the same intense scrutiny, so may in turn be qualified by future research. What does all that mean for the policy-maker? The statistical evidence certainly doesn’t tell us that globalisation has made war in East Asia impossible. ‘Cromwell’s law’ counsels us that a logically conceivable event should never be assigned a probability of zero. The most we could conclude is that globalisation has made such an occurrence much less likely. There’s some hopeful numerical evidence that globalisation does indeed have that effect, but the evidence isn’t so compelling that we can substitute an economic engagement policy for a security policy. By all means, let’s continue to promote trade in the Asia-Pacific. But we should also continue to be prepared for scenarios which are unlikely but would be hugely damaging if they were to occur.

### Ext. #1 – Global Trade High

#### Nairobi conference proves Doha and multilateral trade are not dead

Ramdoo 16 (Isabelle, Deputy Head of Programme for Economic Transformation and Trade at the European Centre for Development Policy Management, “WTO in Nairobi: Did realism win over ambition?”, http://www.ictsd.org/sites/default/files/review/BAfrica\_March\_8.pdf)

For the first time since its creation, WTO ministers convened in Africa for the tenth Ministerial Conference in Nairobi, Kenya. The ministers had a daunting task: salvage the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) that has suffered from a negotiating stasis for over a decade and most importantly, prevent the systemic collapse of the multilateral trade governance architecture, endangered by the proliferation of megaregional trade deals. When the DDA was inked in Doha in 2001, the economic and political context was significant: two months after the horrific events of 11 September, the world needed to give a strong signal that countries with various interests and realities were able to agree on a shared purpose: “development.” Fourteen years later, economic realities, shaped by the financial crisis and the rise of emerging economies, as well as the changing nature of global trade, are spurs to action. The “development” endeavor, in itself, is not at stake. The real question is how to address the increasingly complex group of developing countries, which are not a homogeneous group and can no longer be treated as such. While by certain economic standards, India, China, and other large developing countries can legitimately claim development needs, on some specific issues, it is increasingly hard for them to argue for special and differential treatment (SandDT), given their capacity to significantly influence the global trading system. What did Nairobi achieve? The outcome of the Nairobi conference can be celebrated for at least three reasons: First, on the content, there are three areas in which ministers managed to engineer a deal: • Commitments to guarantee export competition in agriculture. This deal is seen as the WTO’s most important negotiated outcome on agriculture in the last 20 years. It will see the end of export subsidies immediately for most products from developed countries and by 2018 for developing countries. • A meaningful package on least developed country (LDC) and development issues. This includes an agreement on cotton for LDCs, duty-free and quota-free regimes for LDCs from more WTO members, multilateral guidelines on rules of origin, and the services waiver for LDCs. • A landmark deal on information technology. Fifty-three WTO members will eliminate tariffs on 201 IT products, covering 90 percent of world trade on these products, for an approximate value of US$1.3 trillion a year. Second, the world has witnessed a proliferation of parallel mega-regional negotiations, triggered by the fact that multilateral trade rules were not able to catch up with the needs of 21st century trade. A failure to address some issues of importance to developing countries (such as export competition in agriculture, rules of origin for LDCs, or granting preferential access to services), would have continued to deepen the gulf between developed and developing countries. While the multilateral system may not be perfect in its current state, it at least provides for a predictable system that prevents bilateral trade deals from creating their own sets or rules and setting those rules for others.

#### Future multilateral agreements are promising

Bhagwati 14 (Jagdish, Columbia U. IR Pf., Pravin Krishna, Johns Hopkins University and NBER Arvind Panagariya, Columbia University, ‘Trade and Flag: The Changing Balance of Power in the Multilateral Trading System’, IISS Conference 6 – 8 April, 2014 FIRST SESSION: The World Trade System: Trends and Challenges)

We note that at the recent (December 2013) meetings of the WTO in Bali, some partial successes were indeed achieved. These included broad multilateral agreement on improving trade facilitation and agreement for the reduction of lowering barriers to exports from LDCs. Importantly, in the more contentious area of agricultural liberalisation, an interim agreement was reached on the shielding of public stockholding programmes for food security in developing countries, so that they would not be challenged legally even if a country’s agreed limits for trade-distorting domestic support were breached. This may open the door to more ambitious agreements in the agricultural sphere and thus revives optimism toward a multilateral agreement in the future.

### Ext. #2 – WTO Turn

#### TPP focus trades-off with WTO focus

Bhagwati 14 (Jagdish, Columbia U. IR Pf., Pravin Krishna, Johns Hopkins University and NBER Arvind Panagariya, Columbia University, ‘Trade and Flag: The Changing Balance of Power in the Multilateral Trading System’, IISS Conference 6 – 8 April, 2014 FIRST SESSION: The World Trade System: Trends and Challenges)

While bilateral initiatives have resulted, in most cases, in only limited expansion of intra-PTA trade, thus suggesting the continued importance of multilateral initiatives, the momentum towards bilateral agreements has accelerated over time. Indeed the Obama Administration has been pursuing both a “Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership” (TTIP) with the European Union and a “Trans-Pacific Partnership” (TPP) with countries in the Asia Pacific region, while significantly diminishing US investment in rescuing the Doha round. Developing countries have found bilateral agreements to be increasingly appealing as well, especially because South-South agreements may be entered into via the “Enabling Clause” of the GATT, whose requirements are far less stringent than the restrictions imposed by Article XXIV on North-North and North-South Agreements. We argue that this is an unhealthy trend and greatly risks undermining the global trading system.

#### TPP asymmetries undermine multilateral trade

Bhagwati 14 (Jagdish, Columbia U. IR Pf., Pravin Krishna, Johns Hopkins University and NBER Arvind Panagariya, Columbia University, ‘Trade and Flag: The Changing Balance of Power in the Multilateral Trading System’, IISS Conference 6 – 8 April, 2014 FIRST SESSION: The World Trade System: Trends and Challenges)

Importantly, it is also now clear that PTAs have become a stumbling block to multilateral liberalisation. Export interests, especially in the developed countries, have learned that they get better deals through PTAs since they gain an upper hand over non-members within the union. Therefore, they prefer bilateral rather than multilateral route to liberalisation. This is even truer of developed country lobbies pushing non-trade agenda items consisting of intellectual property rights and labour standards. Large developing countries such as India, China and Brazil are strictly opposed to further proliferation of non-trade issues in the WTO. That naturally diverts the lobbies to PTAs where they face much weaker developing country partners and have a relatively free play. The United States in particular is playing the game almost entirely as Bhagwati (1994) had predicted: a hegemonic power is likely to gain a greater payoff by bargaining sequentially with a group of non-hegemonic powers rather than simultaneously.

#### Non-trade inclusion makes ramping up TPP impossible

Steinbock 14 (Dan, 3/2, PhD, research director of international business at the India, China and America Institute (USA) and a visiting fellow at the Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (China), “What If China Joined the Trans-Pacific Partnership Talks?”, http://www.economonitor.com/blog/2014/03/what-if-china-joined-the-trans-pacific-partnership-talks/)

According to the US Trade Representative (USTR) Ron Kirk, the TPP will be a “high-standard, broad-based regional pact.” In practice, U.S. negotiators have included in the TPP non-trade-related issues, including labor matters, environmental laws and intellectual property rights. While the imposition of non-trade-related issues would be extremely challenging in the multilateral Doha Round, it is easier in bilateral regional talks. That is why Jagdish Bhagwati, a leading free-trade economist, sees America as a threat to Trans-Pacific Trade. “If I want to join a golf club, I need to play golf,” he says. “But I should not have to go to church and sing hymns with the other club members.” Acceptance of non-trade-related demands has little to do with true free trade and such requirements certainly should not be a precondition for joining the TPP. However, historically, it is déjà vu all over again.

### Ext. #2 – WTO Turn

#### TPP ratchets down WTO credibility and disincentivizes WTO improvements

Bhagwati 13 (Jagdish, Pf of IR @ Columbia, 11/28, “Overcoming the deadlock in world trade”, http://www.iiss.org/en/publications/strategic%20comments/sections/2013-a8b5/overcoming-the-deadlock-in-world-trade-6f06)

There are two interrelated geo-economic risks inherent in the growing role of regional trade accords. The first is that of fragmentation. Misalignments between regional and multilateral trade rules may distort trade patterns and impose costs on the operation of global supply chains. Mega-regional agreements such as the TPP and the TTIP do not involve tariffs but are essentially about regulation of trade-related issues (such as state-owned enterprises, intellectual property rights, investments, and health-and-safety standards). The proliferation of regional and inter-regional trade agreements may result in the introduction of ‘WTO-plus’ and ‘WTO-extra’ rules. As a consequence, the WTO may gradually lose its position as the ceiling of the multilateral trade regime and instead become its regulatory floor. The second risk is that new trading powers may be excluded from, rather than integrated into, international trade arrangements. Proponents in the Western world see two advantages in the mega-regional agreements: they represent a chance to regain the rule-making initiative and to shape the rules of global trade without having to negotiate with emerging powers; they also argue that these agreements could be ‘multilateralised’ at the WTO in the future. This assumes that the mega-regional vision can be realised – a big assumption given the level of ambition and the complexity of the negotiations. It also assumes that subsequent multilateralisation of mega-regional accords would somehow be easier than concluding the Doha Round. In practice, mega-regional agreements seem likely to reduce the centrality of the WTO in the international trade regime – a trend that is likely to be accelerated if there is no progress in Bali.

### Ext. #3 – No Trade Impact

**Trade wars don’t happen and reductions in trade don’t hurt the economy**

Fletcher 11 Ian Fletcher is Senior Economist of the Coalition for a Prosperous America, former Research Fellow at the U.S. Business and Industry Council M.A. and B.A. from Columbia and U Chicago, "Avoid Trade War? We're Already In One!" August 29 2011 [www.huffingtonpost.com/ian-fletcher/avoid-trade-war-were-alre\_b\_939967.html,](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ian-fletcher/avoid-trade-war-were-alre_b_939967.html%2Cm) CMR

The curious thing about the concept of **trade war** is that, **unlike actual shooting war**, it **has no historical precedent**. In fact, **there has never been a significant trade war,** "significant" **in the sense of having done serious economic damage**. **All history records are minor skirmishes at best**. **Go ahead. Try and name a trade war**. The Great Trade War of 1834? Nope. The Great Trade War of 1921? Nope Again. **There isn't one**. The standard example free traders give is that America's **Smoot-Hawley** tariff of 1930 either caused the Great Depression or made it spread around the world. But this canard **does not survive serious examination**, **and has** actually **been denied by** almost **every economist who has actually researched the question in depth** -- a group ranging **from** Paul **Krugman** on the left **to** Milton **Friedman** on the right. **The Depression's cause was monetary**. **The Fed allowed the money supply to balloon during the late 1920s, piling up in the stock market as a bubble. It then panicked, miscalculated, and let it collapse by a third by 1933, depriving the economy of the liquidity it needed to breathe. Trade had nothing to do with it.** **As for the charge that Smoot caused the Depression to spread worldwide: it was too small a change to have plausibly so large an effect.** For a start, **it only applied to about one-third of America's trade:** about 1.3 percent of our GDP. Our average tariff on dutiable goods went from 44.6 to 53.2 percent -- not a terribly big jump. **Tariffs were higher in almost every year from 1821 to 1914. Our tariff went up in 1861, 1864, 1890, and 1922 without producing global depressions, and the recessions of 1873 and 1893 managed to spread worldwide without tariff increases.** As the economic historian (and free trader!) William Bernstein puts it in his book A Splendid Exchange: How Trade Shaped the World, Between 1929 and 1932, real GDP fell 17 percent worldwide, and by 26 percent in the United States, but **most economic historians now believe that only a miniscule part of that huge loss of both world GDP and the U**nited **S**tates' **GDP can be ascribed to the tariff** **wars**. .. **At the time of Smoot-Hawley's passage, trade volume accounted for only about 9 percent of world economic output**. Had all international trade been eliminated, and had no domestic use for the previously exported goods been found, world GDP would have fallen by the same amount -- 9 percent. Between 1930 and 1933, worldwide trade volume fell off by one-third to one-half. Depending on how the falloff is measured, this computes to 3 to 5 percent of world GDP, and these losses were partially made up by more expensive domestic goods. Thus, **the damage done could not** possibly **have exceeded 1 or 2 percent of world GDP -- nowhere near the 17 percent falloff seen during the Great Depression**... The inescapable conclusion: contrary to public perception, **Smoot-Hawley did not cause, or even significantly deepen, the Great Depression. The oft-bandied idea that Smoot-Hawley started a global trade war of endless cycles of tit-for-tat retaliation is** also **mythical**. According to the official State Department report on this very question in 1931: With the exception of discriminations in France, **the extent of discrimination against American commerce is very slight**...**By far the largest number of countries do not discriminate against the commerce of the U**nited **S**tates **in any way**. That is to say, **foreign nations did indeed raise their tariffs after the passage of Smoot, but this was a broad-brush response to the Depression itself**, aimed at all other foreign nations without distinction, **not a retaliation against the U.S. for its own tariff**. **The doom-loop of spiraling tit-for-tat retaliation between trading partners that paralyzes free traders with fear today simply did not happen.** "Notorious" **Smoot-Hawley is a** deliberately **fabricated myth, plain and simple**. We should not allow this myth to paralyze our policy-making in the present day.

### Ext. #3 – No Trade Impact

**Trade doesn’t solve war**

Katherine **Barbieri 13**, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, Ph.D. in Political Science from Binghamton University, “Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or Source of Interstate Conflict?” Chapter 10 in Conflict, War, and Peace: An Introduction to Scientific Research, google books

How does interdependence affect war, the most intense form of conflict? Table 2 gives **the** empirical results. The rarity of wars makes any analysis of their causes quite difficult, for variations in interdependence will seldom result in the occurrence of war. As in the case of MIDs, the log-likelihood ratio tests for each model suggest that the inclusion of the various measures of interdependence and the control variables improves our understanding of the factors affecting the occurrence of war over that obtained from the null model. However, the individual interdependence variables, alone, are not statistically significant. This is not the case with contiguity and relative capabilities, which are both statistically significant. Again, we see that contiguous dyads are more conflict-prone and that dyads composed of states with unequal power are more pacific than those with highly equal power. Surprisingly, no evidence is provided to support the commonly held proposition that democratic states are less likely to engage in wars with other democratic states.¶ The **evidence from the pre-WWII period provides support for those arguing that** economic factors have little, if any, influence **on** affecting **leaders’ decisions to engage in war**, but many of the control variables are also statistically insignificant. These results should be interpreted with caution, since the sample does not contain a sufficient number wars to allow us to capture great variations across different types of relationships. Many observations of war are excluded from the sample by virtue of not having the corresponding explanatory measures. A variable would have to have an extremely strong influence on conflict—as does contiguity—to find significant results. ¶ 7. Conclusions **This study provides** little empirical support **for the liberal proposition that trade provides a path to interstate peace**. Even after **controlling for the influence of contiguity, joint democracy, alliance ties, and relative capabilities**, the **evidence suggests that** in most instances trade fails to deter conflict. **Instead**, extensive **economic interdependence** increases the likelihood that dyads engage in militarized dispute; however, it appears to have little influence on the incidence of war. The greatest hope for peace appears to arise from symmetrical trading relationships. However, the dampening effect of symmetry is offset by the expansion of interstate linkages. That is, extensive economic linkages, be they symmetrical or asymmetrical, appear to pose the greatest hindrance to peace through trade.

## Regionalism Advantage Answers

### 1NC Regionalism Answers

#### 1. Including China makes regional integration more difficult

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 main issue with a region-wide FTA in East Asia is its depth and comprehensiveness. There is inherent tension and contradiction between the objectives of a large inclusive grouping of diverse economies. Moreover, the inclusion of large developing countries such as the PRC, India, and Indonesia make it difficult for consensus on significant trade and investment liberalization and adoption of open and transparent rules and regulations. Many existing bilateral and plurilateral FTAs in the region already encompass FTA-plus and WTO-plus provisions, however. A region-wide FTA should do no less and the following are areas for possible inclusion.

#### 2. TPP leads to regional fragmentation, not inclusion

Bhagwati 14 (Jagdish, Columbia U. IR Pf., Pravin Krishna, Johns Hopkins University and NBER Arvind Panagariya, Columbia University, ‘Trade and Flag: The Changing Balance of Power in the Multilateral Trading System’, IISS Conference 6 – 8 April, 2014 FIRST SESSION: The World Trade System: Trends and Challenges)

The TPP is widely discussed and considered as a prelude to far broader economic integration, encompassing much of the Asia-Pacific. Proponents argue that it could establish an “open regionalism” framework for other countries to sign on, without being subject to the exhausting negotiations required for bilateral agreements. Specifically, countries could simply elect to join the TPP, via what has been described as a “docking” arrangement. It has been suggested that the TPP could be the last trade agreement the U.S. negotiates and that from now on, other countries could simply elect to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership. However, as Bhagwati (2014) had noted, if accepting the TPPs demands on non-trade issues, such as intellectual property protection and labour standards, remains the precondition for joining TPP, it may just be that the result is a fragmentation of Asia into “TPP, China and India.”

### 1NC Regionalism Answers

#### 3. Multiple mitigating factors prevent Asia war

Kaplan 14 (Robert, Chief Geopolitical Analyst @ Stratfor, Senior Fellow @ the Center for New American Security, “The Guns of August in the East China Sea,” March 17, Foreign Policy, http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/03/17/the-guns-of-august-in-the-east-china-sea/)

But before one buys the 1914 analogy, there are other matters to consider. While 1914 Europe was a landscape, with large armies facing one another inside a claustrophobic terrain with few natural barriers, East Asia is a seascape, with vast maritime distances separating national capitals. The sea impedes aggression to a degree that land does not. Naval forces can cross water and storm beachheads, though with great difficulty, but moving inland and occupying hostile populations is nearly impossible. The Taiwan Strait is roughly four times the width of the English Channel, a geography that continues to help preserve Taiwan’s de facto independence from China. Even the fastest warships travel slowly, giving diplomats time to do their work. Incidents in the air are more likely, although Asian countries have erected strict protocols and prefer to posture verbally so as to avoid actual combat. (That said, the new Chinese Air Defense Identification Zone is a particularly provocative protocol.) Since any such incidents would likely occur over open water there will be few casualties, reducing the prospect that a single incident will lead to war. And because of the speed, accuracy, and destructiveness of postmodern weaponry, any war that does break out will probably be short — albeit with serious economic consequences. Something equivalent to four years of trench warfare is almost impossible to imagine. And remember that it was World War I’s very grinding length that made it a history-transforming and culture-transforming event: it caused 17 million military and civilian casualties; the disputes in the Pacific Basin are certainly not going to lead to that. World War I also featured different and unwieldy alliance systems. Asia is simpler: almost everyone fears China and depends — militarily at least — on the United States. This is not the Cold War where few Americans could be found in the East Bloc, a region with which we did almost no trade. Millions of Americans and Chinese have visited each other’s countries, tens of thousands of American businessmen have passed through Chinese cities, and Chinese party elites send their children to U.S. universities. U.S. officials know they must steer between the two extremes of allowing China’s Finlandization of its Asian neighbors and allowing nationalistic governments in Vietnam, the Philippines, and Japan to lure the United States into a conflict with China. Nationalistic as these democracies may be, the best way to curb their excesses and make them less nervous is to give them the assurance of a U.S. security umbrella, born of credible air and sea power. A strong U.S.-China relationship can keep the peace in Asia. (South Korea also fears Japan, but the United States is successfully managing that tension.) Unlike empires mired in decrepitude that characterized 1914 Europe, East Asia features robust democracies in South Korea and Japan, and strengthening democracies in Malaysia and the Philippines. An informal alliance of democracies — that should also include a reformist, de facto ally like Vietnam — is the best and most stable counter to Chinese militarism. Some of these democracies are fraught, and fascist-cum-communist North Korea could implode, but this is not a world coming apart. Limited eruptions do not equal a global cataclysm. Yet the most profound difference between August 1914 and now is historical self-awareness. As Modris Eksteins meticulously documents in his 1989 book Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age, European capitals greeted the war with outbursts of euphoria and a feeling of liberation. Because 19th century Europe had been relatively peaceful since the Napoleonic Wars ended in 1815, people had lost the sense of the tragic that enables them to avoid tragedy in the first place. Aging, one-child societies like those of China, Japan, and South Korea, with memories of war, revolution, and famine, are less likely to greet violent struggle with joy and equanimity. And the United States, the paramount military player in Asia, by its very conscious fear of a World War I scenario, will take every measure to avoid it.

### Ext. #1 – Economic Diversity

#### Chinese intra-country problems undermine regional integration

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 region-wide FTA will encompass a broader mix of economies with diverse levels of economic development, economic structure, and industrial and technological competitiveness than is the case with plurilateral and bilateral FTAs. The wide development gap is not only inter-country, but also a serious intra-country problem in large countries like the PRC, Indonesia, the Philippines, and India. This diversity impedes consensus on the scope and speed of achieving a high-quality FTA. Among the less developed economies and less efficient producers and suppliers, a region-wide FTA raises concerns of marginalization. Hence governments would be reluctant to open up their less competitive farm sectors, labor-intensive industries, and SMEs without adequate safeguards and financial and technical assistance for capacity building. Among the richer and more competitive economies, there would be public resistance to financial transfers through taxation (that is the EU model) in the absence of political and social integration and common institutions. The issue of inter-country transfers in ASEAN along the lines of the EU is complicated by the fact that the richer countries of ASEAN (Brunei and Singapore) are relatively small countries and economies whereas the poorer countries (Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Myanmar) are relatively larger countries and economies. Hence intercountry transfers thus far have not taken the form of financial transfers but rather of capacity-building transfers of development experience, knowhow, and training from the more advanced to the less advanced ASEAN countries, particularly between Singapore and CLMV.

### Ext. #2 – TPP Hurts Integration

#### TPP doesn’t lead to Asia-wide trade; it’s a competitive, not complementary, model

Meltzer 15 (Joshua, fellow @ Brookings Inst., 5/5, “From the Trans-Pacific Partnership to a free trade agreement of the Asia-Pacific?”, http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/future-development/posts/2015/05/05-tpp-trade-meltzer)

This begs the question: why not pursue an FTAAP now? At the APEC Summit in Beijing last year, leaders reaffirmed their commitments to an FTAAP and agreed to a strategic study on how to achieve it. However, it was also made clear that an FTAAP would build on the TPP and RCEP. To understand the lack of U.S. enthusiasm for an FTAAP and its pursuit instead of the TPP, one needs to take into account the role of the TPP in responding to competition between the U.S. and China over access to and influence in third markets, and more deeply, over potentially different visions for global governance arrangements. Access to overseas markets has been an increasingly important driver of growth for the U.S. and China. China is experiencing significant economic challenges including overcapacity in all key industrial sectors, an oversupply of property, and significant levels of government debt, estimated at 250 percent of GDP. This is also happening at a time when China is trying to rebalance its economy away from investment and towards consumption and services. The slowing Chinese economy and impact these reforms are having on growth create pressure to find additional overseas markets for China’s industrial overcapacity. In the United States, President Obama has emphasized exports as a key driver of growth. In fact, over the last decade U.S. exports have been the fastest growing sector of GDP. Obama’s export initiative sought to double U.S. exports between 2010 and 2015. Where U.S. and Chinese companies compete, the TPP gives U.S. exporters preferential access to important markets in Asia, and this opportunity will grow as more countries join the TPP. Another significant U.S. goal is for the TPP to determine the rules for trade and investment in the Asia Pacific region going forward. Indeed, President Obama has said that without the TPP, China will write the rules for trade and investment in Asia. The TPP will build and deepen rules that are already in the WTO, such as those on intellectual property, and include new rules that address modern economic developments like supply chains and state-owned enterprises. These rules will help ensure a level playing field for U.S. traders and investors. More significantly, the TPP will reinforce U.S. view on appropriate government-market relations for the region. Broadly speaking, the TPP reflects the U.S. commitment to markets with a limited role for government in the economy. This U.S. view on the appropriate role of government in the market is also reflected in the World Trade Organization (WTO). The TPP, however, departs from the WTO commitment to multilateralism. The ongoing FTA negotiation between the U.S. and the EU—the world’s two largest economies—is another example of this trend away from multilateralism. This departure from multilateralism in international trade is a response to the rise of China and the realization that for the first time since the end of World War II, another country has both the economic power to exercise leadership in Asia and a potentially different view on how economies should develop. One way of determining what China’s vision for Asia might be is to take China’s current political and economic arrangements as indicators of the type of economic system and values it might want to project internationally. This can broadly be defined as a role for markets but with the government playing a major role managing the most important economic sectors, combined with a single party political system. If this is the China model and the normative framework for its projection of economic power, the TPP reflects the U.S. counterpoint. The TPP’s disciplines on state-owned enterprises and subsidies limits the role of government in the market; its commitments to an open Internet supports the digital economy and underpins access to information; and its requirements that economic regulation-making be transparent and open to all stakeholders is consistent with democratic governance. Rules such as these bind the TPP parties to the U.S. vision of appropriate forms of economic development, political arrangements, and the role of government in the market. Seen in these terms, the TPP is an important part of a larger contest between the U.S. and China for markets and leadership in Asia. This is why we should not expect an FTAAP anytime soon, despite its clear economic benefits.

### Ext. #2 – TPP Hurts Integration

#### TPP can’t ratchet up to regional integration

Elms 13 (Deborah Kay, fellow @ Asian Dev’t Bank, “The Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement: Looking Ahead to the Next Steps”, http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/156307/adbi-wp447.pdf)

The intention of having the TPP eventually become the FTAAP is also deeply problematic in practice. Not all of the current 21 member economies of APEC appear to want to join such an ambitious agreement. The three other members of the Pacific Alliance are already in the TPP (Chile, Mexico, and Peru). Some of the countries negotiating in the RCEP are also not APEC members (Cambodia, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, and Myanmar in ASEAN, as well as India). Of course, APEC is not averse to having non-APEC members on the path to the FTAAP. Still, the possible addition of non-APEC members into the TPP will further weaken the connection with APEC. There is also a great deal of talk about an eventual merger between the RCEP and the TPP. However, the likelihood of such a merger is extremely remote. The gap in quality between the existing ASEAN+1 agreements and the TPP is impressively large. As a simple example, many of the ASEAN+1 agreements have never managed to sign or implement commitments beyond basic agreements on tariff reductions for goods— nothing at all on services or investment. There are no rules in areas like intellectual property rights, labor, environment, competition, or market liberalization in government procurement, agriculture, and so forth. Even the strongest ASEAN+1 agreement, the ASEAN–Australia–New Zealand Free Trade Agreement(AANZFTA), falls considerably short of meeting the ambitions of the TPP. Of course, the RCEP has only met twice, in May and September 2013, so it is conceivable that the level of ambition in this agreement will ratchet upwards over time.13 The overlapping membership between the two agreements will possibly help to push the RCEP in a more aspiring direction. However, early signs of ambition and convergence are not promising. From the beginning, the RCEP has included language allowing special and differential treatment for developing country members. Initial signals from some of the RCEP countries have suggested a desire to protect special and sensitive products, as well as allow long timelines for implementation. Coupled with the evidence from past agreements, the signs for high ambition in the RCEP are not optimistic. This does not mean that the RCEP will not be worthwhile, or that it will fail to deliver meaningful benefits for its members, but it does suggest that a merger between the TPP and the RCEP will not be possible.

#### Developing countries can’t join because of high standards

Tibung 12 (Sheryl, fellow @ Stimson Center, “A PRIMER ON THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT”, http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/research-pdfs/TPP\_primer\_final.pdf)

In order to be able to move forward, negotiating parties must agree how ambitious they want this 21st century agreement to be. While the TPP is indeed a far reaching agreement, based on the negotiating areas that have been placed on the table, it remains to be seen how less developed economies (Vietnam, Peru, Mexico, Chile) will be able to cope with the high standard rules proposed in the negotiations. Given that a lot of the issues being negotiated are beyond the scope of most existing trade agreements (competition policy, government procurement, etc.), some countries may not even have laws in place that address these issues. Moreover, the high-standard rules may intimidate or deter many countries who might otherwise want to join the negotiations to not participate, since they might not be able to adapt to the requirements of the TPP. Joining the negotiations might especially be viewed by many developing countries as a futile exercise.

### Ext. #3 – No Asia War

**No Asian war or instability**

**Bitzinger 9** (Richard A. Bitzinger, Senior Fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Barry Desker, Dean of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Director of the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, 2009. Survival vol. 50 no. 6, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” p. Proquest)

**Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect.** To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. **Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue**, while not fully resolved**, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan**, while always just beneath the surface, **seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations.** And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, **there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum**, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (**ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability**. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

## Solvency Answers

### 1NC Solvency

#### 1. China says no – too many concerns about TPP standards

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)

China seems to like what it has now in international trade and thus is unmotivated to join the America-led TPP. Deep concerns also exist in Beijing about the TPP’s higher labor, IPR, and environmental standards that link free trade to synchronized sociopolitical policies and values. This is easily viewed fundamentally threatening by the one-party regime of the CCP (Chinese Communist Party) as the TPP would require significant changes of China’s domestic legal system and even its overall political system. Thus China has kept its distance from the TPP.

#### 2. China couldn’t say yes to TPP timetables

Ramasamy 4/13 (Bala, Professor of Economics, China Europe International Business School, “Why China could never sign on to the Trans-Pacific Partnership”, http://theconversation.com/why-china-could-never-sign-on-to-the-trans-pacific-partnership-56361)

China has also lost an opportunity to sign an FTA with the US, but following a specified TPP schedule would be seen as the US dictating the reforms in China. And the US is hardly likely to penalise China given its importance to world trade. China has always reformed using its own timetable. For a country that is establishing its legitimacy as a global economic power, it has to write its own future. The rules of the TPP may not fit the current state of the Chinese economy. China has to mould a domestic economy that is large enough to withstand any global economic slowdown. To create that domestic economy, certain features of the “old” economy may still be required.

### China Says No – General

#### China isn’t ready to join – insufficient economic standards; failure to agree to even a bilateral trade deal with the US proves

Son 1/13 (Joshua, staff @ Deutsche Borse Group, 2016, “USTR Froman: China Not Ready to Join TPP Trade Deal”, https://mninews.marketnews.com/content/ustr-froman-china-not-ready-join-tpp-trade-deal)

China is not ready to join the recently-agreed Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal as they have not even agreed to a bilateral investment treaty (BIT) with the United States that would set similar standards, U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman said Wednesday. "I think there is a fair distance between the standards in TPP and where China is at the moment," Froman said in response to a question following a speech on the benefits of the trade deal. The United States and the Chinese currently are negotiating the terms of a bilateral investment treaty which aims to protect U.S. investments and open the Chinese further to American goods and services. During President Xi Jinping's state visit in September, he and President Barack Obama expressed their commitment to completing the treaty. Froman said, "We said to our Chinese counterparts - let's focus on the bilateral investment treaty. It is similar in standards to the investment chapter of the TPP and let's see if China is ready to engage in the kind of commitment and reforms necessary to achieve that."

#### The things China wants out of trade aren’t covered in TPP

Chunding and 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)

China reached high trade growth after its accession to the WTO in 2001, and now it is the largest goods exporting country in the world. Among China's trade priorities, unsecured risks like antidumping, countervailing and some other environmental and technical barriers are the main obstacles and threats. Therefore, China's main concerns are security of market access, guaranteed market entry and eschewing trade interventions. The TPP only focuses on tariff and non-tariff barrier reductions, which are actually not China's main concern on trade.

#### China can’t join in the short-term

Montanino 15 (Andrea, fellow @ Atlantic Council, “TPP: Putting the United States in the Driver’s Seat”, Interview w Ashish Sen, http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/tpp-putting-the-united-states-in-the-driver-s-seat)

Q: Does the TPP leave the door open for China? Do you see a TPP that includes China somewhere down the road? Montanino: I don’t see this in the short to medium term. There are too many differences still so it will be a work of years. Of course, it will depend on the willingness of the US administration and the Japanese to push for this. Once the Chinese have better standards they can be in a position to start negotiating. Now will be too disruptive for the Chinese economy to adapt to the new standards of the TPP.

### China Says No – Standards

#### Can’t meet intellectual property (IP) standards

Sonnad and Horwitz 15 (Nikhil and Josh, staff @ Quartz news, “What China will have to do to join the Trans-Pacific trade club”, http://qz.com/517905/what-china-will-have-to-do-to-join-the-trans-pacific-trade-club/)

IP theft is a common grievance among international firms that operate in China. In 2007, the US brought a dispute to the WTO accusing China of failing to live up to its IP protection promises. To America’s disappointment, the WTO ruled that China had not violated the relevant rules. That appears to have led the Americans to bring more aggressive standards to the TPP, sometimes stoking controversy even among its allies in the deal. American negotiators, for example, pushed to give drug makers a 12-year period to withhold data that could be used to produce generic “biosimilars,” according to The New York Times. Other nations wanted five years of protection at most. Even so, no amount of negotiation will bring the TPP’s IP rules to a standard low enough to include China, where piracy is widespread, enforcement is reluctant, and even the state itself is widely believed to play a role in hacking foreign firms. “The crucial issue with China in IP is that the laws may be on paper but not implemented properly in practice,” according to June Park, a fellow at the National University of Singapore, writing in the online journal Asan Forum. “If China intends to join TPP, it will take years for implementation if the current levels of IP protection in China are applied,” she notes.

#### China can’t join; their economy doesn’t meet TPP standards

Webster 15 (Graham, senior fellow at The China Center at Yale Law School, “What Will the TPP Mean for China?”, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/10/07/china-tpp-trans-pacific-partnership-obama-us-trade-xi/)

Second, China would have had to undergo substantial reforms in the state-owned sector, labor standards, and other areas — reforms that go well beyond China’s own Third Plenum reforms that many analysts see as lagging. In essence, China wasn’t ready for TPP negotiations even if it wanted to join. Only once the full agreement emerges can we assess the likelihood of China ever joining the TPP, but if the Chinese leadership is successful in pursuing its own reform agenda, it will be in a much better position to enter talks to join the TPP.