

The Final Round¹

Everett Rutan

ejrutan3@ctdebate.org

Connecticut Debate Association

Amity High School

November 14, 2015

Resolved: The US should approve the Trans-Pacific Partnership treaty.

A Note about the Notes

I've reproduced my flow chart for the Final Round at Amity High School augmented by what I remember from the debate. The notes are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I'm sure the debaters will read them and exclaim, "That's not what I said!" I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what they said or what they wish they had said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was actually presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention running across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It's close to the way I actually take notes during the debate.

The Final Round

The Final Round was between the Joel Barlow team of Cara Krupnikoff-Salkin and Melani Zuckerman on the Affirmative and the Daniel Hand team of Sam Thorpe and Tony Xu on the Negative. The debate was won by the Negative.

1) First Affirmative Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the Resolution
- c) Definitions
 - i) The TPP as proposed, with twelve countries
- d) A1²: Global trade helps the world
 - i) Diversity has value—more trade partners make it less likely any one can harm us
 - ii) Asia/Pacific is 50% of world GDP and trade
 - iii) TPP will reduce our dependence on China
 - iv) TPP will neutralize the impact of other regions
- e) A2: TPP provides economic benefits for the US
 - i) TPP eliminates over 18,000 tariffs

¹ Copyright 2015 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

² "A1" indicates the Affirmative first contention, "N2" the Negative second contention and so forth.

- ii) This will increase the number of jobs, especially for small businesses
 - iii) TPP is worth \$14Bn per year by 2025
 - iv) Free trade is responsible for \$13,000/year increase in family income over the past years
 - v) 90% of consumers in the world are located outside of the US
 - vi) TPP increases US role in world economy
 - f) A3: TPP provides non-economic benefits
 - i) TPP sets international standards for labor
 - (1) E.g., force Vietnam to improve labor standards, stop child labor
 - ii) TPP protects the environment
 - (1) E.g., it sets standards for fishing fleets
 - iii) TPP will promote small business growth
 - (1) Large firms can outsource to places like Malaysia
 - (2) US small business can expand in the US
- 2) Cross-Ex of First Affirmative**
- a) Is outsourcing good? Yes, for small countries and small business.
 - b) For the US? It promotes small business growth.
 - c) How? As large firms outsource, small businesses will hire more workers.
 - d) How does eliminating tariffs help small business? Small business are local, not affected by trade.
 - e) Can you cite any precedents? While unemployment may rise in the short-term, in the long-term free trade leads to faster growth.
 - f) What about NAFTA and the Korean trade treaty? We have had lower unemployment since they were enacted.
 - g) What is the problem with the status quo? China's growing influence in the region.
 - h) Does the status quo rely on diplomacy?
 - i) Doesn't expanded trade make us more dependent on trade? It's spread among more trading partners.
 - j) More trading partners means more dependence? But less on any single one.
 - k) For example? Japan
- 3) First Negative Constructive**
- a) Intro
 - b) Resolution
 - c) I will present the Neg case then go over the Aff contentions
 - d) N1: TPP won't achieve stated goals
 - i) TPP claims to create and retain jobs
 - (1) History shows treaties have cost jobs by shifting them overseas
 - (2) Overseas workers are often subject to economic and wage slavery
 - ii) TPP claims to protect the environment
 - (1) Firms can sue governments for laws that cut their profits
 - (2) Therefore they can sue to prevent laws for the environment and the common good
 - iii) TPP claims to increase innovation
 - (1) It increases the time patents and copyrights are valid
 - (2) E.g., drugs stay on patent longer
 - (3) This means no innovation

- e) N2: Continued outsourcing will harm the US and harm foreigners (“and so on and so forth”)
 - i) Vietnam, Indonesia and China provide cheap exports, violate human rights and engage in wage slavery
 - ii) After NAFTA/Korean treaty jobs were lost to these countries at expense of US
 - (1) Resolution is about the US
 - (2) E.g., Nike’s advantage over New Balance will increase forcing New Balance to outsource
 - f) N3: TPP will decrease the influence of the common man and democracy and further empower Wall Street.
 - i) Under TPP corporations can sue countries for harms to profit.
 - ii) This isn’t democratic and doesn’t provide equal protection as individual can’t challenge
 - iii) This will increase inequality and decrease the quality of life.
- 4) Cross-Ex of First Negative**
- a) People can’t challenge laws? Not internationally
 - b) Can’t corporations based in the US sue in the US or China? Not both.
 - c) Who can they sue? Only in the proper court.
 - d) Have laws been amended before? Yes, for various reasons.
 - e) Aren’t US laws based on capitalism so give us the right to sue? Capitalism is not the foundation of our laws. The question isn’t proper.
 - f) Don’t we want to export our democratic ideals? Other ways to do it without making concessions.
 - g) Doesn’t the TPP have the strictest human rights protections of any trade treaty? I’m not sure. Not enough for Vietnam and China.
- 5) Second Affirmative Constructive**
- a) Intro
 - b) Resolution
 - c) I will cover Neg then Aff
 - d) N1: in the long run, trade increases the number of jobs, as small business replaces outsourcing
 - i) We need jobs that have value here in the US
 - ii) Environment: TPP has higher environmental standards than any trade deal
 - iii) Innovation: yes it extends patents and copyrights
 - (1) It eliminates software and digital patents which will increase innovation there
 - e) N2: the reverse is true regarding outsourcing
 - i) TPP will increase trade, helping all nations involved to grow
 - ii) In A2 we noted reduced tariffs will increase exports and trade and lower costs
 - iii) Trade treaties have accounted for \$13,000/year in increased income for US families
 - iv) the jobs that go to other countries are not valuable to the US
 - v) Nike/New Balance outsourcing opens opportunities for smaller firms
 - f) N3: individuals and corporations have always been able to bring their grievance before the law

- i) We already abide by international law, existing trade treaties, UN
 - ii) We have to look at the long-term, not simply the short-term for beneficial impacts
- 6) Cross-Ex of Second Affirmative**
- a) Is unemployment bad? Yes
 - b) If a job can be outsourced are you saying it shouldn't stay in the US?
Outsourcing is not necessarily bad
 - c) What jobs are unique to the US? I'm not an economist.
 - d) But which jobs will stay in the US? A job that can be outsourced will not holds its value in the long-run
 - e) Can you give us an example of trade treaties helping small business in the long-run? From the packet?
 - f) How does more trade make us less reliant? We are less reliant on any one country
 - g) Name one country we are reliant on today? China
- 7) Second Negative Constructive**
- a) I'll cover Neg then Aff
 - b) States N1, N2 and N3
 - c) Before I review the Aff case I want to present our main argument
 - i) Aff has not presented any problem with the status quo
 - ii) They are required to do this by CDA regulations
 - iii) p.5 states "overall the United States would become more import dependent"
e.g. more dependent on goods we don't produce
 - iv) Experience with Japan and the yen show that in a global economy we can't avoid this
 - v) Therefore the status quo is fine, there is no problem
 - d) A1: vs. N2 and the impact of globalization
 - i) Vietnam and China use slave labor and this justifies that abuse
 - ii) 40% of the world economy should exclude human rights abuses
 - e) A2: Aff offered no proof.
 - i) We cited NAFTA and the Korea trade treaty
 - f) A3: International standards mean nothing in Vietnam
 - i) The US ideal is to have good labor standards
 - g) N3: Under TPP, large companies can sue if laws harm them
 - i) E.g. they could sue to stop laws preventing toxic waste and win if it harms their profit
- 8) Cross-Ex of Second Negative**
- a) Won't our human rights ideals be accomplished when TPP requires Vietnam abide by them? (2nd Neg) Does TPP say Vietnam can't violate human rights?
 - b) (Aff) Yes, TPP says Vietnam can't violate human rights. (2nd Neg) There are no details available yet.
 - c) The TPP says Vietnam can't violate human rights included in the treaty! (2nd Neg) That's a goal, but we don't know the details.
 - d) Are the human rights standards in the TPP? Vietnam may not abide by them.
 - e) Aren't jobs being outsourced from the US now? Wouldn't it be better to have rules controlling this? We should set a precedent or exacerbate the problem

- f) Isn't one problem causing outsourcing low labor standards? No, it's lack of democracy for workers
- g) Is it worse to be dependent on one country or many? We aren't reliant now

9) First Negative Rebuttal

- a) Intro
- b) Dependency on China
 - i) All are dependent on China...and on the US and Japan and Brazil
 - ii) It's already a global economy. If any country fails, all are harmed
 - iii) TPP won't change or fix this.
- c) Clash on N1
 - i) No Aff examples of benefits to small business
 - ii) We export important jobs, manufacturing and services
- d) Aff has been confusing and unclear on digital copyright
- e) US has higher labor, wage and living standards
 - i) We should keep jobs here
 - ii) We should not export jobs to countries with wage slavery

10) First Affirmative Rebuttal

- a) Intro
- b) Three issues: Rights of business, long-term vs. short-term, international relations
- c) Rights of businesses
 - i) Neg does not allow for reform
 - ii) International business needs international standards, hence TPP
 - iii) This will help large corporations flourish
 - iv) It will also protect small business so they can survive
 - v) Small business can step into gaps left when large corporations move jobs overseas.
- d) Neg focuses on short-term harms and ignores long-term benefits
 - i) In A2 we gave you the statistics—\$14 billion in more trade, \$13,000 per year in increased income per family
- e) Neg would isolate the US
 - i) International standards help broaden the number of countries we depend on
 - ii) Standards reduce the detrimental effects of trade today
 - iii) E.g., force Vietnam to raise its labor standards

11) Second Negative Rebuttal

- a) Reform, but don't approve TPP
 - i) TPP perpetuates injustice e.g., Vietnam
 - ii) We must protect US workers
 - iii) So TPP will hurt rights
- b) Large companies will eat up the small
 - i) Stop & Shop opened in Madison, CT, and no one goes to Roberts, a smaller grocery store
 - ii) Large firms can capitalize on TPP for efficiently
 - iii) So TPP doesn't apportion growth
- c) Dependency
 - i) China had a financial crash earlier this year
 - ii) Some US stocks dropped

- iii) In October US added 225K jobs and unemployment declined
- d) Long-term vs short-term
 - i) \$75 billion and 175 are hypotheses
 - ii) Aff never replied on NAFTA and Korea

12) Second Affirmative Rebuttal

- a) Intro
- b) Let's compare the world with and without TPP
- c) With TPP
 - i) Stats in A2 show past trade agreements have benefited US
 - ii) US Trade Representative Office says goals will be accomplished
 - iii) Lifting tariffs helps exports and imports
- d) Neg would isolate other countries.
 - i) We have seen this didn't work with Cuba, Russia and Iran, none of whom follow the US lead
- e) Under TPP tribunals protect rights in foreign lands
 - i) You can sue in China now, and don't have to sue in US
- f) Outsourcing is happening now
 - i) TPP adds workers' rights
- g) Under the Affirmative
 - i) US companies will be more competitive
 - ii) Other countries agree to higher standards for labor and the environment
 - iii) More countries will be drawn into the international system
 - iv) There will be strict new standards for trade
 - v) \$14 billion in economic benefits by 2025