

Title: TPP (Trans-Pacific Partnership): What do you think?

Author: Don Jenkins

Recommended time frame: 1-2 periods

Grade levels: 8-12

Applicable courses: Current Events, History, Geography, Government, Economics

Standards:

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.6-8.1

Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.6-8.2

Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of the source distinct from prior knowledge or opinions.

Objectives/ outcomes:

1. Students will be able to define the TPP.
2. Students will be able to give reasons for and against the TPP.
3. Students will be able to write their opinion on the TPP and support their opinion with three reasons.

For Teacher: lesson background information:

The TPP is an important trade agreement which has yet to be ratified by The United States, but could play an important role in world trade and relations between The United States and Asia. Many political candidates and special interest groups have strong opinions for and against The Trans-Pacific Partnership. In this lesson, students will read information from a person or group concerning their opinion on the TPP, discuss that viewpoint in groups of four, and then form an opinion about the TPP, and write to defend their opinion.

Anticipatory set/icebreaker/introducing the lesson:

1. Day before the lesson: Have students bring in a list of their clothes and where they are made. This could also be done during class, or by searching the internet.
2. Day of lesson: Poll the students to see where their clothes come from. Make a list of clothes and country of origin.
3. In pairs have students discuss why consumers buy products from other countries and why companies sell products in other countries. Have students discuss what might make a product more expensive from another country.

4. Explain tariffs and provide students the following information about the TPP:

TPP in a nutshell

<http://www.bbc.com/news/business-32498715>

TPP stands for Trans-Pacific Partnership

It involves 12 countries: the US, Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, Singapore, Brunei, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Mexico, Chile and Peru.

The pact aims to deepen economic ties between these nations, slashing tariffs and fostering trade to boost growth.

Member countries are also hoping to foster a closer relationship on economic policies and regulation.

The agreement could create a new single market something like that of the EU.

How big a deal is the TPP?

Pretty big indeed. The 12 countries have a collective population of about 800 million - almost double that of the European Union's single market. The 12-nation would-be bloc is already responsible for 40% of world trade.

The deal is a remarkable achievement given the very different approaches and standards within the member countries, including environmental protection, workers' rights and regulatory coherence - not to mention the special protections that some countries have for certain industries.

Procedures:

Explain to students that they will be looking at four different points of view concerning the TPP and will be discussing and debating the pros and cons of the TPP. They will then form their own opinion about the TPP and write a paragraph defending their position.

1. Place students in groups of four and give each of them one of the sources concerning the TPP. The four sources are from Bernie Sanders (against), Iowa Farm Bureau (in favor), William Krist (in favor), and Donald Trump (against)
2. Have each student do a Close Read of the article using the following notations. Highlight in red interesting and powerful words and phrases. Highlight in green what is important or key. Write any comments or questions in the margins of the article. Write down 3-5 reasons which the source provides as to why the TPP is a good or bad piece of legislation.
3. In their groups of four, each student will debate the question from the viewpoint presented in their article. You may want to use Handout One: Accountable Student Talk, for students to facilitate their own discussion and so each student has a role during the discussion.

4. After group discussion, have a whole class discussion about whether the TPP is a good idea.
5. Have students write a paragraph providing their opinion on the TPP and supporting their claim with 3 reasons given in their article, in their groups, or during whole class discussion..

Conclusions:

1. Poll students to see who is for or against the TPP.
2. Poll students to see if the TPP will be passed by the US government.

Modifications:

1. Whole class discussion could take place on Google Classroom which would allow less reluctant speakers to discuss their ideas..
2. Instead of printing the sources, the sources could be placed on Google Docs and students could make their Close Read notations on The Google Doc.

Extensions:

1. Have students do additional research to write a 5 paragraph essay supporting or rejecting the TPP.
2. Students could hold a formal debate on the issue. Resolved: The TPP should be signed into law.
3. Have students write a letter to the editor of the local newspaper supporting or rejecting the TPP.

Sources/ websites: (place any connected to FPRI first)

<http://www.fpri.org/article/2015/05/why-we-need-the-trans-pacific-partnership-and-how-to-get-it-right/>

<https://www.sanders.senate.gov/download/the-trans-pacific-trade-tpp-agreement-must-be-defeated?inline=file>

<https://www.iowafarmbureau.com/Article/Japan-offers-lucrative-market-for-iowa-farmers>

https://ballotpedia.org/2016_presidential_candidates_on_the_Trans-Pacific_Partnership_trade_deal#tab=Republican_candidate

<http://www.bbc.com/news/business-32498715>

Source #1

SENATOR BERNIE SANDERS: THE TRANS-PACIFIC TRADE (TPP) AGREEMENT MUST BE DEFEATED

<https://www.sanders.senate.gov/download/the-trans-pacific-trade-tpp-agreement-must-be-defeated?inline=file>

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is a disastrous trade agreement designed to protect the interests of the largest multi-national corporations at the expense of workers, consumers, the environment and the foundations of American democracy. It will also negatively impact some of the poorest people in the world. The TPP is a treaty that has been written behind closed doors by the corporate world. Incredibly, while Wall Street, the pharmaceutical industry and major media companies have full knowledge as to what is in this treaty, the American people and members of Congress do not. They have been locked out of the process. Further, all Americans, regardless of political ideology, should be opposed to the “fast track” process which would deny Congress the right to amend the treaty and represent their constituents’ interests. The TPP follows in the footsteps of other unfettered free trade agreements like NAFTA, CAFTA and the Permanent Normalized Trade Agreement with China (PNTR). These treaties have forced American workers to compete against desperate and low-wage labor around the world. The result has been massive job losses in the United States and the shutting down of tens of thousands of factories. These corporately backed trade agreements have significantly contributed to the race to the bottom, the collapse of the American middle class and increased wealth and income inequality. The TPP is more of the same, but even worse. During my 23 years in Congress, I helped lead the fight against NAFTA and PNTR with China. During the coming session of Congress, I will be working with organized labor, environmentalists, religious organizations, Democrats, and Republicans against the secretive TPP trade deal. Let’s be clear: the TPP is much more than a “free trade” agreement. It is part of a global race to the bottom to boost the profits of large corporations and Wall Street by outsourcing jobs; undercutting worker rights; dismantling labor, environmental, health, food safety and financial laws; and allowing corporations to challenge our laws in international tribunals rather than our own court system. If TPP was such a good deal for America, the administration should have the courage to show the American people exactly what is in this deal, instead of keeping the content of the TPP a secret.

10 Ways that TPP would hurt Working Families

1. TPP will allow corporations to outsource even more jobs overseas. According to the Economic Policy Institute, if the TPP is agreed to, the U.S. will lose more than 130,000 jobs to Vietnam and Japan alone. But that is just the tip of the iceberg.
- Service Sector Jobs will be lost. At a time when corporations have already outsourced over 3 million service sector jobs in the U.S., TPP includes rules that will make it even easier for corporate America to outsource call centers; computer programming; engineering; accounting; and medical diagnostic jobs.
- Manufacturing jobs will be lost. As a result of NAFTA, the U.S. lost nearly 700,000 jobs. As a result of Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, the U.S. lost over 2.7 million jobs. As a result of the Korea Free Trade Agreement, the U.S. has lost 70,000 jobs. The TPP would make matters worse by providing special benefits to firms that offshore jobs and by reducing the risks associated with operating in low-wage countries.

2. U.S.

sovereignty will be undermined by giving corporations the right to challenge our laws before international tribunals. The TPP creates a special dispute resolution process that allows corporations to challenge any domestic laws that could adversely impact their “expected future profits.” These challenges would be heard before UN and World Bank tribunals which could require taxpayer compensation to corporations. This process undermines our sovereignty and subverts democratically passed laws including those dealing with labor, health, and the environment. 3. Wages, benefits, and collective bargaining will be threatened. NAFTA, CAFTA, PNTR with China, and other free trade agreements have helped drive down the wages and benefits of American workers and have eroded collective bargaining rights. The TPP will make the race to the bottom worse because it forces American workers to compete with desperate workers in Vietnam where the minimum wage is just 56 cents an hour. 4. Our ability to protect the environment will be undermined. The TPP will allow corporations to challenge any law that would adversely impact their future profits. Pending claims worth over \$14 billion have been filed based on similar language in other trade agreements. Most of these claims deal with challenges to environmental laws in a number of countries. The TPP will make matters even worse by giving corporations the right to sue any of the nations that sign onto the TPP. These lawsuits would be heard in international tribunals bypassing domestic courts. 5. Food Safety Standards will be threatened. The TPP would make it easier for countries like Vietnam to export contaminated fish and seafood into the U.S. The FDA has already prevented hundreds of seafood imports from TPP countries because of salmonella, e-coli, methyl-mercury and drug residues. But the FDA only inspects 1-2 percent of food imports and will be overwhelmed by the vast expansion of these imports if the TPP is agreed to. 6. Buy America laws could come to an end. The U.S. has several laws on the books that require the federal government to buy goods and services that are made in America or mostly made in this country. Under TPP, foreign corporations must be given equal access to compete for these government contracts with companies that make products in America. Under TPP, the U.S. could not even prevent companies that have horrible human rights records from receiving government contracts paid by U.S. taxpayers. 7. Prescription drug prices will increase, access to life saving drugs will decrease, and the profits of drug companies will go up. Big pharmaceutical companies are working hard to ensure that the TPP extends the monopolies they have for prescription drugs by extending their patents (which currently can last 20 years or more). This would expand the profits of big drug companies, keep drug prices artificially high, and leave millions of people around the world without access to life saving drugs. Doctors without Borders stated that “the TPP agreement is on track to become the most harmful trade pact ever for access to medicines in developing countries.” 8. Wall Street would benefit at the expense of everyone else. Under TPP, governments would be barred from imposing “capital controls” that have been successfully used to avoid financial crises. These controls range from establishing a financial speculation tax to limiting the massive flows of speculative capital flowing into and out of countries responsible for the Asian financial crisis in the 1990s. In other words, the TPP would expand the rights and power of the same Wall Street firms that nearly destroyed the world economy just five years ago and would create the conditions for more financial instability in the future. Last year, I co-sponsored a bill with Sen. Harkin to create a Wall Street speculation tax of just 0.03 percent on trades of derivatives, credit default swaps, and large amounts of stock. If TPP were enacted, such a financial speculation tax may be in violation of this trade agreement. 9. The TPP would

reward authoritarian regimes like Vietnam that systematically violate human rights. The State Department, the U.S. Department of Labor, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International have all documented Vietnam's widespread violations of basic international standards for human rights. Yet, the TPP would reward Vietnam's bad behavior by giving it duty free access to the U.S. market. 10. The TPP has no expiration date, making it virtually impossible to repeal. Once TPP is agreed to, it has no sunset date and could only be altered by a consensus of all of the countries that agreed to it. Other countries, like China, could be allowed to join in the future. For example, Canada and Mexico joined TPP negotiations in 2012 and Japan joined last year.

Source #2

Japan offers lucrative market for Iowa farmers

<https://www.iowafarmbureau.com/Article/Japan-offers-lucrative-market-for-iowa-farmers>

The Japanese market for pork, beef and other high-value agricultural products is big today, continues to grow and is far too lucrative for American farmers to pass up, Farm Bureau members and U.S. trade officials said last week.

That's why passage of the Trans-Pacific Trade Partnership, or TPP, in Congress is so critical, they said. The TPP, which would link the United States with Japan and 10 other nations in a trade bloc spanning the Pacific Ocean, would significantly reduce tariffs on meats imported into Japan and other nations, reduce prices for Japanese consumers and increase demand.

"We need the TPP. We can't afford to let this opportunity with Japan slip away," Scott Heater, Louisa County Farm Bureau president and cattle raiser, said during the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation county presidents' incentive trip to Japan, which ended last week. "They have the money to buy things, and they also have infrastructure that is necessary to get fresh meat across the Pacific and into stores."

Heater's view was echoed by other county presidents who visited both Tokyo and the Yamanashi prefecture in Japan. And it was underscored by Japanese representatives of the U.S. Meat Export Federation (USMEF), as well as ag trade officials at the U.S. Embassy.

"We can't miss out on this market," Jason Russell, Linn County Farm Bureau president and a hog raiser, said after he and other county presidents visited a Japanese supermarket and the food aisles of a high-end department store in Tokyo's fashionable Ginza district. "Trade is so important to us today. We have lower cost of production than anywhere else, and we are blessed with abundant land and feed resources. But we also need strong markets."

Mike Kleitsch, Poweshiek County Farm Bureau president, said the visit to the Tokyo supermarket and department store was eye-opening. "It really brought home the importance of exports for our livestock markets," he said.

Japan is already America's highest-value red meat export destination. In 2015, Japan bought nearly \$1.6 billion worth of pork and about \$1.3 billion worth of U.S. beef, ahead of all other export markets.

Meat exports to Japan have a positive effect well beyond livestock sales. They create stronger local demand for feed grains, boost jobs and increase economic activity in rural Iowa.

Despite the fact that Japan has an aging market and its population is expected to decline in the coming decades, there is still room to grow, according to Evan Magino of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, who is stationed in Tokyo.

Japan's diet is evolving away from the traditional rice and fish dominated meals of the past, and pork and beef are taking a bigger place at the dinner table, Magino said. Consumers in Japan are also very willing to pay for high quality food products, he said.

"It's definitely a very high-value market. Japan's imports of value-added products dwarf what we sell to China."

Although Japan is a very good customer, the United States can't take the market for granted, noted Larry Sailer, Franklin County Farm Bureau president and hog raiser. "It's an aging market, but it's a great market for us, and we need to work to take care of it."

Passage of the TPP, which still has to be approved by Congress, is a big part of caring for the Japanese market, said Takemichi Yamashoji, Japan director for the USMEF. It would lower tariffs, reduce supermarket prices for Japanese consumers and, importantly, put U.S. farmers on an even playing field with competitors, he said.

Because Japan is such a lucrative market, there is naturally a lot of competition, Yamashoji said. Some competitors, such as Australia, have already signed a free trade agreement, and others are in the wings. "If the United States doesn't pass the TPP, it will put our farmers at a big disadvantage," he said.

Louisa County's Heater agreed. "We really need the TPP to boost exports. Without exports, I'd just hate to see what cattle prices would go to. I just know it wouldn't be pretty."

Source #3

Why We Need the Trans-Pacific Partnership and How to Get It Right

William Krist

May 1, 2015

The United States and 11 other countries are negotiating an enormous trade agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which will have a major impact on the world economy and help shape the future rules governing international trade. These negotiations began in earnest in 2008 among the United States, Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. Subsequently, they have expanded to include Canada, Japan and Mexico. Today, they are arguably the most important trade negotiations since the World Trade Organization went into effect in 1995.

Success in these negotiations is significant for both U.S. commercial and foreign policy interests. It is important to conclude these negotiations in 2015, however, because the agreement will need to gain Congressional approval to go into effect. In 2016, all members of the House and one-third of the Senate will be up for election, and many members of Congress will be under substantial pressure to oppose further opening the U.S. markets. Because of these political concerns, trade negotiators always have sought to conclude agreements in non-election years.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement would build on current international trade rules contained in the World Trade Organization (WTO); however, it would go far beyond these trade commitments in many respects. First, all of the 12 countries would eliminate trade barriers almost completely among themselves, with just a few product exceptions. In contrast, under the WTO, countries maintain some tariffs which on particular products can be very high.

Additionally, the agreement would cover several new areas that are not addressed currently in any significant way under WTO trade rules. One important new area would be rules on how state-owned enterprises may operate in global competition without having an unfair trade advantage over market oriented firms. A second new area relates to digital commerce; some countries require that data centers be located in their geographic area and impose restrictions on the free flow of data across borders. TPP negotiators are hoping to develop rules of the road for digital commerce.

A third new area relates to regulations. Different regulations among countries governing such areas as product safety or the environment often represent a bigger barrier to trade than formal trade restrictions—even where the differing regulations achieve the same objectives. The United States is seeking greater transparency in the regulatory process with an opportunity for the TPP partners to comment on proposed regulations.

The TPP negotiations appear to be reaching their end game, although there are difficult issues still to be resolved. One of the most difficult areas is agriculture, where several participating countries maintain substantial import protections. For example, Malaysia has a 40 percent tariff on poultry; the United States and Canada protect their dairy markets and America maintains a high tariff on sugar imports.

Japan is the key to successful negotiations on agriculture. The country has astronomically high tariffs on rice, as well as high barriers to imports of wheat, pork, beef, sugar and dairy. Japan's agricultural sector is very inefficient; for example, rice is grown on small plots of land and is extremely labor intensive. Prime Minister Shinzō Abe wants to restructure Japan's economy to restart economic growth. Reducing barriers to agricultural products could be a major feature of this initiative. If Abe agrees to reduce agricultural trade barriers, while simultaneously implementing domestic reforms, many workers could shift from producing high cost agricultural products to producing goods that would compete in world markets. Were Japan to open its agricultural market, it would make it far easier for the United States and Canada to reduce their barriers on dairy, sugar and other products. This, in turn, would give Vietnam, Malaysia, and others more flexibility to reduce their barriers.

Of course, other market access issues are also important. For example, the U.S. auto industry is demanding real access to the Japanese market, which is currently protected by a number of non-tariff barriers and an artificially undervalued currency. And the Vietnamese are demanding improved access to the U.S. textile and apparel markets, if they are to proceed in opening their market and moving from a state-controlled economy to a more market-driven one.

The Importance of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Negotiations

Successfully concluding the Trans-Pacific Partnership would be very significant for the United States for both commercial and foreign policy reasons. The 12 countries negotiating the TPP agreement have a combined gross domestic product of \$27.9 trillion dollars and a total population of some 800 million (see Table 1). In terms of wealth, the 12 countries range from \$67,525 per capita income for Australia down to just \$1,755 per capita for Vietnam.

he United States already has free trade agreements (FTAs) with six of the TPP countries (Australia, Canada, Chile, Mexico, Peru and Singapore); however, some of these agreements were negotiated some time ago (e.g., the North American Free Trade Agreement with Mexico and Canada, which went into effect in 1994). The TPP agreement would update these existing FTAs by extending market openings and making some improvements in the rules.

However, we do not have agreements with five of the countries (Brunei, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand and Vietnam). These countries have a combined GDP of more than \$6 trillion. Japan, the world's third largest economy, of course, is far and away the most important of these five, but both Malaysia and Vietnam are likely to be significant markets in the future.

A study based on an econometric model by the Petersen Institute estimates that "world income would rise by \$295 billion per year on the TPP track, including by \$78 billion per year for the United States."^[1] While this model is based on a number of assumptions, some of which may prove to be incorrect, the conclusion appears to be accurate: the TPP will have a substantial impact if it is successfully negotiated and implemented.

Table 1 Twelve Countries Negotiating TTP

<u>Country</u>	<u>GDP (Billions \$)</u>	<u>Population (Millions)</u>	<u>GDP Per Capita</u>
Australia	1,534.4	22.7	\$67,525
Brunei	16.9	0.4	\$41,127
Canada	1,821.4	34.8	\$52,409
Chile	266.3	17.5	\$15,246
Japan	5,954.5	127.6	\$46,679
Malaysia	305.3	29.2	\$10,440
Mexico	1,186.5	120.8	\$ 9,818
New Zealand	171.5	4.4	\$38,678
Peru	192.6	30	\$ 6,424
Singapore	286.9	5.3	\$54,007
United States	16,163.2	313.9	\$51,496
Vietnam	155.8	88.8	\$ 1,755

World Bank, World Development Indicators, 2012,

<http://databank.worldbank.org/data/home.aspx>.

If the TPP negotiations are not successful, the United States could face severe negative consequences. There is an extremely important alternative trade negotiation to the TPP: the agreement being negotiated between the ten countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations^[2] (ASEAN) with China, Australia, India, Japan, Korea and New Zealand, known as the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP). These negotiations are not as far along as the TPP and they are not as ambitious, but nonetheless they would have a far-reaching impact.

China is also negotiating a trilateral free trade agreement with South Korea and Japan and a bilateral free trade agreement with Australia. If the TPP falters, both the RCEP and China's negotiations for free trade

agreements likely will accelerate and gain new prominence. The result would be that U.S. exporters would face a substantial competitive disadvantage in the Asian market.

In addition to the negative commercial impact, U.S. foreign policy would also suffer. In announcing the “Asian pivot” in 2011, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton outlined six key elements. These included: “strengthening bilateral security alliances; deepening our working relationships with emerging powers, including with China; engaging with regional multilateral institutions; expanding trade and investment; forging a broad-based military presence; and advancing democracy and human rights.”^[3]

Concluding the TPP is central to U.S. credibility in achieving these goals. If the TPP negotiations fail, China would lie at the center of Asian-Pacific trade and the United States essentially would be relegated to the sidelines. To get to closure and to have an agreement that can be a template for 21st century trade agreements, three important changes are needed to the model reportedly being advocated by the U.S. First, the Investor-State Dispute Settlement rules must be clarified to prevent abusive suits. Secondly, the rules to protect the intellectual property of pharmaceuticals must be carefully calibrated to not unduly burden consumers while still providing incentives to develop new drugs. And thirdly, negotiators must include provisions to prevent currency manipulation for the purpose of gaining an unfair commercial advantage.

Donald Trump's views on the TPP

https://ballotpedia.org/2016_presidential_candidates_on_the_Trans-Pacific_Partnership_trade_deal#tab=Republican_candidate

- After [Hillary Clinton](#) announced Sen. [Tim Kaine](#) (D-Va.) as her vice president, Trump tweeted the following on July 23, 2016: "Tim Kaine has been praising the Trans Pacific Partnership and has been pushing hard to get it approved. Job killer!" *Washington Examiner* reported that "Kaine assured Clinton before being picked for the VP spot that he opposes the TPP in its current form."^[18]
- On June 30, 2016, Trump said that the [Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal \(TPP\)](#) "will make NAFTA, in my opinion, look like a baby. ... Trans-Pacific Partnership — it's over 5,000 pages long — every country that's in that partnership has studied every word, every comma, every sentence, every paragraph; our guys probably haven't even read it. This is the way we do business." Trump then criticized Hillary Clinton and former President Bill Clinton for their involvement in past free trade deals, according to *The Hill*. Trump said, "Hillary Clinton understood and backed, and Bill Clinton certainly as the president, initiatives — they are a disaster, and now they want to go into TPP, Trans-Pacific Partnership. ... We have to get smart, folks."^[19]
- On June 28, 2016, Trump said, "The Trans-Pacific Partnership is another disaster done and pushed by special interests who want to rape our country — just a continuing rape of our country. It's a harsh word, but it's true."^[20]
- In a speech titled "Declaring American Economic Independence," delivered on June 28, 2016, Trump criticized the TPP and Clinton for changing her stance on the trade deal. Trump said, "The TPP would be the death blow for American manufacturing. It would give up all of our economic leverage to an international commission that would put the interests of foreign countries above our own. It would further open our markets to aggressive currency cheaters. It would make it easier for our trading competitors to ship cheap subsidized goods into U.S. markets - while allowing foreign countries to continue putting barriers in front of our exports. The TPP would lower tariffs on foreign cars, while leaving in place the foreign practices that keep American cars from being sold overseas. The TPP even created a backdoor for China to supply car parts for automobiles made in Mexico. The agreement would also force American workers to compete directly against workers from Vietnam, one of the lowest wage countries on Earth. Not only will the TPP undermine our economy, but it will undermine our independence. The TPP creates a new

international commission that makes decisions the American people can't veto. These commissions are great Hillary Clinton's Wall Street funders who can spend vast amounts of money to influence the outcomes. It should be no surprise then that Hillary Clinton, according to Bloomberg, took a 'leading part in drafting the Trans-Pacific Partnership'. She praised or pushed the TPP on 45 separate occasions, and even called it the 'gold standard'. Hillary Clinton was totally for the TPP just a short while ago, but when she saw my stance, which is totally against, she was shamed into saying she would be against it too – but have no doubt, she will immediately approve it if it is put before her, guaranteed. She will do this just as she has betrayed American workers for Wall Street throughout her career. Here's how it would go: she would make a small token change, declare the pact fixed, and ram it through. That's why Hillary is now only saying she has problems with the TPP 'in its current form,' – ensuring that she can rush to embrace it again at her earliest opportunity. If the media doesn't believe me, I have a challenge for you. Ask Hillary Clinton if she is willing to withdraw from the TPP her first day in office and unconditionally rule out its passage in any form. There is no way to 'fix' the TPP. We need bilateral trade deals. We do not need to enter into another massive international agreement that ties us up and binds us down."^[21]

- In an op-ed from March 14, 2016, Trump explained his opposition to the [Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal \(TPP\)](#). He wrote, "The number of jobs and amount of wealth and income the United States have given way in so short a time is staggering, likely unprecedented. And the situation is about to get drastically worse if the Trans-Pacific Partnership is not stopped. One of the first casualties of the TPP will be America's auto industry, and among the worst victims of this pact will be the people of Ohio. The TPP will send America's remaining auto jobs to Japan. Yet, Gov. John Kasich, Sen. Ted Cruz and Sen. Marco Rubio have all promoted the Trans-Pacific Partnership — a mortal threat to American manufacturing. ... TPP is the biggest betrayal in a long line of betrayals where politicians have sold out U.S. workers. America's politicians — beholden to global corporate interests who profit from offshoring — have enabled jobs theft in every imaginable way. They have tolerated foreign trade cheating while enacting trade deals that encourage companies to shift production overseas."^[22]
- During the [Fox Business/Wall Street Journal Republican debate](#) on November 10, 2015, Trump said that although he is a "free trader," he does not support [the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal \(TPP\)](#). Trump said, "The TPP is horrible deal. It is a deal that is going to lead to nothing but trouble. It's a deal that was designed for China to come in, as they always do, through the back door and totally take advantage of everyone. It's 5,600 pages long. So complex that nobodies [*sic*] read it. It's like Obamacare; nobody ever read it. They passed it; nobody read it. And look at mess we have right now. And it will be

repealed. But this is one of the worst trade deals. And I would, yes, rather not have it. With all of these countries, and all of the bad ones getting advantage and taking advantage of what the good ones would normally get, I'd rather make individual deals with individual countries. We will do much better. We lose a fortune on trade. The United States loses with everybody. We're losing now over \$500 billion in terms of imbalance with China, \$75 billion a year imbalance with Japan. By the way, Mexico, \$50 billion a year imbalance. So I must say, Gerard, I just think it's a terrible deal. I love trade. I'm a free trader, 100 percent. But we need smart people making the deals, and we don't have smart people making the deals."^[23]

- When asked if there were "particular parts of the deal that you think were badly negotiated," Trump replied, "Yes. Well, the currency manipulation they don't discuss in the agreement, which is a disaster. If you look at the way China and India and almost everybody takes advantage of the United States — China in particular, because they're so good. It's the number-one abuser of this country. And if you look at the way they take advantage, it's through currency manipulation. It's not even discussed in the almost 6,000-page agreement. It's not even discussed. And as you understand, I mean, you understand very well from the Wall Street Journal, currency manipulation is the single great weapon people have. They don't even discuss it in this agreement. So I say, it's a very bad deal, should not be approved. If it is approved, it will just be more bad trade deals, more loss of jobs for our country. We are losing jobs like nobody's ever lost jobs before. I want to bring jobs back into this country."^[23]
- In an attempt to clarify the facts, Sen. [Rand Paul](#) said, "Hey, Gerard, you know, we might want to point out China is not part of this deal."^[23]
- In a statement to *Breitbart* on October 5, 2015, Trump questioned congressional support for the [Trans-Pacific Partnership \(TPP\) trade deal](#). He asked, "Why are we striking trade agreements with countries we already have agreements with? Why is there no effort to make sure we have fair trade instead of 'free' trade that isn't free to Americans? Why do we not have accompanying legislation that will punish countries that manipulate their currencies to seek unfair advantage in trade arrangements? Why has the Congress not addressed prohibitive corporate tax rates and trade agreements that continue to drain dollars and jobs from America's shores?"^[24]
- On October 5, 2015, Trump criticized TPP in the following tweet:



Donald J. Trump 
@realDonaldTrump

 Follow

The incompetence of our current administration is beyond comprehension. TPP is a terrible deal.

RETWEETS
2,005

FAVORITES
3,713



1:46 PM - 5 Oct 2015

Handout #1: Accountable Student Talk

CAPTAIN

Responsibilities:

- First one to speak
- The only member to ask the teacher questions
- Speaks aloud to the class

Sound Bites:

- “Do we have questions for the teacher about how to do this?”
- “Mr. Jenkins, we have a question about...”
- “This is what our group talked about:...”

FACILITATOR

Responsibilities:

- Makes sure that all team members participate in the discussion in a similar way.
- Makes sure everyone is attentive, making eye contact, and listening.

Sound Bites:

- “Let’s give _____ a chance to speak.”
- “We understand what *your* ideas are. What about other people’s ideas?”

ACCOUNTABILITY MANAGER

Responsibilities:

- Makes sure the group discussion relates to the topic.
- Makes sure the question/topic is being thoroughly discussed and analyzed.

Sound Bites:

- “Are we really answering the question/addressing the topic here?”
- “Have we done everything that Mr. Jenkins wanted?”

SKEPTIC

Responsibilities:

- Make sure there are good reasons (evidence) for what people say.
- Challenges other members to think about the problem differently.

Sound Bites:

- “How do you know that?”
- “What is our reason for coming to this conclusion?”