U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement / Agreement should be ratified

< U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

Position: Agreement should be ratified

This position addresses the topic U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

For this position

> "At home, the trade pacts would provide opportunities for American exporters and help create jobs. In Latin America, the pacts would contribute to economic growth, shake off dependence on the narcotics trade and cement relationships in a region where Washington's influence is increasingly trumped by the well-oiled diplomacy of Venezuela's Hugo Chávez."

From Democrats Talk Sense to Democrats, by The New York Times editorial board (*The New York Times*, October 8, 2007) (view)

> "Trade has helped America transform itself into a middle-class service economy. Yes, the country's lost a net 3.3 million manufacturing jobs in the past decade - but it's added a net 11.6 million jobs in service and other sectors where average wages are higher than in manufacturing. Most of these new jobs are in better-paying categories, like professional and business services, finance and education and health services."

From The Truth on Trade, by Daniel Griswold (*New York Post*, November 7, 2007) (view)

> "During the just-concluded campaign, Democrats and their allies launched an avalanche of simplistic ads attacking "outsourcing." Now that the Republicans are in the majority, all three trade agreements have better prospects - good news for the American companies and workers who would benefit from expanded exports, and for the American consumers who would benefit from more choices in the marketplace."

From Trading Up, by The Washington Post editorial board (*The Washington Post*, November 6, 2010) (view)

> "As a political issue, free trade often suffers its share of partisan and industry-specific bashing. As an economic issue, no other force is more responsible for raising global prosperity in recent decades than the elimination of protective barriers and the creation of a more efficient system of trade. And few countries have benefited more than the United States."

From Congress finally gets on free trade track, by San Antonio Express-News editorial board

(*San Antonio Express-News*, November 14, 2007) (view)

> "In the short run, almost every free-trade agreement leads to some near-term job loss. But boosting trade and investment between countries in a major way sparks economies overall, creates new jobs and leads to new entrepreneurial opportunities that also create unexpected jobs. The U.S.-South Korean agreement is so powerful and obviously beneficial that the Japanese business-news media have been pleading for its government in Tokyo to duplicate a similar agreement with the Koreans."

From A vital U.S.-South Korea trade pact, by Tom Plate (*The Seattle Times*, May 3, 2007) (view)

> "All of this is a pity. Just when the falling dollar is boosting American exports, a tit-for-tat trade war, closing markets to US goods, is the last thing a slowing American economy needs."

From The end of free trade as we know it, by Irwin Stelzer (*The Times*, May 20, 2007) (view)

> "Opening markets and lowering barriers for U.S. exports creates jobs, spurs innovation, and gives our economy a competitive edge. Consumers also see the benefits -- they get a greater variety of higher-quality goods at lower prices. Free-trade agreements (FTAs) -- including those now pending before Congress with Colombia, Panama and South Korea -- solidify our relationships with key allies and level the trade playing field by lowering export barriers to American businesses, workers and farmers."

From Keep America Open to Trade, by Carlos Gutierrez, Arnold Schwarzenegger (*The Wall Street Journal*, May 12, 2008) (view)

> "As a democracy with a strong trade union movement, South Korea doesn't pose the workers' rights challenges that vex unionists in agreements with poorer countries. This deal would open the Korean market to a wide array of U.S. agricultural, industrial and cultural products and services; in fact, the political risks in South Korea are far higher than here. And it would demonstrate U.S. commitment to a vital region at a time when China is steadily gaining ground."

From Ms. Clinton, Thinking Small, by The Washington Post editorial board (*The Washington Post*, June 13, 2007) (view)

> "One union and the two smaller U.S. automakers should not be allowed to sink a deal that would improve relations with a strategic ally in Northeast Asia and deliver real gains to U.S. agriculture and industry -- not to mention American consumers. The Democrats' partisan embrace of rationalizations served up by labor and (part of) the auto lobby is not "a new day in trade policy." It's protectionism as usual."

From Same Old Protectionism, by The Washington Post editorial board (*The Washington Post*, July 6, 2007) (view)

> "Good idea, right? Not to Democrats, who said Friday that they'll oppose the pact on human rights grounds until they "see concrete evidence of sustained results on the ground in Colombia." What Colombians think about their president and his policies is apparently meaningless. Mr. Uribe replied that he isn't interested in "a relationship wherein the U.S. is master and Colombia a slave republic"; good for him."

From Trade Double-Cross, by The Wall Street Journal editorial board (*The Wall Street Journal*, July 5, 2007) (view)

> Punishing China with tariffs or other sanctions probably wouldn’t lead to a jobs bonanza. More likely, other low-wage countries would fill the void left by China, while Beijing retaliated against the United States, costing American growth and jobs. The last thing an already unstable global economy needs is a U.S.-China trade war. Congressional posturing may help the Obama administration play “good cop, bad cop” with Beijing. But it should not be allowed to impede three long-overdue free-trade agreements whose benefits are not theatrical but real.

From Free trade must not be a casualty of the currency wars, by The Washington Post editorial board (*The Washington Post*, August 30, 2011) (view)

> "The deal's benefits to California are clear. Its lowering of agricultural barriers would be a boon for citrus growers. Hollywood would be among the biggest winners because the deal opens South Korea to American TV programming, toughens copyright protections and relaxes ownership restrictions on Korean production companies."

From Trading up with South Korea, by Los Angeles Times editorial board (*Los Angeles Times*, April 4, 2007) (view)

> "South Korea has nearly 50 million consumers. Although it does not apply to rice, the agreement nonetheless would be a boon for U.S. farmers and service providers, especially Hollywood and the banking and insurance industries. South Korea is America's seventh-largest goods trading partner. Last year, U.S. exports to South Korea totaled $32.4 billion. U.S. imports were $45.8 billion."

From Pass the U.S.-Korea trade pact, by The Washington Times editorial board (*The Washington Times*, April 11, 2007) (view)

Against this position

> "If the agreement were to pass, workers' rights in both countries would be at greater risk, because hard-won labor protections would be dismissed as "trade barriers." Free trade would undermine South Korea's labor laws, cut wages, eliminate jobs and increase the number of temporary workers without benefits or job security. Already, more than half of all workers in South Korea are "irregular" workers, hired on temporary employment status."

From Free trade agreement between U.S. and South Korea is a lie, by Suk Min Yoon (*Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, March 2, 2007) (view)

Mixed on this position

No results

Retrieved from
"https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=U.S.-Korea_Free_Trade_Agreement_/_Agreement_should_be_ratified&

oldid=5813"

This page was last edited on May 20, 2007, at 13:56.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.