












# Annual Income Effects of Manufacturing Outsourcing Event

Machinery Plant with 300 Shop-Floor Workers Moved Offshore

Bob Agnew (raagnew1@gmail.com, www.raagnew.com)

	United States		Developing Country	
Worker Compensation Including Benefits	(\$12,000,000) =300 * (\$45K gen - \$85K mfg)		\$750,000 =300 * (\$10K mfg - \$7.5K gen)	
Wheels-Turning Capital Expenditure/Consumption	(\$7,000,000) Left with hole in the ground		\$7,000,000 Transplanted capital consumption	
Profit Increase and/or Consumer Cost Reduction	\$22,500,000 = 300 * (\$85K mfg – \$10K mfg) Other costs assumed to carry over			
Free-Trade Gain (Unbalanced)	\$3,500,000		\$7,750,000	
Fair-Trade Adjustment (Govt -> Govt Payment)	\$2,125,000		(\$2,125,000)	
Fair-Trade Gain (Balanced)	\$5,625,000		\$5,625,000	

## Notes

- Free trade is typically unbalanced in favor of developing countries
- Trade should be viewed as a cooperative (positive-sum) game
- Nations should bargain *on behalf of their citizens* to ensure fair allocation of total gain from trade
- According to Nobel laureates John Nash and Lloyd Shapley, the split should be 50-50
- Fair-trade adjustment from developing country should be annual and ongoing. Could be structured as a tariff on total landed import cost.
- Fair-trade adjustment can provide support to displaced US workers