Syntactical analysis

Subject

Verb

Direct Object

Indirect Object

Complement

However, a number of prominent economists express significant skepticism about this claim. Kimberly Clausing, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, states she doesn't believe that tariffs would radically increase the proportion of goods made in America and has strong reasons for her skepticism based on prior literature and past experiments with tariffs.

Clausing notes that according to careful analysis of prior waves of Trump tariffs, it's often difficult to find evidence of significant employment growth in the industries that were most protected by these tariffs. The amount of additional employment was often "indiscernible", even in cases where some job gains were identified, such as a thousand steel jobs. Moreover, there tended to be reductions in employment in other parts of the economy.

Tariffs on intermediate products, which make up a majority of U.S. imports (like steel and aluminum), increase the costs for domestic manufacturers that use these inputs. This can make it more difficult for them to compete with foreign companies and it can lead to job losses in those downstream industries.

Furthermore, the typical response of foreign countries to U.S. tariffs is to retaliate with their own tariffs, often targeting American export goods, such as agricultural products. This hurts U.S. exporters and can lead to shrinking markets for their goods abroad. Economists have often found that, when all these effects are considered, tariffs actually destroy more jobs than they create. Many economists suggest that if the goal is truly to help American middle-class workers, tariffs are not a sensible policy.

Economists have also noted that the claim that tariffs will lead to a "massive insourcing of manufacturing facilities" and new revenue is potentially contradictory to the idea that tariffs

are merely short-term negotiating tools. Insourcing requires sustained and steady tariffs to incentivize long-term investment in relocating supply chains.

In summary, while the Trump administration argued that tariffs would create manufacturing jobs, economic expert Kimberly Clausing suggests that evidence from past tariffs does not support this claim and that tariffs are more likely to result in little to no net job creation and potentially even job losses due to increased costs for businesses and retaliatory tariffs from other countries.

Phonetical analysis

1.

However,

First breath

a number of prominent economists express significant skepticism about this claim.

Second breath - Falling intonation

Kimberly Clausing,

Third breath

a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics,

Fourth breath - Falling intonation

states she doesn't believe that tariffs would radically increase the proportion of goods made in America

Fifth breath

and has strong reasons for her skepticism

Sixth breath - Choice intonation

based on prior literature and past experiments with tariffs.

Seventh breath -Choice intonation

2.

Clausing notes that according to careful analysis of prior waves of Trump tariffs,

First breath - Falling intonation

it's often difficult to find evidence of significant employment growth

Second breath

in the industries that were most protected by these tariffs.

Third breath - Falling intonation

The amount of additional employment was often "indiscernible”,

Fourth breath - Falling intonation

even in cases where some job gains were identified,

Fifth breath

such as a thousand steel jobs.

Sixth breath - Falling intonation

Moreover,

Seventh breath

there tended to be reductions in employment

Eighth breath

in other parts of the economy.

Nineth breath - Falling intonation

3.

Tariffs on intermediate products, which make up a majority of U.S. imports (like steel and aluminum),

First breath - Falling intonation

increase the costs for domestic manufacturers that use these inputs.

Second breath - Falling intonation

This can make it more difficult for them to compete with foreign companies

Third breath - Rising intonation

and it can lead to job losses in those downstream industries.

Fourth breath - Choice intonation

4.

Furthermore, the typical response of foreign countries to U.S. tariffs

First breath - Falling intonation

is to retaliate with their own tariffs, often targeting American export goods, such as agricultural products.

Second breath - Falling intonation

This hurts U.S. exporters

Third breath - Falling intonation

and can lead to shrinking markets for their goods abroad.

Fourth breath -Choice intonation

Economists have often found that, when all these effects are considered,

Fifth breath - Rising intonation

tariffs actually destroy more jobs than they create.

Sixth breath - Falling intonation

Many economists suggest that if the goal is truly to help American middle-class workers,
Seventh breath - Rising intonation

tariffs are not a sensible policy.
Eighth breath - Falling Intonation

5.

In summary, while the Trump administration argued that tariffs would create manufacturing jobs,

First breath -Rising intonation

economic expert Kimberly Clausing suggests that evidence from past tariffs does not support this claim
Second breath - Falling intonation

and that tariffs are more likely to result in little to no net job creation
Third breath - Choice intonation

and potentially even job losses due to increased costs for businesses and retaliatory tariffs from other countries.
Fourth breath - Choice intonation