

Free Trade and Tariffs

Emmanuel M. Asprodites¹, Walter E. Block²

¹²Loyola University New Orleans, United States
wblock@loyno.edu ; emasprod@my.loyno.edu

Abstract:

This paper aims to critically examine the long-standing debate between protectionism and free trade by evaluating the economic, historical, and ethical foundations of tariff-based policies. While tariffs are commonly justified as instruments to protect domestic industries, preserve employment, and promote national economic security, the paper argues that such protectionist measures ultimately undermine economic efficiency, distort market signals, and constrain long-term growth. Drawing upon classical economic theories developed by Adam Smith and David Ricardo, as well as contemporary insights from the Austrian School, the study highlights the central role of specialization, comparative advantage, and voluntary exchange in fostering economic prosperity. Historical evidence from Britain's post-Corn Laws liberalization and East Asian export-led growth strategies is employed to demonstrate how open trade regimes contribute to productivity gains, innovation, and income expansion. Furthermore, the paper advances the argument that free trade is not merely an economically optimal policy but also an ethically grounded framework that promotes mutual benefit, consumer welfare, and global development. In contrast to unilateral protectionism, free trade emerges as a superior and sustainable economic strategy within an interconnected world economy.

Keywords: Free Trade; Tariffs; Comparative Advantage; Protectionism; Economic Efficiency

Introduction

Trade policy has once again emerged as a central and contentious issue in global economic discourse, particularly among sovereign states and their political leadership. In recent years, tariffs and other protectionist measures have been promoted as instruments to revive domestic manufacturing, safeguard employment, and restore economic sovereignty, especially in the United States. Proponents of such policies argue that restricting imports can shield national industries from foreign competition and correct perceived trade imbalances. However, this resurgence of protectionism revives an old economic debate whose theoretical and empirical foundations have long been scrutinized within the discipline of economics.

A careful examination of economic theory and historical experience reveals a consistent conclusion: rather than fostering prosperity, tariffs and protectionist barriers undermine economic welfare. Far from promoting genuine economic independence, tariffs function as government-imposed sanctions on consumers and domestic producers. As Anderson (2018) argues, tariffs are explicitly designed to discourage foreign trade, yet their actual consequences include higher consumer prices, disrupted supply chains, and reduced economic efficiency. These costs are borne not only by foreign producers but also—indeed, primarily—by the very workers and consumers whom tariffs purport to protect. From this perspective, protectionism represents a policy that sacrifices broad social welfare for narrowly concentrated political interests.

This paper advances the case for unilateral free trade as a superior and ethically grounded economic policy. Free trade enhances welfare by reducing prices, intensifying competition, and enabling greater economic cooperation among nations. While it may be tempting to claim that such benefits necessarily outweigh the gains enjoyed by protected industries, mainstream welfare economics cautions against interpersonal comparisons of utility. As Austrian economists emphasize, utility is ordinal rather than cardinal and therefore does not permit objective aggregation across individuals. Nevertheless, even without invoking such comparisons, economic theory clearly demonstrates that tariffs impose diffuse costs on society while conferring visible but limited benefits upon politically favored sectors.

The classical critique of protectionism was articulated with particular clarity by Frédéric Bastiat, who observed that trade restrictions concentrate benefits at a single point while dispersing harm throughout the broader economy. Bastiat's insight highlights the fundamental asymmetry of tariff policies: although a protected industry may experience short-term gains, countless consumers and businesses suffer invisibly through higher prices and reduced choices. This logic underscores that the case for free trade is not merely economic but also moral. Free trade aligns with principles of fairness, voluntary exchange, and social cooperation, whereas protectionism privileges special interests at the expense of the general public.

Accordingly, this paper demonstrates through the application of basic economic theory, historical case studies, and empirical evidence—why free trade constitutes an essential dimension of economic freedom and long-run prosperity. In contrast, tariffs distort market signals, inhibit innovation, and ultimately weaken national economies. Beyond efficiency considerations, the paper also explores the ethical implications of trade policy, emphasizing that commerce is a fundamentally human and peaceful enterprise. Barriers to trade not only impose unnecessary economic costs but also erode the foundations of international cooperation. From both an economic and moral standpoint, free trade emerges as the only viable policy framework for an expanding, prosperous, and interconnected global community.

The Logic of Mutual Gains: Free Trade, Specialization, and Comparative Advantage

The economic rationale for free trade begins with the premise that trade, as an exchange of goods and services involving willing buyers and sellers, is inherently mutually beneficial to all parties involved. While tariffs introduce an additional layer of hardship by obstructing voluntary exchange and attempting to capitalize on adverse circumstances, free trade allows for a natural economic progression that ultimately enhances welfare. Consequently, much of contemporary trade policy is rooted in theoretical foundations established by classical economists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In particular, Adam Smith (1776) and David Ricardo (1817) are widely regarded as the intellectual pioneers who linked economic progress to specialization and comparative advantage as sources of domestic efficiency and national gain.

In *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Smith famously employed the metaphor of a household to represent a nation's economy, arguing that "it is the maxim of every prudent master of a family, never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy" (Smith, 1776). This insight provides a foundational justification for international trade, suggesting that when a country allocates its resources toward activities it performs most efficiently and trades for goods others can produce at lower cost, all participating nations stand to benefit.

Expanding on this logic, David Ricardo developed the theory of comparative advantage, emphasizing that a country need not be the most efficient producer of any good to benefit from free trade. In *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, Ricardo argued that under a system of perfectly free commerce, each country naturally devotes its capital and labor to employments that are most beneficial to itself (Ricardo, 1817). Even when one nation is absolutely more productive in all goods, specialization and trade still yield mutual gains. This framework was later reinforced by the Heckscher–Ohlin model, which explains trade patterns based on differences in factor endowments, whereby capital-abundant countries export capital-intensive goods while labor-abundant countries export labor-intensive goods (Heckscher and Ohlin, 1933). Together, these theories emphasize that trade emerges from economic diversity rather than exploitation.

Reflecting on the enduring relevance of these principles, Hans-Hermann Hoppe characterizes economics as applied logic, arguing that free trade follows naturally from sound economic reasoning rather than political preference (Hoppe, 2017). From this perspective, tariffs, quotas, and other trade barriers generate resource misallocation, replacing efficiency with inefficiency and mutual benefit with zero-sum protectionism. Rather than correcting market failures, such interventions distort voluntary exchange and undermine the coordination function of markets.

Economic theory is therefore unambiguous: free trade generates wealth, increases efficiency, and improves the quality of life for the overwhelming majority of individuals within society. By contrast, protectionist measures tend to confer political benefits on a small number of firms or industries while imposing widespread costs on consumers. Free trade fosters competition, stimulates innovation, reduces consumer prices, and unlocks a nation's productive potential. Far from being a mere abstraction, free trade operates as a tangible force that has improved living standards across the globe.

Efficient resource allocation represents one of the most fundamental advantages of free trade. Through specialization and voluntary exchange, countries direct resources toward their most productive uses, enabling multiple parties to gain simultaneously.

As Brandly (2004) explains, a country may produce one good, such as wheat—export it, and in return receive another good, such as automobiles, thereby effectively “producing” the imported good through trade. This process not only expands output but also allows resources to be reallocated toward innovation and industrial development, particularly in open economies exposed to international competition.

The benefits of free trade are also evident in declining prices and increased product diversity. When imports are unrestricted, competition intensifies, providing consumers with a wider range of goods and services at lower prices. Bastiat captures this dynamic by observing that protectionism relies on deception rather than enlightenment, noting that its true costs are concealed from the public (Bastiat, 1964). Tariffs operate as hidden taxes that burden consumers through higher prices and reduced choice, despite being portrayed as protective measures.

Beyond economic efficiency, free trade contributes to peaceful coexistence among nations. Block (1998) argues that sustained global peace is incompatible with protectionism, as trade barriers foster mistrust and retaliation rather than cooperation. By strengthening economic interdependence, free trade encourages cultural exchange, mutual trust, and shared prosperity, thereby reducing incentives for conflict and promoting political stability.

When shifting attention from short-term to long-term outcomes, the advantages of free trade extend well beyond prices and product variety. Friedman and Friedman (1980) argue that few policies do more to advance freedom and prosperity than the complete removal of trade barriers. Countries that adopt open trade regimes often experience increased foreign investment, higher economic growth, and greater entrepreneurial activity. This pattern holds not only for developed economies but also for emerging markets, as evidenced by the rapid development of countries such as South Korea and Vietnam following trade liberalization.

Finally, protectionist trade policies consistently fail to rival free trade in terms of efficiency, innovation, affordability, or global stability. Although proponents of tariffs claim they protect domestic industries and employment, such arguments reflect a

misunderstanding of basic economic principles. Tariffs function as poorly disguised taxes on consumers, distort market incentives, generate inefficiencies, and provoke retaliatory measures from trading partners. Rather than strengthening an economy, they weaken it by constraining the voluntary exchange that generates wealth.

Rising consumer prices, *ceteris paribus*, constitute another fundamental critique of tariffs. By artificially inflating the cost of imported goods, tariffs shift the financial burden directly onto consumers. Rothbard (2005) emphasizes that protectionism inflicts severe losses on domestic consumers, while Bastiat similarly observes that protective duties ultimately fall upon the home consumer, who becomes the true taxpayer (Bastiat, 1964).

In addition to higher prices, tariffs result in significant resource misallocation by shielding inefficient industries from competitive pressures. Markets are prevented from rewarding efficiency and reallocating resources away from unproductive enterprises. As Bastiat notes, import duties do not equalize conditions of production; inefficiencies persist despite protection (Bastiat, 1964). While tariffs may temporarily preserve politically favored industries, they do so at the cost of broader economic dynamism, reduced efficiency, and diminished national wealth.

Retaliation and the Political Economy of Trade Barriers

Another risk associated with protectionist trade policy is that trading partners may retaliate by imposing their own tariffs in response, either to protect domestic industries or to punish the initiating country. Such retaliatory actions reduce economic cooperation and disrupt international markets, developments that increasingly affect the global economic order. Ebeling (2018) explains that tariffs and protective measures ultimately deny societies greater wealth and welfare by raising prices for goods and services. He argues that these policies disproportionately harm American consumers and businesses while simultaneously undermining international cooperation, as retaliatory barriers compound inefficiencies rather than resolve underlying trade disputes. Few economists today support protectionism, given its association with

reduced innovation and heightened political pressure on markets.

The logic against retaliation can be illustrated through a simple analogy. Imagine two men in a rowboat: one fires a hole into the vessel, causing water to seep in. The second man would not respond by shooting another hole, thereby accelerating the boat's sinking, unless he believed this was the only way to compel the first to stop. This analogy captures the dilemma of tariff retaliation. When Country A imposes a tariff on Country B, the latter may respond in kind—"seeing and raising," in poker terminology, in the hope that the initial aggressor will reconsider. In this paradoxical scenario, a retaliatory tariff is imposed not to restrict trade permanently, but to pressure the originating country into dismantling trade barriers altogether.

Favoritism and political preference further exacerbate the negative consequences of tariffs. In open markets, consumers and producers determine outcomes based on value, cost, and efficiency. However, when tariffs are introduced, industries may petition governments for protection against competitive forces through lobbying and political influence. Industries that lose competitiveness due to international competition often demand tariffs to survive under government protection, effectively living at the expense of taxpayers. This shift in decision-making power from consumers and producers to political actors distorts market signals and undermines competition. Industries should succeed or fail based on their ability to compete, not on their political connections. Tariffs thus benefit a select few while penalizing the broader population, as political considerations override supply and demand. Moreover, government favoritism discourages entrepreneurship by creating predictable protections for incumbents rather than incentives for innovation.

A prominent historical example of the success of free trade is Britain's repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. As discussed by Friedman and Friedman (1980), Britain's removal of tariffs on grain imports initiated a form of unilateral free trade that encouraged other nations to follow suit. The repeal resulted in lower food prices, sustained industrial expansion, and Britain's emergence as the world's leading economic power well into the twentieth century. The Friedmans emphasize that citizens benefit from receiving the largest possible

volume of imports in exchange for exports, or equivalently, from exporting as little as necessary to obtain imports. Similarly, the twentieth-century economic rise of East Asia demonstrates the effectiveness of trade liberalization. Countries such as South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Hong Kong adopted export-led growth strategies and integrated into global markets, facilitating industrial expansion and rising wages. In contrast, countries that remained entrenched in protectionism struggled to achieve comparable development.

The United States has likewise benefited significantly from open markets. Following World War II, the U.S. experienced an unprecedented economic expansion, partly due to trade liberalization through agreements such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). These arrangements substantially increased trade flows among the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Greater competition resulting from reduced trade barriers contributed to lower consumer prices and increased product availability. McMaken (2018) highlights the inconsistency of pro-tariff arguments by noting the absurdity of accepting domestic trade across U.S. states as beneficial while condemning imports from nearby foreign producers as harmful.

Empirical evidence supporting free trade is extensive and compelling. Gwartney (1996) demonstrates that countries participating actively in the global trading system tend to achieve higher levels of prosperity. From nineteenth-century Britain to twentieth-century America and twenty-first-century East Asia, the pattern remains consistent: countries that lower trade barriers grow faster, produce more efficiently, and improve living standards. Conversely, nations that attempt economic self-sufficiency, such as North Korea, impose severe costs on their populations by isolating themselves from global markets.

What ultimately fosters development and national achievement is free and open trade that promotes competition and allows economies to evolve naturally. By facilitating voluntary exchange and specialization, free trade enables sustained economic progress and human development. Historical experience repeatedly shows that protectionism fails to deliver comparable outcomes,

reinforcing the conclusion that open markets remain the most effective path to long-term prosperity.

Conclusion

The analysis of mutual benefit demonstrates that free trade is grounded in fundamental economic principles of voluntary exchange, specialization, and comparative advantage, which consistently generate efficiency gains and welfare improvements across societies. Classical and Austrian economic theories, supported by historical and empirical evidence, reveal that open markets reduce consumer prices, encourage innovation, and enable more efficient allocation of resources. In contrast, tariffs operate as implicit taxes that distort market signals, protect inefficient industries, and impose diffuse costs on consumers and producers alike. From this perspective, free trade is not merely a policy preference but an essential component of economic freedom that enhances long-term prosperity and social cooperation.

The examination of retaliation further underscores the self-defeating nature of protectionist policies. Rather than safeguarding national interests, tariffs provoke countermeasures, intensify political favoritism, and escalate trade conflicts that erode international cooperation. Historical experiences—from Britain’s repeal of the Corn Laws to postwar trade liberalization in the United States and export-led growth in East Asia—demonstrate that prosperity emerges from openness rather than insulation. Protectionism, by contrast, entrenches rent-seeking behavior and undermines entrepreneurial dynamism. Taken together, these findings affirm that unilateral free trade remains the most economically sound and ethically defensible strategy for fostering sustainable growth, peaceful international relations, and broad-based human welfare.

References

- Anderson, William. “Tariffs Are Sanctions.” *Mises Institute*, 25 Mar. 2018. <https://mises.org/wire/tariffs-are-sanctions>.
- Barnett, William II. “The Modern Theory of Consumer Behavior: Ordinal or Cardinal.” *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*,

- vol. 6, no. 1, Spring 2003, pp. 41–63. http://www.mises.org/journals/qjae/pdf/qjae6_1_3.pdf.
- Bastiat, Frédéric. *Economic Sophisms*. Translated by Arthur Goddard, D. Van Nostrand, 1964. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/44145/44145-h/44145-h.htm>.
- Block, Walter E., and Michael A. Walker. "Entropy in the Canadian Economics Profession: Sampling Consensus on the Major Issues." *Canadian Public Policy*, vol. XIV, no. 2, June 1988, pp. 137–150. http://www.walterblock.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/block_canada-econ-major-issues-1988.pdf.
- Block, Walter E., Joseph Horton, and Debbie Walker. "The Necessity of Free Trade." *Journal of Markets and Morality*, vol. 1, no. 2, Oct. 1998, pp. 192–200. <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/Journal-Markets-Morality/186469472.html>.
- Block, Walter E., et al. "The Necessity of Free Trade." *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 67, no. 3, 2006, pp. 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9016-9>.
- Brandly, Mark. "Comparative Advantage." *Mises Institute*, 30 Sept. 2004. <https://mises.org/library/comparative-advantage>.
- Ebeling, Richard M. "Trump's Protectionist Follies Threaten a Trade War." *American Institute for Economic Research*, 16 Mar. 2018. <https://www.aier.org/article/trumps-protectionist-follies-threaten-trade-war/>.
- Friedman, Milton, and Rose D. Friedman. *Free to Choose: A Personal Statement*. Harcourt, 1980. <https://www.hoover.org/research/case-free-trade>.
- Gordon, David. "The Problem of Measuring the Utility Gained from Taxes." *Mises Institute*, 4 Dec. 2020. <https://mises.org/wire/problem-measuring-utility-gained-taxes>.
- Gordon, David. "Toward a Deconstruction of Utility and Welfare Economics." *The Review of Austrian Economics*, vol. 6, no. 2, 1993, pp. 99–112. http://www.mises.org/journals/rae/pdf/RAE6_2_4.pdf.

- Gwartney, James, Robert W. Lawson, and Walter E. Block. *Economic Freedom of the World, 1975–1995*. Vancouver, B.C.: The Fraser Institute, 1996.
- Heckscher, Eli F., and Bertil Ohlin. *Interregional and International Trade*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Herbener, Jeffrey M. “The Pareto Rule and Welfare Economics.” *Review of Austrian Economics*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1979, pp. 79–106. http://www.mises.org/journals/rae/pdf/RAE10_1_4.pdf.
- Hoppe, Hans-Hermann. Interview by Emrah Akkurt. “On Trade and Protectionism.” *AustroLibertarian.com*, 2017. <https://austrolibertarian.com/interview-hans-hermann-hoppe>.
- McMaken, Ryan. “Tariffs Are Taxes. Don’t Be Fooled.” *Mises Institute*, 8 Mar. 2018. <https://mises.org/wire/tariffs-are-taxes-dont-be-fooled>.
- Ricardo, David. *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. John Murray, 1817. <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/ricardo-the-works-and-correspondence-of-david-ricardo-vol-1-principles-of-political-economy-and-taxation>.
- Rothbard, Murray N. “Protectionism and the Destruction of Prosperity.” *Mises Institute*, 2005. <https://mises.org/library/protectionism-and-destruction-prosperity>.
- Rothbard, Murray N. “Toward a Reconstruction of Utility and Welfare Economics.” In *The Logic of Action*, vol. I, 211–254. Lyme, NH: Edward Elgar, 1997 [originally 1956]. <http://www.mises.org/rothbard/toward.pdf>.
- Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. 1776. Edited by Edwin Cannan, Modern Library, 1937. <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/smith-an-inquiry-into-the-nature-and-causes-of-the-wealth-of-nations-cannan-ed-vol-1>.
- Murphy, Robert P. “Why Austrians Stress Ordinal Utility.” *Mises Institute*, 3 Feb. 2022. <https://mises.org/wire/why-austrians-stress-ordinal-utility>.