



Adam Smith Would Approve of Trump

Curtis Ellis

March 18, 2016

Donald Trump is driving the caregivers of the corporatist nanny state crazy.

Trump romps through the primaries, racking up more wins and delegates with each passing week, and his opposition grows increasingly unhinged.

Elite opinion makers who pride themselves on their sophistication and cool bearing drop all pretenses and call Donald a racist and hate-monger.

Street mobs of the same ilk that assault police officers and destroy property shut down Trump's rally in the cause of banning "hate speech." In response, people who should know better (that's you, Ted Cruz) side with the rioters rather than with the First Amendment.

And speaking of those who should know better, the National Review hits a new low with its essay declaring that white working-class voters who support Trump deserve to die.

Everyone needs to get a grip.

The garbage spewing from some quarters comes as no surprise. The mouthpieces corporate media trot out have been schooled in identity politics for their entire lives and finished at the best universities. To their eyes, the skin color (white) of the majority of the crowd at a Trump rally is all the evidence they need to convict everyone involved of racism in the first degree.

It's amusing to watch those who portray themselves as the greatest defenders of democracy call for its demise. Appearing on MSNBC's "Morning Joe" with a Don King coif and a Mao jacket, the supposedly liberal New York Times columnist Anand Giridharadas decried the "stunning lack of stepping up among the people who claim they are dead against" Trump. The former corporate consultant from McKinsey asks: "What about the CEOs? what about the things like

banks saying if you are spreading hate we don't want to do business with you? There's a whole bunch of firepower that has yet to be loaded."

American representative democracy is more than collateral damage in the "bunch of firepower" he seeks to deploy. An oligarchy of Wall Street bankers and globalist corporations (the folks who sought Anand's advice at McKinsey & Company) would choose who rules us, not the voters. Not surprisingly, no one on the panel of "liberals" batted an eye at this suggestion. Such is the true face of liberalism.

Likewise, the Washington Post editorial board considers it a moral imperative to overrule the will of the people in order to – get this – "defend our democracy." It has apparently become necessary to destroy the town in order to save it.

Their bill of particulars against Trump covers the typical liberal whine list – racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia.

But they also take issue with Trump's policies, and topping the list is his "proposed tariff on Chinese imports" that, they darkly warn, "could spark a trade war and global depression."

This is more no-think nonsense. And the folks from the CATO Institute and the Wall Street Journal editorial page are also peddling this particular species of buncombe.

When it comes to trade and tariffs, the CATO and WSJ crowd really should know better.

After all, Adam Smith, the patron saint of free marketeers, laid it all out three centuries ago in "The Wealth of Nations."

When he extolled the virtues of free trade, Smith said there were exceptions – circumstances when it made sense and "be advantageous" to restrict imports with tariffs.

All of Adam Smith's exceptions make sense today – and conform with Donald Trump's plan. Smith wrote:

"Some foreign nation [may restrain] by high duties or prohibitions the importation of some of our manufactures into their country. Revenge in this case naturally dictates retaliation, and that we should impose the like duties and prohibitions upon the importation of some or all of their manufactures into ours. ..."

How does this differ from Trump's threat to slap a tariff on Chinese imports until they stop taxing our goods? Trump said his tariff is a threat – and Smith agrees, writing it's probable "retaliations of this kind ... will procure the repeal of the high duties" placed on our own exports. Trump understands Adam Smith better than the ivory tower pseudo-intellectuals ensconced at inside-the-Beltway think tanks and academic sinecures. That crowd supports unilateral disarmament in the trade war China is waging against America.

Tellingly, Adam Smith concerned himself with building the wealth of *nations* – not the wealth of “the global economy.” He was not an open-borders, one-world zealot.

Smith said tariffs were justified to protect industries “necessary for the defense of the country.” America now depends on Russia to launch our spy satellites, and China to produce electronics for our jet fighters. That rumble you feel is Adam Smith turning over in his grave.

Smith also wrote that “for the encouragement of domestic industry” it makes sense to place a tax (tariff) on imports equal to the taxes imposed on goods made in our country. The minimum wage, environmental, Social Security and Obamacare mandates are costs rightly seen as taxes imposed on American industry. According to Smith, “an equal tax should be imposed upon” similar goods imported from abroad.

Finally, Smith understood that his theory of free trade must be made to work for man, not the other way around. He said “Humanity may require” import tariffs to be reduced gradually, lest we see a surge of “cheaper foreign goods ... deprive all at once many thousands of our people of their ordinary employment and means of subsistence.” Americans who once produced the clothing we wear, the TVs we watch, the cars we drive, the computers we work on and the toys our children play with have been deprived of jobs and reduced to subsistence. And the courageous caretakers of “conservatism” at the National Review say they all deserve to die.

To them we say: No, these Americans don’t deserve to die, and neither does the nation known as United States of America. You may believe in “the global economy,” but we still believe in our nation of birth.

And to the corporatist elites trembling before Trump as if he were a Bolshevik, we say: Get a grip. No one wants to take your property. Just remember our nation, founded on Western values of liberty, property, rights and G-d.

Is that really asking too much?