A Critical Analysis of the Comparative Advantage Doctrine (CAD) Theory

Furqan Naseer
(MSCS) PMAS Arid Agriculture University, Islamabad Pakistan,
(MBA) Al Khair University, Ajk Pakistan

Corresponding Author: Furqan Naseer furqannaseer@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

International trade theories include trade doctrines like the Comparative Advantage Doctrine (CAD) formulated by David Ricardo. According to this doctrine, countries should engage in trade even if one of the countries does not have the capacity of producing the other. The doctrine says that if one country is most capable of producing the commodities in question, then that country should specialize in that commodities. The objective of this essay is to examine CAD's theory based on the present global economy in relation to the theoretical economy, historical evolution, and possible empirical applications. The evaluation of CAD's theory will include contemporary paradigms in globalization, technological evolution, and market failure. The study describes qualitative analysis of theory and secondary data CAD's applicability in present global economy. The rigid structures of CAD only confines the theory in present context which is an apparent phenomenon through the analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Global integration and economic growth are heavily dependent on CAD and international trade, which have undergone fundamental changes. There has been a significant shift in the foundations of international trade. Based on David Ricardo's empirical research, CAD was established in the early 1800s. Ricardo was of the opinion that countries must specialize in a commodities with a low opportunity cost in order to trade effectively (Ricardo, 1817).

CAD theory remains still valuable for explanation trade trends and guiding trade policy contempt its age. However, trade limitations, imperfect competition, industrial innovation, and international firms define the fashionable global reduced, casting doubt on the constant applicability of CAD expectations (Krugman et al., 2018). The determination of this study is to critically examine CAD theory, examine its development in the literature, and evaluate its pertinence through investigative and secondary data approaches.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Origin of Comparative Advantage Doctrine

As a pioneer of the Comparative Advantage Doctrine, David Ricardo built a case for the 1817 publication of 'On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation.' By demonstrating the possibility of mutually beneficial trade, even in a scenario where one country is more productive in the

manufacturing of all items, Ricardo was able to counter one of the pillars of Adam Smith's postulate of absolute advantage. To Ricardo, the only consideration for commerce was relative efficiency, not absolute output (Ricardo, 1817).

Assumptions of CAD Theory

Several simplifying assumptions form the basis of the classical Comparative Advantage Doctrine (CAD) model.

• Two nations and two products.

• Labor is the sole production resource.

• Production scale remains constant.

• Competition is perfect.

• Trade is unrestricted, and transport and trade costs are nonexistent.

• Production resources are immobile across nations (Salvatore, 2020)

These assumptions are critiqued for constraining the theory's relevance to present-day global trade.

Extensions and Modern Interpretations

To improve the theory, subsequent economists built on the foundational theory of Comparative Advantage Doctrine (CAD). The inclusion of more than one production resource and resource endowments was a hallmark of the Heckscher–Ohlin model (Krugman et al., 2018). While new trade theories continue to recognize comparative advantage, they pivot to economies of scale, product differentiation, and imperfect competition (Helpman & Krugman, 1985). Empirical studies on the specialization of exports show that all the factors of production have a role to play is tranquil prejudiced by comparative advantage, particularly in developing nations (Costinot & Rodríguez-Clare, 2014).

Criticism of CAD Theory

According to Chang (2008), detractors claim that flexible essentials such as breakthrough technology, acquiring knowledge by experiencing, and managerial action are ignored by CAD approach. Furthermore, the idea that everyone benefits equally is called into doubt by the approximate profits from employment and the expenses related to modification (Stiglitz, 2017). These criticisms show how using CAD strategically differs from naively following to its ideals.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study's descriptive and empirical method of investigation uses secondary data and scientific evaluation. The process for precisely evaluating economic ideas and determining their relationships in a dynamic economic environment (Creswell, 2014).

Data Sources

Academic papers pertaining to trade; traditional and modern economics textbooks; and reports from global organizations such as the World Bank and the World Trade Organization were the sources of secondary data.

Analytical Framework

Secondary data came from trade-related academic papers, modern and traditional economics textbooks, and reports from international organizations like the World Trade Organization and the World Bank.

Data Analysis

Analytical Evaluation of CAD Theory

The statistics show that countries generally focus on commoditiess in relatively well-organized locations, which is consistent with CAD predictions. Salvatore (2020) claims that while manufacturing countries focus on capital-intensive and knowledge-intensive enterprises, export data from emerging nations shows a concentration in labor-intensive products.

Relevance in Modern Trade

Tariffs, subsidies, and strategic trade policies affect actual trade even though CAD concept presupposes free trade and perfect competition. Empirical studies show that comparative advantage still contributes significantly to trade flows despite these distortions (Costinot & Rodriguez-Clare, 2014).

Limitations Revealed by Data

The drawbacks of CAD theory are additionally demonstrated through data analysis:

 • Trade liberalization may result in temporary unemployment in industries that compete with imports;

• Technological advances may eventually change comparative advantage; and

• Developing nations may be forced to continue producing low-value commoditiess (Chang, 2008).

These results imply that while income distribution and long-term development outcomes are not explained by CAD theory, trade direction is.

DISCUSSION

The findings demonstration that trade concentration can still be efficiently explained by CAD concept. However, because of its stationary character, it is incapable to handle modern trade issues like numerical trade and worldwide value cuffs. Therefore, in order to maximize the assistances of trade, politicians should apply CAD values flexibly and participate them with manufacturing and community strategies.

CONCLUSION

International trade philosophy still relies deeply on the Comparative Advantage Doctrine. Its important idea that shared gains result from concentration based on comparative efficiency relics true, but its expectations limit its pertinency in the modern economy. The study originates to the assumption that rather than if a comprehensive description of the dynamics of global trade, CAD theory should be seen as a important framework.

REFERENCES

Chang, H. J. (2008). *Bad Samaritans: The myth of free trade and the secret history of capitalism.* Bloomsbury Press.

Costinot, A., & Rodríguez-Clare, A. (2014). Trade theory with numbers: Quantifying the consequences of globalization. *Handbook of International Economics*, 4, 197–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-54314-1.00004-5

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Helpman, E., & Krugman, P. R. (1985). *Market structure and foreign trade.* MIT Press.

Krugman, P. R., Obstfeld, M., & Melitz, M. J. (2018). I*nternational economics: Theory and policy* Pearson Education.

Ricardo, D. (1817). *On the principles of political economy and taxation*. John Murray.

Salvatore, D. (2020). *International economics* (13th ed.). Wiley.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2017). *Globalization and its discontents revisited.* W. W. Norton & Company.