

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

TRADE WARS AND TRADE TALKS WITH DATA

Ralph Ossa

Working Paper 17347

<http://www.nber.org/papers/w17347>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH

1050 Massachusetts Avenue

Cambridge, MA 02138

August 2011

I am grateful to the editor Penny Goldberg and two anonymous referees. I would also like to thank Kyle Bagwell, Kerem Cosar, Chang-Tai Hsieh, Giovanni Maggi, Andres Rodriguez-Clare, Bob Staiger, Jon Vogel, and seminar participants at various universities and conferences for very helpful comments and suggestions. Seyed Ali Madanizadeh provided excellent research assistance. This work is supported by the Business and Public Policy Faculty Research Fund at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business. The usual disclaimer applies. The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2011 by Ralph Ossa. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Trade Wars and Trade Talks with Data
Ralph Ossa
NBER Working Paper No. 17347
August 2011, Revised June 2013
JEL No. F11,F12,F13

ABSTRACT

How large are optimal tariffs? What tariffs would prevail in a worldwide trade war? How costly would be a breakdown of international trade policy cooperation? And what is the scope for future multilateral trade negotiations? I address these and other questions using a unified framework which nests traditional, new trade, and political economy motives for protection. I find that optimal tariffs average 59 percent, world trade war tariffs average 58 percent, the welfare losses from a breakdown of international trade policy cooperation average 2.4 percent, and the possible welfare gains from future multilateral trade negotiations average 0.5 percent. Optimal tariffs are tariffs which maximize a political economy augmented measure of real income.

Ralph Ossa
University of Chicago
Booth School of Business
5807 South Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
and NBER
ralph.ossa@chicagobooth.edu

1 Introduction

I propose a flexible framework for the quantitative analysis of noncooperative and cooperative trade policy. It is based on a multi-country multi-industry general equilibrium model of international trade featuring inter-industry trade as in Ricardo (1817), intra-industry trade as in Krugman (1980), and special interest politics as in Grossman and Helpman (1994). By combining these elements, it takes a unified view of trade policy which nests traditional, new trade, and political economy motives for protection. Specifically, it features import tariffs which serve to manipulate the terms-of-trade, shift profits away from other countries, and protect politically influential industries. It can be easily calibrated to match industry-level tariffs and trade.

I use this framework to provide a first comprehensive quantitative analysis of noncooperative and cooperative trade policy, focusing on the main players in recent GATT/WTO negotiations. I begin by considering optimal tariffs, i.e. the tariffs countries would impose if they did not have to fear any retaliation.¹ I find that each country can gain considerably at the expense of other countries by unilaterally imposing optimal tariffs. In the benchmark case without lobbying, the mean welfare gain of the tariff imposing country is 2.2 percent, the mean welfare loss of the other countries is -0.7 percent, and the median optimal tariff is 58.8 percent. These averages are of a comparable magnitude in the augmented case in which political economy forces are taken into account.

I then turn to an analysis of Nash tariffs, i.e. the tariffs countries would impose in a worldwide trade war in which their trading partners retaliated optimally. I find that countries can then no longer benefit at the expense of one another and welfare falls across the board so that nobody is winning the trade war. Intuitively, each country is imposing import tariffs in an attempt to induce favorable terms-of-trade and profit shifting effects. The end result is a large drop in trade volumes which is leaving everybody worse off. In the benchmark case without lobbying, the mean welfare loss is -2.4 percent and the median Nash tariff is 58.1 percent. These averages are again quite similar in the augmented case in which lobbying is taken into account.

¹They are optimal in the sense of maximizing the political economy augmented measure of real income given by equation (3).

I finally investigate cooperative tariffs, i.e. the tariffs countries would negotiate to in efficient trade negotiations. I consider trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs, factual tariffs, and zero tariffs following a Nash bargaining protocol. I find that trade negotiations yield significant welfare gains, that a large share of these gains has been reaped during past trade negotiations, and that free trade is close to the efficiency frontier. In the benchmark case without lobbying, trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs, factual tariff, and zero tariffs yield average welfare gains of 3.4 percent, 0.5 percent, and 0.03 percent, respectively. These averages are again quite similar in the augmented case in which political economy forces are taken into account.

I am unaware of any quantitative analysis of noncooperative and cooperative trade policy which is comparable in terms of its scope. I believe that this is the first quantitative framework which nests traditional, new trade, and political economy motives for protection. Likewise, there is no precedent for estimating noncooperative and cooperative tariffs at the industry level for the major players in recent GATT/WTO negotiations. The surprising lack of comparable work is most likely rooted in long-binding methodological and computational constraints. In particular, widely accepted calibration techniques of general equilibrium trade models have only become available quite recently following the seminal work of Eaton and Kortum (2002). Also, the calculation of disaggregated noncooperative and cooperative tariffs is very demanding computationally and was simply not feasible without present-day algorithms and computers.

The most immediate predecessors are Perroni and Whalley (2000), Broda et al (2008), and Ossa (2011). Perroni and Whalley (2000) provide quantitative estimates of noncooperative tariffs in a simple Armington model which features only traditional terms-of-trade effects. Ossa (2011) provides such estimates in a simple Krugman (1980) model which features only new trade production relocation effects. Both contributions allow trade policy to operate only at the most aggregate level so that a single tariff is assumed to apply against all imports from any given country.² Broda et al (2008) provide detailed statistical estimates of the inverse export supply elasticities faced by a number of non-WTO member countries. The idea is to

²Neither contribution computes cooperative tariffs. The work of Perroni and Whalley (2000) is in the computable general equilibrium tradition and extends an earlier contribution by Hamilton and Whalley (1983). It predicts implausibly high noncooperative tariffs of up to 1000 percent. See also Markusen and Wigle (1989).

test the traditional optimal tariff formula which states that a country's optimal tariff is equal to the inverse export supply elasticity it faces in equilibrium.³

The paper further relates to an extensive body of theoretical and quantitative work. The individual motives for protection are taken from the theoretical trade policy literature including Johnson (1953-54), Venables (1987), and Grossman and Helpman (1994).⁴ The analysis of trade negotiations builds on a line of research synthesized by Bagwell and Staiger (2002). My calibration technique is similar to the one used in recent quantitative work based on the Eaton and Kortum (2002) model such as Caliendo and Parro (2011). However, my analysis differs from this work in terms of question and framework. In particular, I go beyond an investigation of exogenous trade policy changes by emphasizing noncooperative and cooperative tariffs.⁵ Also, I take a unified view of trade policy by nesting traditional, new trade, and political economy effects.

My application focuses on 7 regions and 33 industries in the year 2008. The regions are Brazil, China, the EU, India, Japan, the US, and a residual Rest of the World and are chosen to comprise the main players in recent GATT/WTO negotiations. The industries span the agricultural and manufacturing sectors of the economy. My main data source is the most recent Global Trade Analysis Project database (GTAP 8) from which I take industry-level trade, production, and tariff data. In addition, I use United Nations trade data for the time period 1994-2008 for my estimation of demand elasticities, and the International Trade Centre's Market Access Map tariff data for my calibration of political economy weights. A detailed discussion of the data including the applied aggregation and matching procedures can be found in the appendix.

To set the stage for a transparent presentation of the theory, it is useful to discuss the

³This approach is not suitable for estimating the optimal tariffs of WTO member countries. This is because such countries impose cooperative tariffs so that the factual inverse export supply elasticities they face are not informative of the counterfactual inverse export supply elasticities they would face if they imposed optimal tariffs under all but the most restrictive assumptions.

⁴The analyzed profit shifting effect is more closely related to the production relocation effect in Venables (1987) than the classic profit shifting effect in Brander and Spencer (1981). This is explained in more detail in footnote 12. See Mrazova (2010) for a recent treatment of classic profit shifting effects in the context of GATT/WTO negotiations.

⁵Existing work typically focuses on quantifying the effects of exogenous tariff changes. Caliendo and Parro (2011), for example, analyze the effects of the North American Free Trade Agreement. One exception can be found in the work of Alvarez and Lucas (2007) which includes a short discussion of optimal tariffs in small open economies.

elasticity estimation up-front. As will become clear shortly, I need industry-level estimates of CES demand elasticities which do not vary by country. I obtain such estimates by applying the well-known Feenstra (1994) method to the United Nations trade data pooled across the main importers considered in my analysis. The results are listed in Table 1. As can be seen, the variation in the elasticities appears plausible with homogeneous goods such as wheat and rice having the largest values. Moreover, the mean elasticity of 3.4 is within the range of previous findings in the literature, and I will also consider various scalings as sensitivity checks. The interested reader can find a more detailed discussion of the elasticity estimation in the appendix.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, I lay out the basic setup, characterize the equilibrium for given tariffs, demonstrate how to compute the general equilibrium effects of tariff changes, and discuss the welfare effects of tariff changes. I then turn to optimal tariffs, world trade wars, and world trade talks.

2 Analysis

2.1 Basic setup

There are N countries indexed by i or j and S industries indexed by s . Consumers have access to a continuum of differentiated varieties. Preferences over these varieties are given by the following utility functions:

$$U_j = \prod_s \left(\sum_i \int_0^{M_{is}} x_{ijs} (\nu_{is})^{\frac{\sigma_s-1}{\sigma_s}} d\nu_{is} \right)^{\frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_s-1} \mu_{js}} \quad (1)$$

where x_{ijs} is the quantity of an industry s variety from country i consumed in country j , M_{is} is the mass of industry s varieties produced in country i , $\sigma_s > 1$ is the elasticity of substitution between industry s varieties, and μ_{js} is the fraction of country j income spent on industry s varieties.

Each variety is uniquely associated with an individual firm. Firms are homogeneous within industries and their technologies are summarized by the following inverse production

functions:

$$l_{is} = \sum_j \frac{\theta_{ijs} x_{ijs}}{\varphi_{is}} \quad (2)$$

where l_{is} is the labor requirement of an industry s firm in country i featuring iceberg trade barriers θ_{ijs} and a productivity parameter φ_{is} . Each firm has monopoly power with respect to its own variety and the number of firms is given exogenously.⁶

Governments can impose import tariffs but do not have access to other policy instruments.⁷ I denote the ad valorem tariff imposed by country j against imports from country i in industry s by t_{ijs} and make frequent use of the shorthand $\tau_{ijs} \equiv t_{ijs} + 1$ throughout. Government preferences are given by the following objective functions:

$$G_j = \sum_s \lambda_{js} W_{js} \quad (3)$$

where W_{js} is the welfare of industry s in country j and λ_{js} is the political economy weight of industry s in country j which is scaled such that $\frac{1}{S} \sum_s \lambda_{js} = 1$. Welfare is given by real income in this setup which can be defined at the industry level, $W_{js} \equiv \frac{X_{js}}{P_j}$, and at the aggregate level, $W_j \equiv \frac{X_j}{P_j}$, where X_{js} is the nominal income in industry s of country j , P_j is the ideal price index in country j , and $X_j = \sum_s X_{js}$. X_{js} consists of industry labor income, industry profits, and a share of aggregate tariff revenue, which I assume to be allocated to industries based on employment shares.⁸

Notice that governments simply maximize welfare if the political economy weights are set equal to one since $W_j = \sum_s W_{js}$. The interpretation of the political economy weights is that one dollar of income accruing to industry s of country j counts λ_{js} as much in the government's objective function as one dollar of income accruing to an industry which receives

⁶The model can also be solved and calibrated with free entry and fixed costs of production. I focus on a version without free entry for two main reasons. First, because it features positive profits and therefore lends itself more naturally to an analysis of political economy considerations. Second, because it rules out corner solutions with zero production in some sectors so that it can be implemented using a much simpler algorithm. See footnote 12 for a further discussion of the model with free entry.

⁷This restriction is motivated by the fact that import tariffs have always been by far the most important trade policy instruments in practice. However, it would be easy to extend the framework to also include export subsidies, import quotas, or voluntary export restraints. See Bagwell and Staiger (2009a, 2009b) for a discussion of the importance of this restriction for the theory of trade agreements in a range of simple new trade models.

⁸To be clear, $X_{js} = w_j L_{js} + \pi_{js} + \frac{L_{js}}{L_j} TR_j$, where w_j is the wage rate in country j , L_{js} is employment in industry s of country j , π_{js} are the profits in industry s of country j , L_j is total employment in country j , and TR_j is the tariff revenue of country j .

average political support. This formulation of government preferences can be viewed as a reduced form representation of the "protection for sale" theory of Grossman and Helpman (1994). However, it takes a somewhat broader approach by taking producer interests and worker interests into account. As will become clear shortly, industry profits and industry labor income are proportional to industry sales so that this is the margin special interest groups seek to affect.

2.2 Equilibrium for given tariffs

Utility maximization implies that firms in industry s of country i face demands

$$x_{ijs} = \frac{(p_{is}\theta_{ijs}\tau_{ijs})^{-\sigma_s}}{P_{js}^{1-\sigma_s}} \mu_{js} X_j \quad (4)$$

where p_{is} is the ex-factory price of an industry s variety from country i and P_{js} is the ideal price index of industry s varieties in country j . Also, profit maximization requires that firms in industry s of country i charge a constant markup over marginal costs

$$p_{is} = \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_s - 1} \frac{w_i}{\varphi_{is}} \quad (5)$$

where w_i is the wage rate in country i .

The equilibrium for given tariffs can be characterized with four condensed equilibrium conditions. The first condition follows from substituting equations (2), (4), and (5) into the relationship defining industry profits $\pi_{is} = M_{is} \left(\sum_j p_{is}\theta_{ijs}x_{ijs} - w_i l_{is} \right)$:

$$\pi_{is} = \frac{1}{\sigma_s} \sum_j M_{is} \tau_{ijs}^{-\sigma_s} \left(\frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_s - 1} \frac{\theta_{ijs}}{\varphi_{is}} \frac{w_i}{P_{js}} \right)^{1-\sigma_s} \mu_{js} X_j \quad (6)$$

The second condition combines equations (2), (4), and (5) with the requirement for labor market clearing $L_i = \sum_s M_{is} l_{is}$:

$$w_i L_i = \sum_s \pi_{is} (\sigma_s - 1) \quad (7)$$

The third condition results from substituting equation (5) into the formula for the ideal price

index $P_{js} = \left(\sum_i M_{is} (p_{is} \theta_{ijs} \tau_{ijs})^{1-\sigma_s} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma_s}}$:

$$P_{js} = \left(\sum_i M_{is} \left(\frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_s - 1} \frac{w_i \theta_{ijs} \tau_{ijs}}{\varphi_{is}} \right)^{1-\sigma_s} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma_s}} \quad (8)$$

And the final condition combines equations (4) and (5) with the budget constraint equating total expenditure to labor income, plus tariff revenue, plus aggregate profits:

$$X_j = w_j L_j + \sum_i \sum_s t_{ijs} M_{is} \left(\frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_s - 1} \frac{\theta_{ijs} w_i}{\varphi_{is} P_{js}} \right)^{1-\sigma_s} \tau_{ijs}^{-\sigma_s} \mu_{js} X_j + \sum_s \pi_{js} \quad (9)$$

Conditions (6) - (9) represent a system of $2N(S+1)$ equations in the $2N(S+1)$ unknowns w_i , X_i , P_{is} , and π_{is} which can be solved given a numeraire. An obvious problem, however, is that this system depends on the set of unknown parameters $\{M_{is}, \theta_{ijs}, \varphi_{is}\}$ which are all difficult to estimate empirically.

2.3 General equilibrium effects of tariff changes

I avoid this problem by computing the general equilibrium effects of counterfactual tariff changes using a method inspired by Dekle et al (2007). In particular, conditions (6) - (9) can be rewritten in changes as

$$\hat{\pi}_{is} = \sum_j \alpha_{ijs} (\hat{\tau}_{ijs})^{-\sigma_s} (\hat{w}_i)^{1-\sigma_s} (\hat{P}_{js})^{\sigma_s-1} \hat{X}_j \quad (10)$$

$$\hat{w}_i = \sum_s \delta_{is} \hat{\pi}_{is} \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{P}_{js} = \left(\sum_i \gamma_{ijs} (\hat{w}_i \hat{\tau}_{ijs})^{1-\sigma_s} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma_s}} \quad (12)$$

$$\hat{X}_j = \frac{w_j L_j}{X_j} \hat{w}_j + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \hat{t}_{ijs} (\hat{w}_i)^{1-\sigma_s} (\hat{P}_{js})^{\sigma_s-1} (\hat{\tau}_{ijs})^{-\sigma_s} \hat{X}_j + \sum_s \frac{\pi_{js}}{X_j} \hat{\pi}_{js} \quad (13)$$

where a "hat" denotes the ratio between the counterfactual and the factual value, $\alpha_{ijs} \equiv T_{ijs} / \sum_n T_{ins}$, $\gamma_{ijs} \equiv \tau_{ijs} T_{ijs} / \sum_m \tau_{mjs} T_{mjs}$, $\delta_{is} \equiv \sum_j \frac{\sigma_s-1}{\sigma_s} T_{ijs} / \sum_t \sum_n \frac{\sigma_t-1}{\sigma_t} T_{int}$, and $T_{ijs} \equiv M_{is} \left(\frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_s-1} \frac{\theta_{ijs} w_i}{\varphi_{is} P_{js}} \right)^{1-\sigma_s} \tau_{ijs}^{-\sigma_s} \mu_{js} X_j$ is the factual value of industry s trade flowing from country i to country j evaluated at world prices.

Equations (10) - (13) represent a system of $2N(S+1)$ equations in the $2N(S+1)$ un-

knowns \widehat{w}_i , \widehat{X}_i , \widehat{P}_{is} , $\widehat{\pi}_{is}$. Crucially, their coefficients depend on σ_s and observables only so that the full general equilibrium response to counterfactual tariff changes can be computed without further information on any of the remaining model parameters. Moreover, all required observables can be inferred directly from widely available trade and tariff data since the model requires $X_j = \sum_i \sum_s \tau_{ijs} T_{ijs}$ and $w_j L_j = X_j - \sum_i \sum_s t_{ijs} T_{ijs} - \sum_s \pi_{js}$, where $\pi_{js} = \frac{1}{\sigma_s} \sum_j T_{ijs}$ in this constant markup environment.⁹

Notice that this procedure also ensures that the counterfactual effects of tariff changes are computed from a reference point which perfectly matches industry-level trade and tariffs. Essentially, it imposes a restriction on the set of unknown parameters $\{M_{is}, \theta_{ijs}, \varphi_{is}\}$ such that the predicted T_{ijs} perfectly match the observed T_{ijs} given the observed τ_{ijs} and the estimated σ_s . It is important to emphasize that the restriction on $\{M_{is}, \theta_{ijs}, \varphi_{is}\}$ does not deliver estimates of $\{M_{is}, \theta_{ijs}, \varphi_{is}\}$ given the high dimensionality of the parameter space. To obtain estimates of $\{M_{is}, \theta_{ijs}, \varphi_{is}\}$, one would have to reduce this dimensionality, for example, by imposing some structure on the matrix of iceberg trade barriers.¹⁰

One issue with equations (10) - (13) is that they are based on a static model which does not allow for aggregate trade imbalances thereby violating the data. The standard way of addressing this issue is to introduce aggregate trade imbalances as constant nominal transfers into the budget constraints. However, this approach has two serious limitations which have gone largely unnoticed by the literature. First, the assumption of constant aggregate trade imbalances leads to extreme general equilibrium adjustments in response to high tariffs and cannot be true in the limit as tariffs approach infinity. Second, the assumption of constant nominal transfers implies that the choice of numeraire matters since real transfers then change with nominal prices.¹¹

To circumvent these limitations, I first purge the original data from aggregate trade imbalances using my model and then conduct all subsequent analyses using this purged dataset.

The first step is essentially a replication of the original Dekle et al (2007) exercise using my

⁹Notice that this system can be reduced to $2N$ equations in the $2N$ unknowns \widehat{w}_i and \widehat{X}_i , by substituting for $\widehat{\pi}_{is}$ and \widehat{P}_{js} in conditions (11) and (13) using conditions (10) and (12). I work with this condensed system in my numerical analysis to improve computational efficiency.

¹⁰I do not further pursue an estimation of $\{M_{is}, \theta_{ijs}, \varphi_{is}\}$ in this paper, since the model relates T_{ijs} and $\{M_{is}, \theta_{ijs}, \varphi_{is}\}$ with a standard gravity equation whose empirical success is widely known.

¹¹Essentially, the choice of numeraire reflects an assumption of how real aggregate trade imbalances change in counterfactuals. This is explained in more detail in the appendix.

setup. In particular, I introduce aggregate trade imbalances as nominal transfers into the budget constraint and calculate the general equilibrium responses of setting those transfers equal to zero which allows me to construct a matrix of trade flows featuring no aggregate trade imbalances. I discuss this procedure and its advantages as well as the first-stage results in more detail in the appendix.

As an illustration of the key general equilibrium effects of trade policy, the upper panel of Table 2 summarizes the effects of a counterfactual 50 percentage point increase in the US tariff on chemicals or apparel. Chemical products have a relatively low elasticity of substitution of 2.34 while apparel products have a relatively high elasticity of substitution of 5.39. The first column gives the predicted percentage change in the US wage relative to the numeraire. As can be seen, the US wage is predicted to increase by 1.45 percent if the tariff increase occurs in chemicals and is predicted to increase by 0.67 percent if the tariff increase occurs in apparel.

The second column presents the predicted percentage change in the quantity of US output in the protected industry and the third column the simple average of the predicted percentage changes in the quantity of US output in the other industries. Hence, US output is predicted to increase by 5.73 percent in chemicals and decrease by an average 1.40 percent in all other industries if the tariff increase occurs in chemicals. Similarly, US output is predicted to increase by 33.35 percent in apparel and decrease by an average 0.97 percent in all other industries if the tariff increase occurs in apparel.

Intuitively, a US import tariff makes imported goods relatively more expensive in the US market so that US consumers shift expenditure towards US goods. This then incentivizes US firms in the protected industry to expand which bids up US wages and thereby forces US firms in other industries to contract. Even though it is not directly implied by Table 2, it should be clear that mirroring adjustments occur in other countries. In particular, firms in the industry in which the US imposes import tariffs contract which depresses wages and allows firms in other industries to expand.

2.4 Welfare effects of tariff changes

Given the general equilibrium effects of tariff changes, the implied welfare effects can be computed from $\widehat{W}_j = \widehat{X}_j / \widehat{P}_j$, where $\widehat{P}_j = \Pi_s \left(\widehat{P}_{js} \right)^{\mu_{js}}$ is the change in the aggregate price index. This framework features both traditional as well as new trade welfare effects of trade policy. This can be seen most clearly from a log-linear approximation around factials. As I explain in detail in the appendix, it yields the following relationship for the welfare change induced by tariff changes, where $\frac{\Delta W_j}{W_j}$ is the percentage change in country j 's welfare and so on:

$$\frac{\Delta W_j}{W_j} \approx \sum_i \sum_s \frac{T_{ijs}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta p_{js}}{p_{js}} - \frac{\Delta p_{is}}{p_{is}} \right) + \sum_s \frac{\pi_{js}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta \pi_{js}}{\pi_{js}} - \frac{\Delta p_{js}}{p_{js}} \right) + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta T_{ijs}}{T_{ijs}} - \frac{\Delta p_{is}}{p_{is}} \right) \quad (14)$$

The first term is a traditional terms-of-trade effect which captures changes in country j 's real income due to differential changes in the world prices of country j 's production and consumption bundles. Country j benefits from an increase in the world prices of its production bundle relative to the world prices of its consumption bundle because its exports then command more imports in world markets. The terms-of-trade effect can also be viewed as a relative wage effect since world prices are proportional to wages given the constant markup pricing captured by formula (5).

Notice that this equivalence between terms-of-trade effects and relative wage effects implies that changes in tariffs always change the terms-of-trade in all industries at the same time. This is because a tariff in a particular industry can only affect the terms-of-trade in that industry if it changes relative wages in which case it then also alters the terms-of-trade in all other industries. This would no longer be true if the tight connection between prices across industries within countries was broken by allowing for variable markups, changing marginal costs, or more than one perfectly mobile factor of production.

The second term is a new trade profit shifting effect which captures changes in country j 's real income due to changes in country j 's aggregate profits originating from changes in industry output. It takes changes in industry profits, nets out changes in industry prices, and then aggregates the remaining changes over all industries using profit shares as weights.

These remaining changes are changes in industry profits originating from changes in industry output since industry profits are proportional to industry sales in this constant markup environment.¹²

The last term is a combined trade volume effect which captures changes in country j 's real income due to changes in country j 's tariff revenue originating from changes in import volumes. It takes changes in import values, nets out changes in import prices, and then aggregates the remaining changes over all countries and industries using tariff revenue shares as weights. These remaining changes are changes in import volumes since changes in import values can be decomposed into changes in import prices and import volumes.¹³

As an illustration, the lower panel of Table 2 reports the welfare effects of the counterfactual 50 percentage point increase in the US tariff on chemicals or apparel and decomposes them into terms-of-trade and profit shifting components following equation (14). As can be seen, US welfare increases by 0.17 percent if the tariff increase occurs in chemicals but decreases by 0.14 percent if the tariff increase occurs in apparel. The differential welfare effects are due to differential profit shifting effects. While the terms-of-trade effect is positive in both cases, the profit shifting effect is positive if the tariff increase occurs in chemicals and negative if the profit increase occurs in apparel.

The positive terms-of-trade effects are a direct consequence of the increase in the US relative wage identified above. The differential profit shifting effects are the result of cross-industry differences in markups which are brought about by cross-industry differences in the elasticity of substitution. Since the quantity of US output always increases in the protected

¹²This profit shifting effect is more closely related to the production relocation effect from Venables (1987) than the classic profit shifting effect from Brander and Spencer (1981). It can be shown that in a version of the model with free entry and fixed costs of production, the equivalent of equation (14) would be $\frac{\Delta V_j}{V_j} \approx \sum_i \sum_s \frac{T_{ijs}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta p_{js}}{p_{js}} - \frac{\Delta p_{is}}{p_{is}} \right) + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{\tau_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \frac{1}{\sigma_s - 1} \frac{\Delta M_{is}}{M_{is}} + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta T_{ijs}}{T_{ijs}} - \frac{\Delta p_{is}}{p_{is}} \right)$, where the second term can now be interpreted as a production relocation effect. Essentially, tariffs lead to changes in industry output at the intensive margin without free entry and at the extensive margin with free entry.

¹³Readers familiar with the analysis of Flam and Helpman (1987) may wonder why decomposition (14) does not reveal that tariffs can also be used to partially correct for a domestic distortion brought about by cross-industry differences in markups. The reason is simply that this decomposition only captures first-order effects, while the Flam and Helpman (1987) corrections operate through second-order adjustments in expenditure shares. As will become clear in the discussion of efficient tariffs, they always push governments to impose somewhat higher tariffs on higher elasticity goods in an attempt to counteract distortions in relative prices. While I take this force into account in all my calculations, I only emphasize it in the discussion of efficient tariffs, as the key channels through which countries can gain at the expense of one another are terms-of-trade and profit shifting effects.

industry but decreases in other industries, the change in profits which is due to changes in industry output is always positive in the protected industry but negative in other industries. The overall profit shifting effect depends on the net effect which is positive if the tariff increase occurs in a high profitability industry such as chemicals and negative if it occurs in a low profitability industry such as apparel.¹⁴

Notice that the overall welfare effects are smaller than the sum of the terms-of-trade and profit shifting effects in both examples. One missing factor is, of course, the trade volume effect from equation (14). However, this effect is close to zero in both examples since the loss in tariff revenue due to a decrease in import volumes in the protected industry is approximately offset by the gain in tariff revenue due to an increase in import volumes in other industries. The discrepancy therefore largely reflects the fact that equation (14) only provides a rough approximation if tariff changes are as large as 50 percentage points since it is obtained from a linearization around factials.¹⁵

2.5 Optimal tariffs

The above discussion suggests that governments have incentives to use import tariffs to increase relative wages generating a positive terms-of-trade effect and induce entry into high-profitability industries generating a positive profit shifting effect. However, these incentives combine with political economy considerations as governments also seek to favor politically influential industries. In particular, governments grant extra protection to high λ_{is} industries as this increases industry revenue by increasing industry sales. Recall from above that producers and workers simply split industry revenue using the constant shares $\frac{1}{\sigma_s}$ and $1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_s}$. As a result, there is no conflict of interest between producers and workers with respect to trade policy in this environment.

I compute optimal tariffs using the Su and Judd (forthcoming) method of mathematical programming with equilibrium constraints, as I explain in detail in the appendix. Essentially, it involves maximizing the government's objective function (3) subject to the equilibrium

¹⁴As is easy to verify, equations (5) and (11) imply that $\sum_s \frac{\pi_{js}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta \pi_{js}}{\pi_{js}} - \frac{\Delta p_{js}}{p_{js}} \right) = 0$ if $\sigma_s = \sigma$ for all s so that there is then no profit shifting effect.

¹⁵In particular, the overall reduction in imports associated with the increase in tariffs also reduces the import shares which leverage the improvement in relative world prices. This effect does not appear in equation (14) since changes in import shares are second order effects.

conditions (10) - (13), which ensures relatively fast convergence despite the high dimensionality of the optimization problem. I begin by discussing optimal tariffs for the benchmark case in which $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s . I then describe how I calibrate the political economy weights and present the political economy results. To be clear, optimal tariffs refer to tariffs countries would choose given all other countries' factual tariffs. They are regarded as an important benchmark in the trade policy literature.

Figure 1a summarizes the optimal tariffs of each country for the benchmark case in which $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s . It ranks all industries by elasticity of substitution and plots the optimal tariffs of each country with respect to all trading partners against the industry rank. As can be seen, optimal tariffs vary widely across industries and are strongly decreasing in the elasticity of substitution, as one would expect given the profit shifting motive for protection.¹⁶ There is also some variation across countries and trading partners even though it is much less pronounced. Optimal tariffs are highly correlated across countries with the mean pairwise correlation coefficient being 91.2 percent. The median optimal tariff across all countries combined is 58.8 percent.¹⁷

Table 3a lists the effects of imposing the optimal tariffs from Figure 1a individually for each country, always showing the effects on the tariff imposing country ("own") as well as the averages of the effects on all other countries ("other"). Recall that $G_j = W_j$ if $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s so that the changes in government welfare and overall welfare are identical here. As can be seen from the first to fourth column of Table 3a, each country can gain considerably at the expense of other countries by unilaterally imposing optimal tariffs. The average welfare gain of the tariff imposing country is 2.2 percent. The average welfare loss of the other countries is 0.7 percent. The reason each country can gain at the expense of other countries is that the terms-of-trade and profit shifting effects have a beggar-thy-neighbor character, as can be seen from the fifth to eighth column of Table 3a.¹⁸

¹⁶Loosely speaking, governments choose the level of tariffs to optimally manipulate the terms-of-trade and the distribution of tariffs to optimally shift profits. It is easy to verify numerically that optimal tariffs only vary by trading partner but not by industry in versions of the model in which there are no profit shifting effects. In particular, this is true in the special case of the benchmark model in which the elasticities are assumed to be all the same. Moreover, this is true in an Armington version of the benchmark model in which markets are perfectly competitive and prices equal marginal costs even if the elasticities are allowed to vary.

¹⁷This number differs slightly from the number given in the last row of Table 3a, since the last row of Table 3a computes the mean of the median optimal tariffs for consistency.

¹⁸I have also computed the effects of optimal tariffs on trade flows. On average, trade flows are predicted to

Country sizes vary significantly in my sample, with the largest countries (EU and Rest of World) being around eight times larger than the smallest countries (Brazil and India) in nominal income terms. This variation in country size matters for optimal tariffs just as one would expect. In particular, median optimal tariffs are positively related to country size, as one can see from the last column of Table 3a. Also, the trade policy externalities associated with optimal tariffs are positively related to country size, as one can see from columns two, four, six, and eight of Table 3a. Japan is an outlier in Table 3a because of its extreme factual trade policy. Most notably, Japan imposes factual tariffs of up to 513 percent on rice which implies that factual tariffs are highly distortive so that a move to optimal tariffs also brings about sizeable efficiency gains.

The extreme protection of the Japanese rice industry is the result of the political influence this industry enjoys as a key constituent of the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party.¹⁹ And political economy forces also provide a plausible explanation for the cross-industry variation in factual tariffs in other countries. For example, the five most protected US industries in the sample are sugar, dairy, leather products, wearing apparel, and textiles which are all perceived as having political clout. Interestingly, the most protected industries also tend to be associated with the highest elasticities as one might suspect from inspecting the industry ranking in Table 1. As a result, the cross-industry variation in factual tariffs differs from the cross-industry variation in optimal tariffs in the baseline case in which $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s with the rank correlation coefficient averaging -16 percent.

A natural approach to identifying the political economy weights would therefore be to match the cross-industry distribution of optimal tariffs to the cross-industry distribution of factual tariffs after controlling for their respective means. However, factual tariffs are the result of complex and unfinished trade negotiations so that their relationship to optimal tariffs is far from clear. I therefore instead match the cross-industry distribution of optimal tariffs to the cross-industry distribution of noncooperative tariffs whenever measures of noncooperative tariffs are available from the MAcMap database. The MAcMap database is the source of GTAP's applied tariffs which I use as factual tariffs throughout. However, it also

fall by 30.8 percent for the tariff imposing country and by 7 percent for all other countries.

¹⁹See, for example, a Japan Times article from February 20, 2011 entitled "The sticky subject of Japan's rice protection".

separately lists the components of applied tariffs including noncooperative tariffs whenever noncooperative tariffs are imposed.²⁰

Direct measures of noncooperative tariffs are available for China, Japan, and the US. These are tariffs applied nondiscriminatorily against a number of non-WTO member countries with which China, Japan, or the US do not have normal trade relations.²¹ They are known as "general rate" in the case of China and Japan, and as "column 2 tariffs" in the case of the US. They are significantly higher than factual tariffs with the simple averages being 69 percent as opposed to 9.5 percent for China, 76 percent as opposed to 21 percent for Japan, and 23 percent as opposed to 3 percent for the US.²² However, their ranking is highly correlated with the ranking of factual tariffs with the rank correlation coefficients being 49 percent for China, 80 percent for Japan, and 28 percent for the US.

Moreover, it might be argued that the factual tariffs of Brazil and India reflect their noncooperative tariffs to some extent. This is because Brazil and India choose to set their factual tariffs well below the bound tariffs they have committed to in the WTO. In particular, the MAcMap database suggests that the average "water in the tariff", i.e. is the difference between bound and factual tariffs, is around 20 percentage points for Brazil and around 30 percentage points for India. Needless to say, these and the other measures of noncooperative tariffs have to be taken with a large grain of salt. However, it will turn out that all aggregate results are quite robust to the choice of political economy weights which will considerably mitigate this concern.

Figure 1b shows the result of matching the distribution of optimal tariffs to the distribution of noncooperative tariffs for China, Japan, and the US, and to the distribution of factual tariffs for Brazil, the EU, India, and the Rest of the World. The matching is conducted by minimizing the residual sum of squares between the optimal tariffs and the noncooperative or

²⁰Some readers might feel that I should match the cross-industry distribution of *Nash* tariffs instead of the cross-industry distribution of *optimal* tariffs to the cross-industry distribution of noncooperative tariffs. As will become clear in the next section, this would make hardly any difference at all.

²¹The particular countries are Andorra, Bahamas, Bermuda, Bhutan, British Virgin Islands, British Cayman Islands, French Guiana, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Gibraltar, Monserrat, Nauru, Aruba, New Caledonia, Norfolk Island, Palau, Timor-Leste, San Marino, Seychelles, Western Sahara, and Turks and Caicos Islands for China; Andorra, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lebanon, and Timor-Leste for Japan; and Cuba and Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the US.

²²The average reported for the US column 2 tariffs might seem too low to readers closely familiar with US tariff data. Notice, however, that the average is taken over GTAP sectors which gives a lot of weight to agricultural industries. The simple average over all HS 6-digit US column 2 tariffs in my dataset is 32 percent.

factual tariffs after controlling for their respective means.²³ Since noncooperative tariffs are applied nondiscriminatorily I also restrict the optimal tariffs to be applied nondiscriminatorily for the purpose of this exercise. As can be seen, the model is able to replicate the distributions of noncooperative and factual tariffs as one would expect given the number of free political economy parameters.

Japan's most extreme noncooperative tariffs are too close to prohibitive to be exactly matched by my method of computing optimal tariffs without imposing extreme convergence tolerances. For example, Japan's noncooperative tariff on rice is 721 percent which is virtually indistinguishable from a tariff of, say, 800 percent as far as its quantitative implications are concerned. I therefore restrict each optimal tariff corresponding to a noncooperative tariff higher than 225 percent to be at most as high as the noncooperative tariff itself and find the lowest possible political economy weight which makes the optimal tariff hit that upper bound. As can be seen from Figure 1b, this procedure applies only to the most extreme noncooperative tariffs of Japan.

The resulting political economy weights are reported in the second to eighth column of Table 1 in which I have marked the five highest values for each country with boxes for better legibility. Overall, the estimates appear highly plausible. For example, the five most favored US industries are found to be wearing apparel, dairy, textiles, beverages and tobacco products, and wheat. With an average rank correlation of 71 percent, the political economy weights are highly correlated across countries. With an average rank correlation of 79 percent, they are also highly correlated with the elasticities. The latter correlation arises because the targeted tariffs tend to be higher the higher the elasticity and because tariffs are harder to rationalize the higher the elasticity.²⁴

Table 3b lists the effects of unilaterally imposed optimal tariffs given the estimated political economy weights in exactly the same format as the earlier Table 3a. A comparison of the last rows of Table 3a and Table 3b reveals that the aggregate implications of optimal tariffs with

²³A more detailed discussion of the algorithm can be found in the appendix.

²⁴For a number of reasons, it is hard to compare these estimates to the ones obtained by Goldberg and Maggi (1999). First, Goldberg and Maggi (1999) estimate a dummy variable indicating whether or not an industry is politically organized whereas I allow the political economy weights to vary continuously by industry. Also, Goldberg and Maggi (1999) restrict attention to US manufacturing industries only whereas I consider agricultural and manufacturing industries around the world. Finally, Goldberg and Maggi (1999) use an SIC 3-digit industry classification which is hard to match to the GTAP sectors considered here.

lobbying are quite similar to the aggregate implications of optimal tariffs without lobbying. The unweighted welfare gains are now a bit smaller given that governments now maximize weighted welfare. Also, the median optimal tariffs are now a bit higher given that the optimal tariff distribution is now more extreme. The main difference is that profit shifting effects are now all but eliminated given that the cross-industry distribution of tariffs is now driven primarily by political considerations.

Table 3c explores the sensitivity of the results in Tables 3a and 3b to alternative assumptions on the elasticity of substitution. In particular, it recalculates the averages reported in the last rows of Tables 3a and 3b using scaled versions of the original elasticity estimates reported in Table 1, where the scaling is such that the elasticities average to the values displayed in the first column of Table 3c (recall that the original elasticity estimates reported in Table 1 average to 3.4 percent). The specific range is chosen to correspond to the range of aggregate trade elasticities suggested by Simonovska and Waugh (2011). As can be seen, the optimal tariffs and their welfare effects are strongly decreasing in the elasticities. Intuitively, lower elasticities give countries more monopoly power in world markets which they optimally exploit through higher tariffs.²⁵

Recalculating the last row of Table 3b involves recalibrating the political economy weights to ensure that the distribution of optimal tariffs continues to match the distribution of non-cooperative or factual tariffs. The main effect of increasing the elasticities is to decrease the variance of the political economy weights as it makes the optimal tariffs more sensitive to changes in the political economy weights. At the same time, the ranking of the political economy weights stays largely unchanged with the average rank correlation coefficient across specifications being 97 percent. Moreover, recalculating the last rows of Table 3a and 3b also involves repurging the original data from aggregate trade imbalances following the same procedure explained above.

Since optimal tariffs are strongly decreasing in the elasticities, increasing the elasticities also reduces the differences between optimal tariffs and noncooperative or factual tariffs for

²⁵The trade elasticities are the partial equilibrium elasticities of trade flows with respect to trade costs and equal $1 - \sigma_s$ here. Simonovska and Waugh (2011) obtain their results in the context of an Eaton and Kortum (2002) model, which means that their results do not exactly apply here. However, it is now well-understood that different gravity models share similar aggregate behaviors so that I still use their numbers as rough bounds.

all countries other than China for which the levels were already closely matched in Figure 1b. For example, the optimal tariffs of the US almost perfectly match the noncooperative tariffs of the US in a version of Figure 1b drawn for the case in which the elasticities average to 6.5. In light of this, it might be tempting to calibrate the average elasticity to minimize the differences between optimal tariffs and noncooperative or factual tariffs. Recall, however, that the measured noncooperative or factual tariffs are highly imperfect proxies for the actual noncooperative tariffs so that I do not pursue this here.^{26,27}

2.6 Trade wars

The above discussion of each country's optimal tariffs assumes that the other countries do not retaliate which allows each country to benefit considerably at the other countries' expense. I now turn to an analysis of the Nash equilibrium in which all countries retaliate optimally. The Nash tariffs are such that each government chooses its tariffs to maximize its objective function (3) given the tariffs of all other governments as well as conditions (10) - (13). They can be computed by iterating over the algorithm used to compute optimal tariffs, as I discuss in detail in the appendix. I refer to optimal tariffs without retaliation as optimal tariffs and optimal tariffs with retaliation as Nash tariffs throughout.²⁸

Figure 2a summarizes the Nash tariffs of each country for the benchmark case in which $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s . It ranks all industries by elasticity of substitution and plots the Nash

²⁶By giving an extra weight to real profits in the government objective functions (3), one could also control the level of optimal tariffs from the political economy side. However, this would work in a highly implausible fashion which is why I refrain from it here. In particular, the level of optimal tariffs could then be *decreased* by *increasing* the weights on real profits in all industries. To see this, consider a tariff reduction which is such that it leaves the scale of all industries unchanged. Such a tariff reduction would then increase real profits in all industries by reducing the aggregate price index while leaving nominal profits in all industries unchanged as nominal profits are directly proportional to industry scale. Essentially, governments would then cater to producer interests by subsidizing consumption since they cannot boost production in all industries at the same time.

²⁷To get a sense of how a version of the model without profit shifting effects behaves, I have also computed optimal tariffs in the baseline case without lobbying under the assumption that the elasticity of substitution is equal to 3.42 in all industries which is the average of my elasticity estimates from Table 1. In this case, optimal tariffs would be uniform across industries and have a median of 44 percent. They would increase welfare in the tariff imposing country by 1.5 percent on average and decrease welfare in all other countries by 0.5 percent on average. Of course, the prediction that optimal tariffs are uniform across industries should not be expected to generalize to richer terms-of-trade only environments in which relative prices and relative wages are less closely linked.

²⁸I have experimented with many different starting values without finding any differences in the results which makes me believe that the identified Nash equilibrium is unique. This is, of course, subject to the well-known qualification that complete autarky is also always a Nash equilibrium.

tariffs of each country with respect to all trading partners against the industry rank. As can be seen, these Nash tariffs are very similar to the optimal tariffs from Figure 1a. The median Nash tariff across all countries is 58.0 percent which is remarkably close to the average tariff of 50 percent typically reported for the trade war following the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930.²⁹ This trade war is the only full-fledged trade war in economic history and therefore an interesting benchmark for me. Of course, it can only serve as a rough reference point given the differences in the set of players and the timing of the experiment.

Table 5a lists the welfare effects of Nash tariffs in a similar format as Table 3a. The main difference is that there is now only a single multilateral tariff scenario under consideration in contrast to the seven unilateral ones from Table 3a. As can be seen, countries can no longer benefit at one another's expense and welfare falls across the board with the average loss equaling -2.4 percent. This loss is much higher than the average loss from unilaterally imposed optimal tariffs since all countries now impose noncooperative tariffs at the same time. Intuitively, each country now increases its import tariffs in an attempt to induce favorable terms-of-trade and profit shifting effects. The end result is a large drop in trade volumes which leaves all countries worse off.³⁰

Notice that the welfare losses resulting from Nash tariffs are quite similar across countries with only Japan and the Rest of the World standing out. The relatively small welfare loss of Japan is again mainly due to Japan's highly distortive factual tariffs which imply that Japan's Nash tariffs are well below Japan's factual tariffs in agricultural industries such as rice. The relatively large welfare loss of the Rest of the World is mainly due to the fact that the Rest of the World is by far the most open economy in the sample with an overall import share of 27 percent (the average across all other countries is 16 percent). Variation in openness is also the reason why variation in country size is not as visible as in Table 3a, since the larger countries also tend to be the more open ones here.

Figure 2b turns to the political economy case and plots the Nash tariffs computed using the political economy weights from above against the same measures of noncooperative and

²⁹See, for example, Bagwell and Staiger (2002: 43). The reported number of 58.0 again differs slightly from the one reported in the last row of Table 5a, since the last row of Table 5a computes the mean of the median Nash tariffs for consistency.

³⁰On average, trade flows are predicted to fall by 57.7 percent due to Nash tariffs.

factual tariffs shown in Figure 2a. As can be seen, the distribution of Nash tariffs is also quite closely in line with the distribution of noncooperative and factual tariffs even though they have not been directly matched. This suggests that the political economy weights would have been very similar if they had been chosen to match the distribution of Nash tariffs rather than the distribution of optimal tariffs to the distribution of noncooperative and factual tariffs. This is comforting since it is not entirely clear which point on the tariff reaction curves the measures of noncooperative and factual tariffs best represent.

Table 5b summarizes the welfare effects of Nash tariffs in the political economy case. A comparison of the last rows of Table 5a and Table 5b reveals that the aggregate implications of Nash tariffs are also quite similar with and without political economy forces. Similar to what we observed with respect to optimal tariffs, the unweighted welfare losses are a bit larger in the political economy case given that governments now maximize weighted welfare. Also, the median Nash tariffs are a bit higher in the political economy case given that the tariff distribution is now more extreme. Notice that the average profit shifting effects are very small even without lobbying which is the case because all governments attempt to boost their most profitable industries at the same time.³¹

Table 5c explores the sensitivity of the results in Tables 5a and 5b to alternative assumptions on the elasticity of substitution exactly in the same fashion as explained earlier for Table 3c. As can be seen, the Nash tariffs and their welfare effects are strongly decreasing in the elasticity of substitution just like the optimal tariffs discussed above. Indeed, the average welfare loss from Nash tariffs almost goes to zero in the benchmark case without lobbying. This is because high factual tariffs such as some of the agricultural tariffs imposed by Japan become more distortive the higher the elasticity so that a move to Nash tariffs also entails sizeable efficiency gains. Recall that all welfare changes are computed relative to factual tariffs and not relative to free trade as in much of the theoretical literature.³²

³¹ While the relatively high government welfare loss in the Rest of the World is again the result of its relatively high trade exposure, the relatively low government welfare loss of Japan is now driven by its relatively extreme political economy. In particular, Japan is effectively banning imports in its politically best connected industries which limits the losses in government welfare but significantly harms overall welfare.

³² To get a sense of how a version of the model without profit shifting effects behaves, I have again also computed Nash tariffs in the baseline case without lobbying under the assumption that the elasticity of substitution is equal to 3.42 in all industries which is the average of my elasticity estimates from Table 1. In this case, Nash tariffs would be uniform across industries and have a median of 43 percent. They would decrease welfare by 1.8 percent on average. Just like before, the prediction that Nash tariffs are uniform across industries should

2.7 Trade talks

The inefficiency of the Nash equilibrium creates incentives for international trade policy cooperation. I now turn to an analysis of such cooperation by characterizing the outcome of efficient multilateral trade negotiations. As will become clear shortly, there is an entire efficiency frontier so that I have to take a stance on the specific bargaining protocol. I adopt one in the spirit of symmetric Nash bargaining according to which all governments evenly split all efficiency gains. In particular, I solve $\max \widehat{G}_1$ s.t. $\widehat{G}_j = \widehat{G}_1 \forall j$ starting at *Nash* tariffs, thereby invoking the same threat point as most of the theoretical literature. Moreover, I also report results starting at *factual* tariffs and *zero* tariffs in order to quantify the scope for future mutually beneficial trade liberalization and assess how close global free trade is to the efficiency frontier.

Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c show the world cooperative tariffs under these three regimes for the benchmark case in which $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s . They rank all industries by the elasticity of substitution and plot the cooperative tariffs of each country with respect to all trading partners against the industry rank. As can be seen, the cross-industry variation in the cooperative tariffs is very similar across the three figures while the cross-country variation is changing quite a bit. The cross-industry variation in the cooperative tariffs counteracts distortions in relative prices originating from cross-industry variation in markups. The cross-country variation in the cooperative tariffs induces terms-of-trade effects which replicate international side payments and ensure that all efficiency gains are split equally as required by the bargaining protocol.

To better understand the cross-industry variation in cooperative tariffs, notice that the equilibrium in this economy is efficient as long as relative prices equal relative marginal costs.³³ If markups are the same across industries, this is the case without policy intervention so that free trade is then first-best. If markups differ across industries, however, relative prices

not be expected to generalize to richer terms-of-trade only environments in which relative prices and relative wages are less closely linked.

³³To see this, consider the effects of a fully symmetric increase in markups starting at the efficient benchmark where prices equal marginal costs. On the demand side, consumption would be unchanged for all varieties since relative prices would be unchanged and profits would be fully redistributed to consumers. On the supply side, output would be unchanged for all varieties since there is a fixed number of firms, a fixed supply of workers, and wages adjust to ensure full employment.

are distorted without policy intervention but can be fully corrected by taxing imports and domestic sales in the high elasticity industries and subsidizing imports and domestic sales in the low elasticity industries. This is also what governments attempt in the cooperative equilibrium with the important difference that they are given no access to domestic policy instruments. This is similar to the point of Flam and Helpman (1987).

To better understand the cross-country variation in cooperative tariffs, notice that a combination of import tariffs and import subsidies can induce terms-of-trade effects which replicate international side payments. As an illustration, consider the case of the US and Japan. If the US imposes an across-the-board import tariff, this improves the US terms-of-trade but also increases the prices of Japanese goods relative to US goods in the US market with the opposite occurring in Japan. If Japan now responds with the right across-the board import subsidy, it is possible to further improve the US terms-of-trade but now decrease the prices of Japanese goods relative to US goods in the US market back to their original level with the opposite occurring in Japan. In this situation, Japan would then effectively make a side payment to the US. This is essentially the point of Mayer (1981).

An unrealistic feature of the cooperative tariffs summarized in Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c is that they include import subsidies which are rarely found in practice. However, ruling out import subsidies makes very little difference in terms of the quantitative results in the benchmark case in which $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s . Table 7a therefore lists the effects of cooperative tariffs under the more realistic assumption that tariffs cannot be negative. These restricted cooperative tariffs essentially look like a truncation of the unrestricted cooperative tariffs presented in Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c. The different columns of Table 7a refer to negotiations starting at Nash tariffs, factual tariffs, and free trade, and all changes are always computed relative to these respective starting points.³⁴

As can be seen, trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs increase each country's welfare by 3.4 percent. Since this number relates the worst-case scenario to the best-case scenario, it can be viewed as an upper bound on the value of multilateral trade policy cooperation.

³⁴Without ruling out import subsidies, the mean welfare effects would have been 3.5%, 0.6%, and 0.05%, the mean wage effects would have been 0.0%, 0.0%, and 0.0%, and the mean profit effects would have been 0.3%, 0.4%, and 0.2%, for negotiations starting at Nash tariffs, factual tariffs, and zero tariffs, respectively. Comparing those numbers to the last row of Table 7a reveals that ruling out import subsidies indeed makes very little difference here.

The results for trade negotiations starting at factual tariffs suggest that a significant share of these gains has already been reaped during past trade liberalizations with future trade negotiations only permitting additional welfare gains of 0.5 percent. Moreover, the results for trade negotiations starting at free trade suggest that free trade is very close to the efficiency frontier as the potential gains from such negotiations are negligibly small. This implies that tariffs are not an effective tool for correcting domestic distortions exactly as the standard targeting principle predicts.

The associated wage effects reflect the equilibrium side payments which ensure that all governments gain the same. For example, Brazil suffers less from the Nash equilibrium than other countries because it is relatively closed to international trade. As a result, it faces lower tariffs than other countries in the cooperative equilibrium from Figure 3a which explains the associated terms-of-trade gains apparent in Table 7a. Similarly, Japan gains a lot by reducing its high factual tariffs on rice and other agricultural products. This implies that it needs to make transfers to all other countries if the Nash bargaining protocol is to be satisfied, which explains the high tariffs it faces in the cooperative equilibrium from Figure 3b as well as the associated wage decline noted in Table 7a.

Table 7b turns to the welfare effects of cooperative tariffs in the political economy case, again focusing on the realistic scenario that tariffs must be nonnegative. A comparison of the last rows of Table 7a and Table 7b reveals that the aggregate implications of cooperative tariffs are also quite similar with and without lobbying. The unweighted welfare gains from negotiations starting at factual tariffs or free trade are now a bit smaller since governments now maximize weighted welfare. In contrast, the unweighted welfare gains from negotiations starting at Nash tariffs are now a bit larger because Nash tariffs are now associated with lower unweighted welfare. Interestingly, trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs make households in all countries better off even though they are conducted by politically motivated governments. This is no longer true, however, for trade negotiations starting at factual tariffs or zero tariffs, specifically in the cases of China, India, and Japan.³⁵

³⁵The strong political preferences of Japan also imply that restricting tariffs to be nonnegative is not as innocuous here as it was in the benchmark case without political economy forces. Without that restriction, Japan would be able to make larger side payments to other countries thereby buying additional support for its rice and wheat industry and imposing significant distortions on its economy.

Table 7b further reveals that free trade is quite close to the efficiency frontier even in the political economy case. In particular, government welfare only increases by 0.2 percent in all countries following trade negotiations starting at free trade. This suggests that a good rule of thumb for achieving efficiency in remaining trade negotiations might be to focus on tariff reductions in sectors in which factual tariffs remain high. One complication, however, is that a move to free trade does not make all governments better off relative to factual tariffs. Most notably, Japanese government welfare would fall by 0.9 percent in this case since Japan's factual rice tariffs are very high and Japan's political preference for its domestic rice industry is very strong.

Table 7c explores the sensitivity of the results in Tables 7a and 7b to alternative assumptions on the elasticity of substitution exactly in the same fashion as explained earlier for Tables 3c and 5c. As can be seen, the gains from trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs are decreasing in the elasticity while the gains from trade negotiations starting at factual tariffs are increasing in the elasticity. The gains from trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs are decreasing in the elasticity simply because the Nash tariffs themselves are decreasing in the elasticity. The gains from trade negotiations starting at factual tariffs are increasing in the elasticity simply because factual tariffs get more distortive the higher the elasticity.³⁶

In practice, governments do not simply engage in multilateral Nash bargaining but instead follow a rules-based negotiation approach guided by the principles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). The most prominent one is the most-favored nation (MFN) principle which forces countries to impose the same tariff against all trading partners for any given traded product. A comprehensive assessment of the implications of this principle is difficult in the context of this paper since MFN is enforced at the tariff-line level and therefore does not have to hold within the broad industry categories considered here. Nevertheless, it seems useful to discuss the effects of imposing MFN to get a sense of some of the broader issues involved.

³⁶To get a sense of how a version of the model without profit shifting effects behaves, I have again also computed cooperative tariffs in the baseline case without lobbying under the assumption that the elasticity of substitution is equal to 3.42 in all industries which is the average of my elasticity estimates from Table 1. In this case, cooperative tariffs would be uniform across industries. They would increase welfare by 2.5 percent, 0.5 percent, and 0.0 percent for trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs, factual tariffs, and zero tariffs respectively with the latter result simply reflecting that free trade would then be on the efficiency frontier.

Tables 4a, 4b, and 4c report the effects of imposing optimal tariffs subject to the constraint of MFN in the same format as the Tables 3a, 3b, and 3c discussed above. As can be seen, the results are virtually identical with and without MFN, as one might have suspected from the lack of cross-country variation in Figure 1a. Tables 6a, 6b, and 6c then turn to the effects of MFN versions of the Nash tariffs covered in Table 5a, 5b, and 5c. Again, the results are very similar with and without MFN, as one might have suspected from the lack of cross-country variation in Figure 2a. Overall, these results suggest that MFN by itself is hardly effective in pushing countries towards the efficiency frontier. Incidentally, this is consistent with the fact that the abovementioned "general rate" and "column 2" tariffs of China, Japan, and the US are all imposed nondiscriminatorily.

Tables 8a, 8b, and 8c list the effects of trade negotiations subject to the constraint of MFN in the same format as Tables 7a, 7b, and 7c. Recall from the above discussion of Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c that cross-country variation in the cooperative tariffs induces terms-of-trade effects which replicate international side payments. Imposing MFN somewhat restricts such side payments which implies slightly lower gains from trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs or factual tariffs. The main effect of imposing MFN, however, is that it significantly reduces the difference between changes in government welfare and overall welfare for trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs or factual tariffs in the political economy case. This is due to the fact that a restriction of side payments limits the governments' ability to coordinate their support for each other's politically influential industries.

An additional implication of the MFN principle is that it "multilateralizes" trade negotiations between a subset of countries by forcing them to extend all negotiated tariff concessions to non-participating countries as well. This implication has been discussed quite controversially in the theoretical literature. Some authors argue that it undermines multilateral trade negotiations by allowing non-participating countries to free ride on the bargaining outcomes of participating ones (e.g. Caplin and Krishna, 1988). Other authors argue that it solves a bilateral opportunism problem resulting from a trade bloc's ability to manipulate its external terms-of-trade (e.g. Bagwell and Staiger, 1999).³⁷ While a comprehensive quantitative analysis of these issues is beyond the scope of this paper, a simple thought experiment nevertheless

³⁷See chapter 5 of Bagwell and Staiger (2002) for a detailed review of the relevant literature.

sheds some interesting light on them.

In particular, consider the trade war equilibrium in the benchmark case in which $\lambda_{is} = 1 \forall i$ and s and suppose that the EU, Japan, and the US reciprocally reduce their tariffs against one another while the other countries keep their trade war tariffs in place. The Northwest panel of Figure 4 shows the average welfare effects of this tariff reduction under the assumption that the liberalizing countries also keep their trade war tariffs against all other countries in place. As can be seen, this non-MFN tariff reduction benefits the liberalizing countries and harms the other countries. The welfare loss of the other countries is explained by a deterioration of their terms-of-trade which can be seen from the associated relative wage effects in the Northeast panel of Figure 4. It is the result of a shift in US, EU, and Japanese consumer expenditure towards the cheaper liberalized goods.³⁸

Suppose now that the EU, Japan, and the US undertake the same tariff reductions but extend them to the other countries according to the MFN principle while the other countries still keep their trade war tariffs in place.³⁹ As can be seen from the Southwest panel of Figure 4, the liberalizing countries first gain and then lose from this MFN-tariff reduction while the other countries are left much better off. The welfare gain of the other countries is explained by an improvement of their terms-of-trade which can be seen from the associated relative wage effects in the Southeast panel of Figure 4. This is due to the fact that the liberalizing countries make tariff concessions to the other countries without receiving anything in return. Overall, MFN therefore seems to protect "outsider" countries from welfare losses associated with liberalizations among "insider" countries. However, it also makes "insider" liberalizations much less attractive by more than neutralizing their adverse external effects.⁴⁰

³⁸The associated profit shifting effects are minimal since the tariff reduction occurs proportionately across industries.

³⁹Recall that the trade war equilibrium is very similar with and without imposing MFN so that it does not really matter which one is taken as a starting point. For simplicity, I focus on the trade war equilibrium subject to MFN in all thought experiments captured in Figure 4.

⁴⁰Readers closely familiar with the work of Bagwell and Staiger (1999) will recall that MFN neutralizes external terms-of-trade effects in their framework if the liberalizing parties keep their bilateral terms-of-trade unchanged. While the thought experiment underlying Figure 4 simply considers proportional tariff cuts, the bilateral terms-of-trade of the liberalizing countries are still largely unchanged so that this does not explain why the Bagwell and Staiger (1999) result does not apply. Instead, the key is the presence of product differentiation which breaks the direct link between countries' bilateral terms-of-trade present in Bagwell and Staiger (1999).

3 Conclusion

I proposed a flexible framework for the quantitative analysis of noncooperative and cooperative trade policy which nests traditional, new trade, and political economy motives for protection. I used this framework to provide a first comprehensive quantitative analysis of noncooperative and cooperative trade policy, addressing some natural questions emerging from the theoretical trade policy literature. I began by considering optimal tariffs, i.e. the tariffs countries would impose if they did not have to fear any retaliation. I then turned to an analysis of Nash tariffs, i.e. the tariffs countries would impose in a worldwide trade war in which their trading partners retaliated optimally. I finally investigated cooperative tariffs, i.e. the tariffs countries would negotiate to in efficient trade negotiations with and without being restricted by the GATT/WTO's most-favored nation clause.

The interpretation of my results depends on whether the framework is taken as a maintained or tested hypothesis. In the former case, they can be viewed as answers to questions of immediate policy relevance: for example, as revealing what would have happened if a trade war had broken out in the wake of the recent financial crisis; or as suggesting how much there is to gain from future multilateral trade negotiations. In the latter case, they can be interpreted as suggestive of the plausibility of some of the leading models of trade policy making: for example, as demonstrating that the predicted noncooperative tariffs can be brought in line with observed noncooperative tariffs by choosing plausible political economy weights; or as showing that the underlying trade policy externalities can be sufficiently strong to reasonably justify a lengthy process of multilateral trade negotiations.

Given the near-absence of prior quantitative analyses of noncooperative and cooperative trade policy, the framework could be extended in many ways and used to address a whole host of related questions emerging from the large qualitative trade policy literature. As one of many examples, one could elaborate on the role played by the GATT/WTO principles of reciprocity and nondiscrimination as formalized by Bagwell and Staiger (1999) and ask whether they are helpful or harmful for achieving and maintaining global efficiency. This could entail a quantitative analysis of the long-standing debate associated with Bhagwati (1991) of whether free trade agreements, which are allowed under GATT/WTO rules as an important

exception to the principle of nondiscrimination, represent building-blocks or stumbling-blocks on the way towards full multilateral cooperation.

4 Appendix

4.1 Data

My main data source is the eighth version of the Global Trade Analysis Project database (GTAP 8) from which I take industry-level trade, production, and tariff data for the year 2008. The GTAP 8 database is a carefully cleaned, fully documented, publicly available, and globally consistent database covering 129 countries and 57 industries which span the agricultural, manufacturing, and service sectors of the economy. The GTAP 8 database is itself based on a number of underlying databases. In particular, its trade data is mainly drawn from the UN's Comtrade database, its production data is mainly built from national input-output tables, and its tariff data is mainly taken from the International Trade Centre's Market Access Map database. Additional information is available directly from the GTAP website under <https://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu>.

For my estimation of the demand elasticities, I further make use of the NBER-UN trade data for the time period 1994-2008 which covers most countries in the world. The data is originally at the SITC-Rev2 4-digit level and I convert it, first, to the SITC-Rev3 4-digit level using a concordance from the Center for International Data at UC Davis and, second, to the GTAP sector level using a concordance which I manually constructed with the help of various concordances available from the GTAP website. This involved combining the original GTAP sectors "raw milk" and "dairy products" into a new GTAP sector "raw and processed dairy", the original GTAP sectors "paddy rice" and "processed rice" into a new GTAP sector "raw and processed rice", and the original GTAP sectors "raw and processed sugar" and "sugar cane, sugar beet" into a new GTAP sector "sugar".

For my calibration of the political economy weights of China, Japan, and the US, I also make direct use of the International Trade Centre's Market Access Map database (MAcMap). The MAcMap data provides exhaustive and consistent measures of tariff protection across the world. Particular care has been taken to transform specific tariffs into ad valorem equivalents which is especially relevant for agricultural industries. The database does not contain the measures of noncooperative tariffs described in the main text for the year 2008, so I use the next closest alternatives which are from the year 2007 for China and the US and the year 2005

for Japan. A small number observations are missing for Japan which I replace with Japan's applied MFN rate. The data is originally at the HS 6-digit level and I convert it to the GTAP sector level using a concordance available from the GTAP website.

4.2 Elasticity estimation

I estimate the import demand elasticities using the method of Feenstra (1994) which identifies them from variation in the variances and covariances of demand and supply shocks across countries and over time. I base my estimation on the instructions in Feenstra (2010) in which the method is particularly clearly explained. My estimating equation is equation (2.21) in Feenstra (2010) which I estimate using weighted least squares following the code provided in Appendix 2.2 of Feenstra (2010). However, I do not focus on a single importer, but pool across the main importers considered in my analysis.

Specifically, I pool across the importers Brazil, China, India, Japan, the US, and the EU-25 countries Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Spain, and the United Kingdom. I use all exporters available in the data. In my estimation, all results turn out to be real numbers so that I do not need to resort to the grid search method proposed by Broda and Weinstein (2006).

Given that profit shifting effects feature prominently in my analysis, one might wonder how the cross-industry variation in markups implied by my elasticity estimates compares to the cross-industry variation in other markup estimates in the literature. To address this, I have compared the cross-country averages of the markup estimates reported in Tables 3 and 4 of Martins et al (1996) to the markup estimates implied by the elasticity estimates in my Table 1. This was possible only for 23 of the 33 industries I consider since Martins et al (1996) do not provide estimates for agricultural industries. Encouragingly, the estimates are positively related with only one industry clearly standing out (beverages and tobacco products). The overall correlation is 30 percent if the outlier is included and 45 percent otherwise.

4.3 Elimination of aggregate trade imbalances

To purge the trade data of aggregate trade imbalances, I essentially replicate the original Dekle et al (2007) exercise using my model. In particular, I introduce aggregate trade imbalances as nominal transfers into the budget constraints and allow them to change exogenously so that equation (13) becomes

$$\widehat{X}_j = \frac{w_j L_j}{X_j} \widehat{w}_j + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \widehat{t}_{ijs} (\widehat{w}_i)^{1-\sigma_s} (\widehat{P}_{js})^{\sigma_s-1} (\widehat{\tau}_{ijs})^{-\sigma_s} \widehat{X}_j + \sum_s \frac{\pi_{js}}{X_j} \widehat{\pi}_{js} - \frac{NX'_j}{X_j} \quad (15)$$

where $NX_i \equiv \sum_j \sum_s (T_{ijs} - T_{jis})$ is taken from the data. I then use equations (10), (11), (12), and (15) to solve for the general equilibrium effects $\widehat{w}_i, \widehat{X}_i, \widehat{P}_{is}, \widehat{\pi}_{is}$ resulting from setting $NX'_j = 0$ while keeping all tariffs unchanged. I finally use these general equilibrium effects to calculate the effects on trade flows using the relationship $\widehat{T}_{ijs} = (\widehat{w}_i)^{1-\sigma_s} (\widehat{P}_{js})^{\sigma_s-1} \widehat{X}_j$, which delivers a trade matrix without aggregate trade imbalances.

Aggregate trade imbalances are quite large in the raw data. In particular, exports minus imports as a ratio of exports plus imports equal 17 percent for Brazil, 21 percent for China, 8 percent for the EU, -4 percent for India, 28 percent for Japan, -9 percent for the Rest of the World, and -22 percent for the US. Given the elasticities listed in Table 1, the predicted changes in exports and imports resulting from an elimination of aggregate trade imbalances are -15 percent and 20 percent for Brazil, -17 percent and 28 percent for China, -9 percent and 6 percent for the EU, 1 percent and -8 percent for India, -18 percent and 44 percent for Japan, 6 percent and -11 percent for the Rest of the World, and 16 percent and -26 percent for the US.

As indicated in the main text, calculating the counterfactual effects of trade policy changes using the purged data and equations (10), (11), (12), and (13) has two main advantages over the standard approach which would call for using the raw data and equations (10), (11), (12), and (15) with aggregate net exports kept unchanged. First, the assumption of constant aggregate trade imbalances leads to extreme general equilibrium adjustments in response to high tariffs and cannot be true in the limit as tariffs approach infinity. Second, the assumption of constant nominal transfers implies that the choice of numeraire matters since real transfers then change with nominal prices.

While the first point should be obvious, the second point may not be immediately clear. To see the problem, notice that country j 's real income depends on $\frac{NX_j}{P_j}$ in the presence of aggregate trade imbalances if they are introduced as nominal transfers into the budget constraints. If NX_j is held fixed, changes in real income therefore depend on changes in P_j which, in turn, depend on the choice of numeraire. As a result, changes in all real variables then depend on the choice of numeraire which can be a serious problem. Notice that NX_j can generally not be held fixed in real terms since it also has to satisfy the global adding up constraint $\sum_j NX_j = 0$. Notice also that the numeraire is not an issue in the original Dekle et al (2008) exercise since aggregate net exports are then set equal to zero anyway.

4.4 Algorithm

As indicated in the main text, calculating disaggregated noncooperative and cooperative tariffs is very intensive computationally due to the high dimensionality of the problem which has been a major barrier to progress in the area. I overcome this barrier with a combination of modern computing power and an efficient algorithm based on the idea of mathematical programming with equilibrium constraints as formulated in Su and Judd (forthcoming). Using a high-end desktop computer and standard MATLAB software, it takes about 4 days to calculate all results which are reported in the paper.

I compute US optimal tariffs by maximizing the government's objective function (3) subject to the equilibrium conditions (10) - (13) using the algorithm suggested by Su and Judd (forthcoming). To minimize the dimensionality of the problem, I do not literally use equations (10) - (13) but substitute first for $\hat{\pi}_{is}$ using equation (10) and then for \hat{P}_{js} using equation (12). As an alternative, I have also experimented with computing optimal tariffs directly from the first-order conditions which can also be manipulated in the spirit of Dekle et al (2008). However, I eventually abandoned this approach since it did not sufficiently improve performance to justify the substantial added complication.

I compute world Nash tariffs using a similar approach as Perroni and Whalley (2000) and Ossa (2011). Starting at factual tariffs, I compute each country's optimal tariffs, then impose these optimal tariffs, and let each country reoptimize given all other countries' optimal tariffs, and so on, until the solution converges in the sense that no country has an incentive to deviate

from its tariffs. I have experimented with many different starting values without finding any differences in the result which makes me believe that the identified Nash equilibrium is unique. This is, of course, subject to the well-known qualification that complete autarky is also always a Nash equilibrium.

I compute world cooperative tariffs by maximizing \widehat{G}_1 subject to the equilibrium conditions (10) - (13) as well as the condition that $\widehat{G}_j = \widehat{G}_1$ for all j using again the algorithm suggested by Su and Judd (forthcoming). I either start from Nash tariffs, factual tariffs, or zero tariffs and again substitute first for $\widehat{\pi}_{is}$ using equation (10) and then for \widehat{P}_{js} using equation (12) to reduce the dimensionality of the problem. As discussed in the main text, there is an entire frontier of efficient tariffs due to the existence of de facto side payments and restricting $\widehat{G}_j = \widehat{G}_1$ for all j can be thought of as finding the point on that frontier which also lies on a 45 degree line from the origin.

I compute the political economy weights using a simple iterative procedure. Starting with an initial guess, I always increase the political economy weights in industries in which the predicted optimal tariff is below the targeted noncooperative tariff, and decrease the political economy weights in industries in which the predicted optimal tariff is above the targeted optimal tariff, always controlling for the cross-industry mean. I continue this procedure until the distribution of predicted optimal tariffs converges to the distribution of targeted noncooperative tariffs, as in Figure 1b. For Japan's most extreme noncooperative tariffs, I follow a slightly modified procedure as explained in the main text.

4.5 Derivations

4.5.1 Derivation of equation (14)

Equilibrium conditions (8) and (9) can be approximated as

$$\frac{\Delta P_{js}}{P_{js}} \approx \sum_i \frac{\tau_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta w_i}{w_i} + \frac{\Delta \tau_{ijs}}{\tau_{ijs}} \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{\Delta X_j}{X_j} \approx \frac{w_j L_j}{X_j} \frac{\Delta w_j}{w_j} + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta t_{ijs}}{t_{ijs}} + \frac{\Delta T_{ijs}}{T_{ijs}} \right) + \sum_s \frac{\pi_{js}}{X_j} \frac{\Delta \pi_{js}}{\pi_{js}} \quad (17)$$

These approximations imply

$$\frac{\Delta P_j}{P_j} \approx \sum_i \sum_s \frac{T_{ijs}}{X_j} \frac{\Delta p_{is}}{p_{is}} + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \frac{\Delta p_{is}}{p_{is}} + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \frac{\Delta t_{ijs}}{t_{ijs}} \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{\Delta X_j}{X_j} \approx \sum_i \sum_s \frac{T_{ijs}}{X_j} \frac{\Delta p_{js}}{p_{js}} + \sum_s \frac{\pi_{js}}{X_j} \left(\frac{\Delta \pi_{js}}{\pi_{js}} - \frac{\Delta p_{js}}{p_{js}} \right) + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \frac{\Delta T_{ijs}}{T_{ijs}} + \sum_i \sum_s \frac{t_{ijs} T_{ijs}}{X_j} \frac{\Delta t_{ijs}}{t_{ijs}} \quad (19)$$

which immediately combines to equation (14) since $\frac{\Delta W_j}{W_j} \approx \frac{\Delta X_j}{X_j} - \frac{\Delta P_j}{P_j}$. Notice that changes in profits which are due to changes in prices are attributed to the terms-of-trade effect. Notice also that changes in the price index which directly result from changes in tariffs cancel with changes in tariff revenue which directly result from changes in tariffs.

References

- [1] Alvarez, F. and R. Lucas. 2007. "General Equilibrium Analysis of the Eaton-Kortum Model of International Trade." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 54(6): 1726-1768.
- [2] Bhagwati, J. 1991. "The World Trading System at Risk." Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [3] Bagwell, K. and R. Staiger. 1999. "An Economic Theory of GATT." *American Economic Review* 89(1): 215-248.
- [4] Bagwell, K. and R. Staiger. 2006. *The Economics of the World Trading System*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [5] Bagwell, K. and R. Staiger. 2009a. "Delocation and Trade Agreements in Imperfectly Competitive Markets." Manuscript, Stanford University.
- [6] Bagwell, K. and R. Staiger. 2009b. "Profit Shifting and Trade Agreements in Imperfectly Competitive Markets." Manuscript, Stanford University.
- [7] Bagwell and Staiger. 2011. "What Do Trade Negotiators Negotiate About? Empirical Evidence from the World Trade Organization." *American Economic Review* 101(4): 1238-1273.
- [8] Brander, J. and B. Spencer. 1981. "Tariffs and the Extraction of Foreign Monopoly Rents under Potential Entry." *Canadian Journal of Economics* 14: 371-389.
- [9] Broda, C., N. Limao, and D. Weinstein. 2008. "Optimal Tariffs and Market Power: The Evidence." *American Economic Review* 98(5): 2032-2065.
- [10] Broda, C. and D. Weinstein. 2006. "Globalization and the Gains from Variety." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121(2): 541-585.
- [11] Caliendo, L. and F. Parro. 2011. "Estimates of the Trade and Welfare Effects of NAFTA." Manuscript, University of Chicago.
- [12] Dekle, R., J. Eaton, and S. Kortum. 2007. "Unbalanced Trade." *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 97(2): 351-355.

- [13] Eaton, J. and S. Kortum. 2002. "Technology, Geography, and Trade." *Econometrica* 70(5): 1741-1779.
- [14] Feenstra, R. 1994. "New Product Varieties and the Measurement of International Prices." *American Economic Review* 84(1): 157-177.
- [15] Feenstra, R. 1996. "US Imports, 1972-1994: Data and Concordances." *NBER Working Paper 5515*
- [16] Feenstra, R. 2010. *Product Variety and the Gains from International Trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [17] Flam, H., Helpman, E. 1987. "Industrial Policy under Monopolistic Competition." *Journal of International Economics* 22: 79-102.
- [18] Goldberg, P. and G. Maggi. 1999. "Protection for Sale: An Empirical Investigation." *American Economic Review* 89(5): 1135-1155.
- [19] Grossman, G. and E. Helpman. 1994. "Protection for Sale." *American Economic Review* 84(4): 833-850.
- [20] Hamilton, B. and J. Whalley. 1983. "Optimal Tariff Calculations in Alternative Trade Models and Some Possible Implications for Current World Trading Arrangements." *Journal of International Economics* 15: 323-348.
- [21] Johnson, H. 1953-54. "Optimum Tariffs and Retaliation." *Review of Economic Studies* 21(2): 142-153.
- [22] Martins, J., S. Scarpetta, and D. Pilat. 1996. "Mark-up ratios in manufacturing industries." *OECD Working Paper 162*.
- [23] Markusen, J. and R. Wagle. 1989. "Nash Equilibrium Tariffs for the United States and Canada: The Roles of Country Size, Scale Economies, and Capital Mobility." *Journal of Political Economy* 97(2): 368-386.
- [24] Mayer, W. 1981. "Theoretical Considerations on Negotiated Tariff Adjustments." *Oxford Economic Papers* 33: 135-153.

- [25] Mrazova, M. 2011. "Trade Agreements When Profits Matter." Manuscript, London School of Economics.
- [26] Krugman, P. 1980. "Scale Economies, Product Differentiation, and the Pattern of Trade." *American Economic Review* 70(5): 950-959.
- [27] Ossa, R. 2011. "A "New Trade" Theory of GATT/WTO Negotiations." *Journal of Political Economy* 119(1): 122-152.
- [28] Perroni, C. and J. Whalley. 2000. "The New Regionalism: Trade Liberalization or Insurance?" *Canadian Journal of Economics* 33(1): 1-24.
- [29] Pierce, J. and P. Schott. 2009. "Concording US Harmonized System Codes Over Time." *NBER Working Paper 15548*.
- [30] Ricardo, D. 1817. "On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation." London, United Kingdom: John Murray.
- [31] Simonovska, I. and M. Waugh. 2011. The Elasticity of Trade: Estimates and Evidence. Manuscript, New York University.
- [32] Su, C. and K. Judd. Forthcoming. "Constrained Optimization Approaches to Estimation of Structural Models." *Econometrica*.
- [33] Venables, A. 1987. "Trade and Trade Policy with Differentiated Products: A Chamberlinian-Ricardian Model." *Economic Journal* 97: 700-717.

TABLE 1: Parameter estimates

	σ_s	λ_{BRA}	λ_{CHN}	λ_{EU}	λ_{IND}	λ_{JPN}	λ_{ROW}	λ_{US}
Wheat	10.07	1.29	1.68	1.32	1.67	1.91	1.27	1.24
Rice	7.01	1.23	1.64	1.33	1.38	1.91	1.23	1.19
Dairy	5.89	1.24	1.29	1.34	1.29	1.46	1.25	1.34
Wearing apparel	5.39	1.29	1.46	1.20	1.13	1.03	1.22	1.48
Other metals	4.47	1.11	0.80	1.11	1.05	0.94	1.08	1.16
Vegetable oils, etc	4.03	1.13	1.19	1.11	1.50	0.96	1.08	1.03
Bovine meat products	3.89	1.05	1.16	1.32	1.05	0.95	1.11	1.07
Leather products	3.67	1.18	1.13	1.07	0.97	1.17	1.08	1.22
Ferrous metals	3.67	1.10	0.73	1.04	1.04	0.90	1.03	1.09
Other manufactures	3.53	1.15	1.22	1.02	1.00	0.86	1.04	1.23
Other cereal grains	3.32	0.98	1.22	1.03	1.04	1.72	1.41	0.91
Oil seeds	3.21	0.97	1.01	1.00	1.20	1.79	1.20	1.04
Other meat products	3.20	1.03	1.09	1.12	1.04	0.91	1.11	0.96
Beverages and tobacco products	2.92	1.01	1.45	1.00	1.51	0.93	1.09	1.24
Bovine cattle, etc.	2.91	0.92	0.56	0.98	0.92	0.94	0.91	0.81
Textiles	2.87	1.04	1.19	0.98	0.91	0.82	0.99	1.26
Other transport equipment	2.84	0.91	0.76	0.93	0.74	0.73	0.90	1.03
Plant-based fibers	2.80	0.96	0.58	0.91	0.82	0.73	0.90	0.81
Wool, etc	2.76	0.91	0.85	0.59	0.86	1.37	0.91	0.64
Motor vehicles, etc	2.75	0.99	1.18	0.96	0.96	0.73	0.92	0.90
Metal products	2.70	1.01	0.96	0.91	0.84	0.75	0.91	1.06
Sugar	2.69	0.92	1.22	1.37	1.34	1.27	1.00	0.85
Other food products	2.62	0.90	1.01	0.94	1.05	0.93	0.96	0.89
Paper products, etc.	2.56	0.93	0.67	0.89	0.81	0.73	0.86	0.91
Other crops	2.53	0.92	0.64	0.89	1.12	0.74	0.93	0.80
Electronic equipment	2.49	0.91	0.82	0.87	0.61	0.66	0.84	1.00
Other mineral products	2.47	0.92	0.87	0.88	0.80	0.72	0.89	1.02
Other machinery, etc.	2.46	0.94	0.76	0.87	0.79	0.73	0.83	1.00
Vegetables, etc.	2.42	0.82	0.96	0.91	1.01	0.90	0.90	0.80
Chemical products, etc.	2.34	0.85	0.74	0.83	0.73	0.71	0.81	0.96
Wood products	2.32	0.90	0.77	0.81	0.72	0.71	0.83	0.90
Forestry	2.20	0.77	0.78	0.80	0.61	0.70	0.76	0.61
Other animal products	1.91	0.68	0.59	0.71	0.50	0.72	0.73	0.53
Mean	3.42	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Notes: The entries under σ_s are the estimated elasticities of substitution. The entries under λ_{BRA} until λ_{US} are the estimated political economy weights for each country which are scaled to have a mean of one. The boxes highlight the industries with the five highest values of λ for each country.

TABLE 2: Effects of 50 percentage point increase in US tariff

General equilibrium effects			
	Δ US wage	Δ US production (protected)	Δ US production (other)
Chem.	1.45%	5.73%	-1.40%
Appar.	0.67%	33.35%	-0.97%
Welfare effects			
	Δ US welfare	Terms-of-trade effect	Profit shifting effect
Chem.	0.17%	0.34%	0.12%
Appar.	-0.14%	0.16%	-0.15%

Notes: The entries under "General equilibrium effects" are the percentage change in the US wage normalized such that the average wage change across all countries is zero (column 1), the percentage change in the quantity of output in the US chemicals or apparel industry (column 2), and the average of the percentage changes in the quantity of output in the other US industries (column 3). The entries under "Welfare effects" are the percentage change in US welfare (column 1), the component due to terms-of-trade effects (column 2), and the component due to profit shifting effects (column 3). The values in column 2 and 3 do not add up to the value in column 1 because they are computed using equation (14) which is a linear approximation. Here, all changes are computed relative to factual tariffs.

TABLE 3a: Optimal tariffs without lobbying

	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
Brazil	1.1%	-0.1%	1.1%	-0.1%	18.2%	-3.0%	0.8%	-0.0%	56.1%
China	1.8%	-0.6%	1.8%	-0.6%	17.6%	-2.9%	0.5%	-0.1%	59.3%
EU	1.9%	-1.0%	1.9%	-1.0%	22.5%	-3.7%	0.1%	-0.2%	61.3%
India	1.7%	-0.1%	1.7%	-0.1%	8.7%	-1.5%	2.7%	-0.1%	54.0%
Japan	4.0%	-0.3%	4.0%	-0.3%	18.6%	-3.1%	1.7%	-0.1%	59.6%
RoW	2.9%	-1.7%	2.9%	-1.7%	19.0%	-3.2%	1.1%	-0.6%	61.5%
US	2.3%	-0.9%	2.3%	-0.9%	23.8%	-4.0%	0.6%	-0.1%	60.3%
Mean	2.2%	-0.7%	2.2%	-0.7%	18.3%	-3.1%	1.1%	-0.2%	58.9%

TABLE 3b: Optimal tariffs with lobbying

	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
Brazil	0.9%	-0.1%	1.0%	-0.1%	18.1%	-3.0%	0.3%	-0.0%	54.2%
China	1.5%	-0.4%	1.5%	-0.5%	13.3%	-2.2%	0.1%	-0.0%	60.7%
EU	2.1%	-1.2%	1.7%	-1.1%	26.8%	-4.5%	-0.9%	0.1%	69.4%
India	0.5%	-0.0%	0.7%	-0.0%	11.4%	-1.9%	0.6%	-0.0%	49.9%
Japan	2.6%	-0.4%	1.0%	-0.4%	30.0%	-5.0%	-1.4%	0.1%	77.5%
RoW	2.9%	-1.7%	2.6%	-1.8%	21.9%	-3.7%	-0.1%	-0.2%	68.9%
US	2.5%	-0.9%	2.1%	-0.9%	26.4%	-4.4%	-0.2%	0.0%	56.4%
Mean	1.9%	-0.7%	1.5%	-0.7%	21.1%	-3.5%	-0.2%	0.0%	62.4%

TABLE 3c: Sensitivity of optimal tariffs w.r.t. σ_s

Without lobbying (all values are means)									
σ	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
mean	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
3.5	2.2%	-0.6%	2.2%	-0.6%	17.6%	-2.9%	1.1%	-0.2%	56.8%
5.0	1.7%	-0.4%	1.7%	-0.4%	9.1%	-1.5%	1.1%	-0.2%	34.3%
6.5	1.5%	-0.2%	1.5%	-0.2%	5.4%	-0.9%	1.1%	-0.2%	24.6%
With lobbying (all values are means)									
σ	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
mean	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
3.5	1.8%	-0.6%	1.5%	-0.6%	20.2%	-3.4%	-0.2%	0.0%	60.1%
5.0	1.2%	-0.4%	0.9%	-0.4%	10.5%	-1.8%	-0.2%	0.0%	35.5%
6.5	1.1%	-0.3%	0.7%	-0.3%	6.6%	-1.1%	-0.2%	0.0%	25.9%

Notes: The entries under "gvt. welfare" are the percentage changes in G , the entries under "welfare" are the percentage changes in W , the entries under "wage" are the percentage changes in w normalized such that the average wage change across all countries is zero, the entries under "profits" are the percentage changes in total profits due to changes in industry output, and the entries under "opt. tariff" are the medians of the optimal tariffs. The entries under "own" are the effects on the tariff imposing country while the entries under "other" are the averages of the effects on all other countries. The last rows of Tables 3a and 3b report averages. Table 3c reports only such averages.

TABLE 4a: Optimal tariffs without lobbying under MFN

	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
Brazil	1.1%	-0.1%	1.1%	-0.1%	18.2%	-3.0%	0.8%	-0.0%	56.2%
China	1.8%	-0.6%	1.8%	-0.6%	17.6%	-2.9%	0.5%	-0.1%	59.9%
EU	1.9%	-1.0%	1.9%	-1.0%	22.4%	-3.7%	0.1%	-0.2%	60.9%
India	1.7%	-0.1%	1.7%	-0.1%	8.7%	-1.5%	2.7%	-0.1%	54.0%
Japan	4.0%	-0.3%	4.0%	-0.3%	18.6%	-3.1%	1.7%	-0.1%	59.6%
RoW	2.8%	-1.7%	2.8%	-1.7%	19.0%	-3.2%	1.1%	-0.6%	63.0%
US	2.3%	-0.9%	2.3%	-0.9%	23.8%	-4.0%	0.6%	-0.1%	60.8%
Mean	2.2%	-0.7%	2.2%	-0.7%	18.3%	-3.1%	1.1%	-0.2%	59.2%

TABLE 4b: Optimal tariffs with lobbying under MFN

	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
Brazil	0.9%	-0.1%	1.0%	-0.1%	18.1%	-3.0%	0.3%	-0.0%	54.2%
China	1.5%	-0.4%	1.5%	-0.5%	13.3%	-2.2%	0.1%	-0.0%	61.7%
EU	2.1%	-1.2%	1.7%	-1.1%	26.8%	-4.5%	-0.9%	0.1%	68.7%
India	0.5%	-0.0%	0.7%	-0.0%	11.4%	-1.9%	0.6%	-0.0%	50.0%
Japan	2.6%	-0.4%	1.0%	-0.4%	30.0%	-5.0%	-1.4%	0.1%	77.8%
RoW	2.9%	-1.7%	2.5%	-1.8%	22.0%	-3.7%	-0.1%	-0.2%	68.7%
US	2.5%	-0.9%	2.1%	-0.9%	26.4%	-4.4%	-0.2%	0.0%	57.5%
Mean	1.9%	-0.7%	1.5%	-0.7%	21.1%	-3.5%	-0.2%	0.0%	62.6%

TABLE 4c: Sensitivity of optimal tariffs w.r.t. σ_s under MFN

Without lobbying (all values are means)									
σ	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
mean	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
3.5	2.2%	-0.6%	2.2%	-0.6%	17.6%	-2.9%	1.1%	-0.2%	57.2%
5.0	1.7%	-0.4%	1.7%	-0.4%	9.0%	-1.5%	1.1%	-0.2%	34.4%
6.5	1.5%	-0.2%	1.5%	-0.2%	5.4%	-0.9%	1.1%	-0.2%	24.7%
With lobbying (all values are means)									
σ	Δ gvt. welfare		Δ welfare		Δ wage		Δ profits		opt. tariff
mean	own	other	own	other	own	other	own	other	median
3.5	1.8%	-0.6%	1.5%	-0.6%	20.2%	-3.4%	-0.2%	0.0%	60.4%
5.0	1.2%	-0.4%	0.9%	-0.4%	10.5%	-1.8%	-0.2%	0.0%	35.6%
6.5	1.1%	-0.3%	0.7%	-0.3%	6.6%	-1.1%	-0.2%	0.0%	25.9%

Notes: The entries under "gvt. welfare" are the percentage changes in G , the entries under "welfare" are the percentage changes in W , the entries under "wage" are the percentage changes in w normalized such that the average wage change across all countries is zero, the entries under "profits" are the percentage changes in total profits due to changes in industry output, and the entries under "opt. tariff" are the medians of the optimal tariffs. The entries under "own" are the effects on the tariff imposing country while the entries under "other" are the averages of the effects on all other countries. The last rows of Tables 4a and 4b report averages. Table 4c reports only such averages.

TABLE 5a: Nash tariffs without lobbying

	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
Brazil	-1.9%	-1.9%	1.3%	0.4%	56.4%
China	-2.2%	-2.2%	0.5%	-0.2%	58.6%
EU	-2.6%	-2.6%	2.7%	-0.9%	59.1%
India	-2.2%	-2.2%	-9.3%	1.9%	54.5%
Japan	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.6%	0.7%	58.5%
RoW	-5.0%	-5.0%	-0.8%	-0.6%	59.7%
US	-2.2%	-2.2%	6.3%	-0.3%	59.6%
Mean	-2.4%	-2.4%	0.0%	0.2%	58.1%

TABLE 5b: Nash tariffs with lobbying

	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
Brazil	-2.6%	-2.5%	-4.6%	0.5%	54.6%
China	-3.4%	-2.9%	-7.1%	0.3%	62.9%
EU	-2.2%	-2.7%	5.5%	-1.2%	69.3%
India	-3.6%	-3.3%	-10.5%	0.8%	53.9%
Japan	-1.0%	-2.7%	11.5%	-1.7%	77.6%
RoW	-5.3%	-5.5%	-1.4%	0.0%	68.4%
US	-2.0%	-2.4%	6.5%	-0.2%	56.6%
Mean	-2.9%	-3.2%	0.0%	-0.2%	63.3%

TABLE 5c: Sensitivity of Nash tariffs w.r.t. σ_s

Without lobbying (all values are means)					
σ_{mean}	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
3.5	-2.3%	-2.3%	0.0%	0.2%	56.0%
5.0	-1.0%	-1.0%	0.0%	0.3%	34.4%
6.5	-0.3%	-0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	25.4%
With lobbying (all values are means)					
σ_{mean}	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
3.5	-2.8%	-3.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	61.1%
5.0	-1.5%	-1.7%	0.0%	-0.1%	36.2%
6.5	-0.8%	-1.1%	0.0%	-0.1%	26.7%

Notes: The entries under "gvt. welfare" are the percentage changes in G , the entries under "welfare" are the percentage changes in W , the entries under "wage" are the percentage changes in w normalized such that the average wage change across all countries is zero, the entries under "profits" are the percentage changes in total profits due to changes in industry output, and the entries under "Nash tariff" are the medians of the Nash tariffs. The last rows of Tables 5a and 5b report averages. Table 5c reports only such averages.

TABLE 6a: Nash tariffs without lobbying under MFN

	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
Brazil	-1.8%	-1.8%	2.0%	0.5%	56.4%
China	-2.3%	-2.3%	0.0%	-0.2%	59.4%
EU	-2.5%	-2.5%	3.1%	-0.9%	58.7%
India	-2.1%	-2.1%	-9.3%	1.9%	54.9%
Japan	-0.7%	-0.7%	-0.7%	0.8%	58.6%
RoW	-5.0%	-5.0%	-1.0%	-0.6%	60.4%
US	-2.2%	-2.2%	5.8%	-0.3%	60.0%
Mean	-2.4%	-2.4%	0.0%	0.2%	58.3%

TABLE 6b: Nash tariffs with lobbying under MFN

	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
Brazil	-2.5%	-2.4%	-3.7%	0.5%	54.6%
China	-3.5%	-2.9%	-7.4%	0.3%	63.6%
EU	-2.1%	-2.6%	5.9%	-1.2%	68.8%
India	-3.6%	-3.3%	-10.5%	0.8%	54.2%
Japan	-1.1%	-2.8%	10.8%	-1.7%	77.9%
RoW	-5.3%	-5.6%	-1.4%	0.0%	66.9%
US	-2.1%	-2.5%	6.2%	-0.2%	57.8%
Mean	-2.9%	-3.2%	0.0%	-0.2%	63.4%

TABLE 6c: Sensitivity of Nash tariffs w.r.t. σ_s under MFN

Without lobbying (all values are means)					
σ_{mean}	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
3.5	-2.3%	-2.3%	0.0%	0.2%	56.2%
5.0	-1.0%	-1.0%	0.0%	0.3%	34.5%
6.5	-0.2%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	25.4%
With lobbying (all values are means)					
σ_{mean}	Δ gvt. welfare	Δ welfare	Δ wage	Δ profits	Nash tariff
3.5	-2.8%	-3.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	61.1%
5.0	-1.5%	-1.7%	0.0%	-0.1%	36.3%
6.5	-0.8%	-1.1%	0.0%	-0.1%	26.8%

Notes: The entries under "gvt. welfare" are the percentage changes in G , the entries under "welfare" are the percentage changes in W , the entries under "wage" are the percentage changes in w normalized such that the average wage change across all countries is zero, the entries under "profits" are the percentage changes in total profits due to changes in industry output, and the entries under "Nash tariff" are the medians of the Nash tariffs. The last rows of Tables 6a and 6b report averages. Table 6c reports only such averages.

TABLE 7a: Cooperative tariffs without lobbying

	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
Brazil	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	9.2%	6.1%	0.1%	-0.7%	-0.7%	0.0%
China	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	0.0%	0.2%	-0.2%	-0.8%	-0.9%	0.2%
EU	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	-2.1%	2.7%	0.1%	1.0%	0.3%	0.0%
India	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	5.8%	-4.0%	-0.1%	-0.9%	1.0%	0.2%
Japan	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	-2.7%	-9.4%	0.6%	1.4%	1.8%	-0.2%
RoW	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	-6.0%	1.8%	-0.2%	0.6%	-0.2%	0.3%
US	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	-4.2%	2.8%	-0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%
Mean	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	3.4%	0.5%	0.03%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%

TABLE 7b: Cooperative tariffs with lobbying

	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
Brazil	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	3.4%	0.4%	0.25%	10.7%	3.3%	1.5%	-0.8%	-0.2%	0.5%
China	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	1.0%	-1.6%	-1.27%	-4.6%	-8.1%	-3.1%	-2.3%	-2.1%	-1.4%
EU	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	4.2%	0.5%	0.16%	-1.9%	1.7%	1.3%	1.5%	0.2%	0.0%
India	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	3.3%	0.6%	-1.00%	4.8%	0.3%	-1.1%	-0.8%	0.1%	-0.8%
Japan	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	4.8%	0.4%	-0.53%	-0.9%	1.2%	0.8%	1.7%	0.4%	-0.6%
RoW	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	4.1%	0.6%	0.23%	-4.5%	1.1%	1.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%
US	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	4.0%	0.6%	0.13%	-3.5%	0.6%	-0.4%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Mean	3.6%	0.4%	0.2%	3.6%	0.2%	-0.29%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%	-0.1%

TABLE 7c: Sensitivity of cooperative tariffs w.r.t. σ_s

σ	Without lobbying (all values are means)											
	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
mean	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
3.5	3.3%	0.5%	0.03%	3.3%	0.5%	0.03%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
5.0	2.2%	0.8%	0.01%	2.2%	0.8%	0.01%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
6.5	1.7%	1.1%	0.01%	1.7%	1.1%	0.01%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
σ	With lobbying (all values are means)											
	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
mean	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
3.5	3.5%	0.5%	0.2%	3.4%	0.2%	-0.29%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%	-0.1%
5.0	2.2%	0.7%	0.3%	2.1%	0.4%	-0.31%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.1%	0.0%
6.5	1.7%	0.9%	0.4%	1.6%	0.6%	-0.39%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%

Notes: The entries under "gvt. welfare" are the percentage changes in G , the entries under "welfare" are the percentage changes in W , the entries under "wage" are the percentage changes in w normalized such that the average wage change across all countries is zero, and the entries under "profits" are the percentage changes in total profits due to changes in industry output. The individual columns refer to trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs, factual tariffs, and free trade, respectively. The last rows of Tables 7a and 7b report averages. Table 7c reports only such averages.

TABLE 8a: Cooperative tariffs without lobbying under MFN

	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
Brazil	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	10.5%	3.3%	0.0%	-0.4%	-0.5%	0.1%
China	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	-0.3%	-0.6%	-0.2%	-0.5%	-0.9%	0.2%
EU	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	-2.3%	1.2%	0.1%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%
India	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	5.2%	-5.9%	-0.2%	-0.4%	1.0%	0.3%
Japan	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	-2.9%	0.6%	0.7%	1.2%	0.5%	-0.1%
RoW	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	-6.0%	0.5%	-0.2%	0.3%	-0.1%	0.3%
US	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	-4.2%	0.8%	-0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%
Mean	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	3.3%	0.3%	0.03%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%

TABLE 8b: Cooperative tariffs with lobbying under MFN

	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
Brazil	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	3.3%	0.3%	0.15%	9.9%	2.4%	0.6%	-0.7%	-0.3%	0.5%
China	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.2%	-0.5%	-0.24%	-1.0%	-5.1%	-0.4%	-1.1%	-1.0%	-0.2%
EU	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	3.9%	0.4%	0.02%	-2.8%	0.8%	0.5%	1.2%	0.2%	-0.1%
India	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	3.3%	0.5%	-0.27%	4.0%	0.6%	-0.3%	-0.7%	0.2%	-0.3%
Japan	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	4.4%	0.3%	-0.44%	-1.1%	0.3%	-0.6%	1.3%	0.4%	-0.4%
RoW	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	4.0%	0.4%	-0.01%	-5.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%
US	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	3.8%	0.4%	0.08%	-3.6%	0.5%	-0.1%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%
Mean	3.4%	0.3%	0.1%	3.6%	0.2%	-0.10%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%

TABLE 8c: Sensitivity of cooperative tariffs w.r.t. σ_s under MFN

σ	Without lobbying (all values are means)											
	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
mean	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
3.5	3.2%	0.3%	0.03%	3.2%	0.3%	0.03%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
5.0	2.1%	0.6%	0.01%	2.1%	0.6%	0.01%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
6.5	1.6%	0.8%	0.01%	1.6%	0.8%	0.01%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.1%	-0.1%	0.1%
σ	With lobbying (all values are means)											
	Δ gvt. welfare			Δ welfare			Δ wage			Δ profits		
mean	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free	Nash	Fact.	Free
3.5	3.3%	0.3%	0.1%	3.4%	0.2%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
5.0	2.0%	0.4%	0.1%	2.1%	0.3%	-0.15%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%	0.1%
6.5	1.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%	0.3%	-0.19%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%	0.1%

Notes: The entries under "gvt. welfare" are the percentage changes in G , the entries under "welfare" are the percentage changes in W , the entries under "wage" are the percentage changes in w normalized such that the average wage change across all countries is zero, and the entries under "profits" are the percentage changes in total profits due to changes in industry output. The individual columns refer to trade negotiations starting at Nash tariffs, factual tariffs, and free trade, respectively. The last rows of Tables 8a and 8b report averages. Table 8c reports only such averages.




Figure 1a: Optimal tariffs without lobbying




Figure 1b: Optimal tariffs with lobbying




Figure 2a: Nash tariffs without lobbying




Figure 2b: Nash tariffs with lobbying




Figure 3a: Cooperative tariffs without lobbying starting at Nash tariffs




Figure 3b: Cooperative tariffs without lobbying starting at factual tariffs




Figure 3c: Cooperative tariffs without lobbying starting at zero tariffs







Figure 4: Discriminatory versus nondiscriminatory tariff reductions