

## **WTO - Strain in the Global Trading Order**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- The effective functioning of WTO has come under intense strain recently, due to the deadlock between the developed and the developing world.

\n

- Also, the US seems to want a whole new system to replace WTO, as China is posing a formidable challenge to its global dominance.

\n

\n\n

### **What is the historical perspective?**

\n\n

\n

- Powerful western countries have controlled the global trade in the past 5 centuries - by rules if possible, and by war if necessary.

\n

- Between 16th to 19th centuries, Britain and other imperial powers, powered by the industrial revolution, colonised most parts of the rest of the world.

\n

- The colonies provided the source for raw materials and also the markets for their surplus produce - an arrangement that enriched their coffers massively.

\n

- If rulers were hindering free and unrestricted trade as per the liking of the imperialists, war was used as a means to usher in political change.

\n

- Also, wars were fought to control strategic aspects of trade, like the four Anglo-Dutch wars that were fought to control sea routes.

\n

- British success in controlling the seas and its subsequent territorial conquests crowned it Britain as the undisputed power in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century.

\n

\n\n

## How did trade policies change over the years?

\n\n

\n

- **The Strain** - Rising awareness among the colonial masses and the spread of nationalistic was straining the earlier style of promoting trade by war.

\n

- But trade wars continued in official policy parleys till most colonies forced their way to liberation after the end of 2<sup>nd</sup> world war (WW-II).

\n

- **New Order** - The comprehensive victory WW-II victory gave confidence to the US and Britain to envision an era of rules based trading order.

\n

\n\n

\n

- Notably, they had already mastered the industrial system and most of their products were innovated and mass produced efficiently and cheaply.

\n

- Given their dominant economic position, the rest of the world was forced to buy their products out of sheer need, which obliterated the need for war.

\n

- The best way to enhance trade was by pushing for reduction in tariffs, and General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) was to achieve precisely that.

\n

- Notably, GATT member countries reduced import duties significantly during 1947-1986 period through eight rounds of negotiations.

\n

- **WTO** - US and EU clearly reigned over GATT's decisions, but GATT had its limitations as it formulated rules for trade in goods only.

\n

- The growth of pharma industries and services sector mandated more extensive global trade rules for expanding American and European businesses.

\n

- Hence, WTO was born in 1995 to replace GATT and to accommodate the new interests like "Intellectual Property Rights" (IPR).

\n

- Also, the "Dispute Settlement Mechanism" was recreated as an efficient body for disputes resolution with the provision for appeal.

\n

- **The Constrain** - Believing that low import duties are essential for trade growth, US and EU committed to almost zero bound duty for most products.

- \n
- This commitment meant an acceptance in the WTO that they won't increase the import tariffs in future and hence any such move would be a violation.
  - Notably, most developing countries (including China) refrained from such commitments, and hence have retained their sovereign right over tariffs.
  - This inadvertent pledge seems to be constraining US and EU immensely, and has caused their share in global trade volumes to fall considerably.
  - More specifically, in the 1990s, the US and EU could not foresee the rise of China, which was to soon become the manufacturing hub of the world.
- \n

\n\n

### **How has the rise of China changed the dynamics?**

\n\n

- \n
- US and EU had got most WTO members to sign a plurilateral Agreement called the "Information Technology Agreement" in 1996.
  - This was in anticipation of promoting their dominance in Computer and telecom products as most others had then lacked the technical know-how.
  - Yet, most of the benefits of the ITA were cornered by China, which had emerged as the largest electronics and IT product exporter by a big margin.
  - By 2010 it became a leading supplier of computers, mobile phones, washing machines, TVs, organic chemicals, steel and many other items of everyday use.
  - It produces everything from capital-intensive products like factory machinery to labour-intensive products like shoes and umbrellas.
  - China made its own rules for conducting trade by offering free land, power, tax breaks and cheap labour to entice the MNCs to invest there.
  - Wherever necessary, it also stole "intellectual property" (in violation of the IPR agreement) and forced technology transfer obligations at times.
- \n

\n\n

### **Why and how is WTO getting undermined?**

\n\n

\n

- Presently, US and EU are unable to bully the developing countries like India and China the way they have been doing earlier.

\n

- Also, as the decision-making process is consensus-driven, it leaves no scope for unilateral pushing of the agenda by muscling a majority.

\n

- Hence, the US and the EU have probably decided that the WTO in its current avatar is of no use to them, which explains Trump's attempts at weakening it.

\n

- His decision to impose import duty on steel and aluminium from China violate the USA's commitment to "ZERO duty" made at the WTO in 1995.

\n

- Notably, Trump used the 'threat to national security' clause, for imposing tariffs, which is a last resort for exceptional circumstances.

\n

- US has also been blocking the appointment of members to the Appellate Committee, which is increasing case pendency and choking the system.

\n

\n\n

### **How is the dispute shaping up at WTO summits?**

\n\n

\n

- There have been serious contestations between the developed and developing countries regarding agriculture subsidies and their classifications.

\n

- Notably, developing countries (lead by India) are arguing for renegotiating the "Agreement on Agriculture" which they feel is favouring rich counties.

\n

- But contrarily, with little regard for these concerns, the richer countries want to push through newer domains like e-commerce, and investment facilitation.

\n

- The stalemate is only growing stronger and global trade is expected to be the first causality of the weakening international system.

\n

- Also, while a major trade war between US and China seems inevitable, India may probably remain a keen bystander that is focused on its internal economy.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Business Line**

\n

