

is to some extent negated by the fact that the WTO is a leaky organization (attributed by some to the presence of reasonable people on the inside) and can be pushed back by members.²⁹ Nonetheless, as was argued, since the WTO does not derive its power formally, it is difficult for this power to be transparently subjected to discipline. It was also observed that, in India, the WTO is paid far more attention than is accorded the IMF or the World Bank.

Many of those who see the WTO as inordinately weak argue that it should be strengthened, armed with larger budgets and more personnel, and granted greater executive powers to deal with, at a minimum, lower-level administrative decisions and technical interpretations. Conversely, those who see the WTO as too powerful would like to see its influence cut back to increase its democratic legitimacy. It is not clear that there is a feasible middle ground.

While the WTO of presently 144 members is a radically different organization than the original GATT of 23, its decision-making architecture has not changed. Nor is it likely to change any time soon because the consensus format is a major source of power within the institution for the smaller members. Equally importantly, institutional reform of the WTO is not a high priority for the United States.

The WTO thus remains without a management committee. As well, it lacks a policy forum in which to debate divisive issues, something which it did have prior to the disbandment of the Consultative Group of 18 (CG18). Finally, a way to meet the developing countries' concern about not being fully part of the negotiating process has not yet been sorted out.

At the same time, the proposals put forward at Doha on "external transparency" were greeted with yawns, reflecting perhaps a perception that the anti-globalization demonstrations had passed their peak (a perception which many in civil society

²⁹ The Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) was indeed forced to disinvite *amicus curiae* briefs in the course of a dispute when members called a special session of the General Council to protest what they saw as the DSB deciding an issue that members had left undecided in the Uruguay Round