

Other writers addressing various aspects of the theme that the trade policy system provides scope for protection, restrictionism, and cartelization are Malmgren, Grey, Dunkel, Curzon, Patterson, Baldwin and Bergsten.

In his important paper prepared for a conference on trade policy organized by the Washington-based Institute for International Economics in 1982, Malmgren described what has been happening as "a mood... of neo-mercantilism" and characterized the growth of so-called industrial policies of sectorial intervention as being "adjustment resistance policies".²⁴

X
Grey has consistently held to the view that the developing trade policy system, particular as sanctioned by the non-tariff measures agreements of the Tokyo Round, was best understood as a system of highly detailed, discriminatory legalistic intervention and that the literature of "trade liberalization" should best be viewed as part of the rhetoric of political presentation, rather than as an accurate description of trade policy in practice, or of the motives of the players.²⁵ In a paper delivered in 1980 at the University of Western Ontario, Grey stated: "It does not seem to have been realized that as tariffs came down, some other devices would have to be used to meet the demands of domestic producers who could make a politically convincing case for protection. Hence the growing emphasis on "fair trade"... Given these developments, the commercial policy system of the United States, in particular — but also of the EEC and, in due course, of Canada — will be a system in which the central set of mechanisms for interventions will be "contingency measures" rather than tariff measures. It is not clear that such a system will provide a more open and more stable trading environment than a system relying on a structure of moderate tariffs, bound against increase... the new GATT now sanctions, even makes obligatory, systems centered on the concept of contingency protection."²⁶

Grey's view on a nutshell

Gerard and Victoria Curzon formulated their concern about the decay in the international trade order by identifying the GATT as a "multi-tier system" rather than a one-tier system of rights and obligations that apply on equal terms and with equal force and relevance between all the signatories.²⁷

Arthur Dunkel, the second and present Director General of the GATT, has repeatedly and emphatically expressed his concern over the impact of protectionist policies that ignore the GATT rules and the GATT as a forum. Dunkel has stated: "The tendency toward bilateralism and sectorialism on trade policy is the greatest present danger both politically and economically to order and prosperity in the world economy...".²⁸

Gardiner Patterson, the distinguished American economist and Deputy Director General of the GATT during the Tokyo Round, has identified the protectionist policies and the emphasis on discrimination of the European Community as one of the sources of disorder in the international trade system.²⁹

Robert Baldwin, one of the most prominent and prolific academic writers on trade policy in the U.S., and adviser during trade negotiations to the U.S. government, has tended to emphasize the importance of tariff reductions and to assume that "liberalization" is a reality. More recently, he has expressed some skepticism as to the character of U.S. trade policy; in a paper presented at a conference convened by the National Bureau of Economic Research in 1982, he identified a number of policy changes, one of which is "the increase in the use of