

forward. This supports the view that broader trade-offs are essential for forward movement in this area.

From a governance perspective, the agricultural trade negotiations highlight several issues.

First, there is the central role in shaping the Doha outcome played by the European Union's insistence that its own internal reforms to the Common Agricultural Policy *not* be pre-judged in any way by the multilateral trade negotiations.<sup>24</sup> The tough negotiations and the sophisticated language used to present the outcome is indicative of the scope for multilateral rules to impinge on domestic rulemaking—and the result is indicative of the privileged position of the larger economies in determining the outcome of trade rounds.

Second, there is the complicated issue of “non-trade” concerns.

Third, there is the conflict between the commitment made by the industrialized countries to open up markets for developing country agricultural exports and the entrenched position of agricultural producers in domestic politics within the advanced countries.

Fourth, the pressure on family farm incomes is undermining support for trade liberalization in agriculture even in successful exporting countries. This may have less to do with trade liberalization *per se* than, as was argued at the conference, with the mergers and take-overs that have increased corporate concentration in various links in the agri-food production chain, including upstream equipment/input suppliers and downstream processors/ distributors.

### *Trade-related Issues*

The intersections between trade and other policy issues that are affected by trade and/or in their turn impact on trade policy are the focus of much of the concern about trade policy and especially about further liberalization. The rules that are to

---

<sup>24</sup> This was at the crux of the issue about the interpretation of the words “with a view to” elimination of export subsidies.