

How far is it from Rome to Lisbon? EU trade policy and bargaining power from 1958 until today

Prof. Dirk De Bièvre, PhD EUI

Department of Political Science University of Antwerp, Flanders, Belgium

dirk.debievre@uantwerpen.be



Dalhousie University, 6 February 2020

Universiteit Antwerpen



The road from Rome to Lisbon...

- Treaty of Rome (1957)
 EC-6 rise to trade policy power
- From GATT Kennedy Round (1964) to Uruguay Round, creating the WTO (1995)
 EU shapes multilateral trade regime with US
- Status quo power (1996 2020) & the Treaty of Lisbon (2009)
 - Failure of Doha Development Round (2006)
 - Bilateral trade negotiations (S-Korea, CETA, TTIP, Japan, etc.)



Two sources of trade policy bargaining power

- a) Attractiveness of internal market, relative to other trading entities in the world: varies over time...
- b) Consensus decision rule in Council: *a* constant
 - Reinforces bargaining power when attractive
 - Reduces bargaining when relative attractiveness is lower: a paradox of weakness
 - Large autonomy of negotiator, small bargaining power
 - Small autonomy of negotiator, large bargaining power



EU as co-shaper of multilateral trade regime with US 1958-1994 (1)

Obtaining transatlantic trade liberalization, whilst protecting agriculture & textiles

- Kennedy Round & **USA** liberalization:
 - US as demanding market access to EC
 - US having to accept absence of liberalization in agriculture

- Developing countries:

- subject to quota for tariff free market access, flanked with development aid
- blocks long-term trade development
- locks-in oligopolistic reliance on primary products, often consolidating autocratic political systems



EU as co-shaper of multilateral trade regime with US 1958-1994 (2)

- Expansion of WTO's regulatory reach
 - Rules limiting abuse of antidumping & subsidies (Tokyo/Uruguay Round)
 - Agreements with large adjustment costs for others: services, IPR, public procurement, TBTs, rules of origin, SPS, investment (Uruguay Round)
- **Institutionalization** of these policy preferences through stronger dispute settlement in WTO

Why?

- Threat of exclusion from GATT liberalization
- **Issue linkage** in 'Single Undertaking' (with US)



Status quo power: 1997-2020 (1)

- Why no longer in driving seat?
 - Threat of exclusion no longer available
 - UR obligation to re-open agriculture negotiations
 - Political rise of emerging economies
 - Bindingness of rules turns against EU, esp. in agriculture
- → For 1st time, EU is *demandeur* for a Round
- → EU attempts but fails to broaden agenda & functional scope of WTO
 - Services, IPR & geographical indications, trade-and-environment
 - Government procurement, competition, investment
 - 'Millennium Round' becomes 'Doha Development Agenda'
- → EU turns to bilateral & regional negotiations in 2005 (with Korea, Japan, Canada, US, Mercosur, ...)

Universiteit Antwerpen



Constraining effect of EU decision-rules under Lisbon Treaty of 2009

• Consensus practice

- under the shadow of a QMV vote for 'exclusive' competences'
- broad interpretation since ECJ Singapore Opinion (May 2017): including environment, labor, intellectual property, outward investment

• **Unanimity** for:

- 'mixed' agreements: e.g. with investment arbitration
- Agreements that take the legal form of association agreements (= a strategic choice of EU member states, not the Commission)
- Largely remained constant over time



Effects on EU bargaining power

- A 'paradox of weakness' in negotiations
 - If other side wants a deal, small margin of manoeuvre of Commission negotiator = large EU bargaining power
 → surprise / frustration in negotiation partner
 - 2. If not: collapse

 → recriminations EU cannot get its act together
- Strength in enforcement: quasi automatic
 - Threat of retaliation in response to WTO violations
 - → EU Reg of 2014: reverse majority!!
 - Reaction to WTO panel rulings, now without AB rulings
- Weakness:
 - Investment arbitration; association agreement
 - Inward investment (only screening)



References

- De Bièvre & Poletti (2013), 'The EU in Trade Policy: From Regime Maker to Status Quo Power', Falkner & Patrick Müller (ed.), EU Policies in a Global Perspective. London: Routledge.
- Gstöhl & De Bièvre (2018), The Trade Policy of the European Union. London: Macmillan Int. Education.
- De Bièvre (2018), 'The Paradox of Weakness in European Trade Policy: Contestation and Resilience in CETA and TTIP Negotiations', The International Spectator 53(3):70-85.

