

Conclusions

History will record the Uruguay Round as the most ambitious of all the post-war Rounds. Indeed, it may record a judgement of over-ambition. It is easy to see the Round as essentially a bilateral struggle between the US and EU, with most friction being generated by temperate zone agriculture. This is over-simplistic. The complexity of the Round was fashioned by the range of issues covered and the number of CPs involved. Both were influenced by the more active participation of developing countries in the agenda setting and negotiation of the issues, compared with previous Rounds. There were many issues on the Round's agenda which were essentially developing country issues. This is important to recognise in any overall assessment.

The interests of developing countries are diverse, given the range and structure of those countries which fall into that set. This is as true of CDCs as it is of developing countries in general. The eventual deals which were struck

were inevitably fashioned more by the major protagonists than by developing countries individually or collectively. Nevertheless there is much to be welcomed in the Round from a CDC perspective. Chief among these potential gains are improvements in market access, commitments to reduce dependence on source-specific quotas in DMEs, commitments to phase out the MFA and reduce protection in temperate zone agricultural products, and the general tightening up of disciplines, including those relating to dispute settlement. Equally there are some threats, particularly those which could arise from a sanctioning of discriminatory intervention under Article XIX and the greater competitive pressures resulting from the TRIPs and services agreements. Nonetheless, it must be the case that CDCs are better off with the Uruguay Round agreements and a strengthened set of disciplines and obligations governing world trade, not only in the long run but also in the short run.