Journal of African Foreign Affairs (JoAFA)
ISSN 2056-5658 (Online) ISSN 2056-564X (Print)
Published consistently since 2014
Indexed by: IBSS, JSTOR, EBSCO, ERIH PLUS, ProQuest, J-Gate and Sabinet

Volume 13, Number 1, April 2026
pp 7 - 25

The WTO's 30th Anniversary: Reimagining Multilateralism in the 21st Century

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31920/2056-5658/2026/v13n1a1

Mr Tanatsiwa Dambuza
PhD Candidate, University of Pretoria, Doctoral Research Assistant, The African Centre for the Study of the United Sates, University of Pretoria (ACSUS-UP), Research Associate, African Institute of International Trade and Diplomacy, tanatsiwadambuza62@gmail.com

Dr Levious Chiukira,
Research Associate, University of Johannesburg, Lecturer, Midlands State University

Dr Authur F Chikerema,
Lecturer, Midlands State University

Mr Ray Masuku,
Research Associate, Africa Trade Solutions Consulting

…………………………………………………………………………

Abstract

As the World Trade Organisation's (WTO) celebrates its 30th anniversary in 2025, it faces significant challenges to its promotion of global trade multilateralism. It was established in 1995 to create a rules-based global trade framework for trade negotiations, dispute resolution and reduction of trade barriers. Over the last decades, it has contributed to global economic integration especially for developing countries. However, rising protectionism, the proliferation of regional trade agreements, and the failure to conclude major trade rounds have increasingly hindered the WTO's ability to maintain a multilateral trade system. There is a shift toward unilateralism which is evidenced by the trade policies of the Trump administration which puts more emphasis on tariffs, trade wars and bilateral agreements over multilateral cooperation. These actions, including the U.S.-China trade war, the blockage of appointments to the WTO's Appellate Body and withdrawal from agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), have further fragmented the global trade system. This paper uses a qualitative research methodology by using content analysis of WTO documents and policy reports in order to examine the WTO's evolution and its responses to these challenges. The study uses a comparative analysis in order to evaluate the increasing significance of regional and bilateral trade agreements and their influence on multilateralism. Moreover, this study argues that the WTO must undergo significant reforms so that it remains relevant. The WTO must modernise its rules in order to address key issues related to digital trade and environmental sustainability as well as reforming its dispute resolution mechanism so that trade is facilitated to ensure shared prosperity, innovation or growth and poverty reduction through trade for all developing countries. Therefore, the future of global trade governance depends on the WTO's ability to adapt to new realities and restoring multilateralism in a world that is fragmented.

Keywords: *The WTO's 30th Anniversary, Reimagining Multilateralism, 21st Century*

Introduction

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) was founded in 1995 to build a rules-based system for global trade. It succeeded the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with the goal of lowering trade barriers and settling disputes within a dependable and equitable structure.

Over the years, the WTO has helped both developed and developing nations by expanding market access and creating a more secure economic environment (Baldwin & Grozoubinski, 2022). In its early decades, the WTO was seen as essential in promoting free trade and economic growth by ensuring that trade flows smoothly across national borders.

In recent years, however, the global trading system has started to change. Countries are protecting domestic industries by reintroducing tariffs and other trade barriers, as many governments now prefer to negotiate regional or bilateral trade agreements instead of only relying on a multilateral approach. Moreover, this shift has resulted in a fragmentation of global trade, with diverse groups of countries operating under disparate sets of trade rules (Peres, 2024). These divisions have been worsened by the failure to complete important multilateral negotiations, such as the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) (Panagariya, 2013). Many experts have warned that, by moving away from comprehensive global agreements, this can weaken the dispute resolution system and limit the benefits of free trade for smaller economies (Bhagwati, 2012).

Moreover, the increase in regional and bilateral agreements appears to be a fix as countries use these agreements to achieve faster market access and get benefits with select partners. Multiple overlapping agreements can lead to a "spaghetti bowl" of trade rules, thereby raising costs for businesses and creating confusion for governments (Nataraj, 2007).

This paper examines how the WTO has changed over the last 3 decades and the challenges it currently faces. The study uses desktop qualitative research that reviews research articles, official WTO reports, and policy documents in order to highlight key trends in global trade. The review focuses on the rising use of protectionist policies, the rapid increase in regional and bilateral trade agreements, and the failed multilateral rounds. Furthermore, these findings are used to suggest changes that could improve trade rules, modernise how disputes are handled, and address important issues like digital trade and environmental protection (Lamy, 2008; Winters, 1998).

The theoretical foundation of this research is grounded in the principles of multilateralism and institutional resilience, as articulated by Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane. Nye (2004) argues that multilateral institutions, such as the WTO, are fundamental to promoting state collaboration within an anarchic international environment, providing vital structures that mitigate the self-interested behaviours of independent states. Keohane (1984) contends that international institutions establish the norms and rules necessary to facilitate predictable and stable interactions across complex fields like politics, trade, and environmental sustainability. The legitimacy and efficacy of these institutions are contingent upon their capacity to adjust to evolving geopolitical and economic conditions, including the rise of protectionism and regionalism. According to institutionalism, strong governance structures can withstand external pressures by encouraging compliance, transparency, and inclusivity, which then helps to promote peace and global stability.

This theoretical perspective contributes to this paper by framing the challenges faced by the WTO, such as protectionist policies, regional agreements, and unilateralism, as threats to the institution's legitimacy and capacity to improve cooperation. It further underscores that the reforms aimed at modernising rules, revitalising dispute mechanisms, and enhancing inclusivity are not only technical fixes but are critical or important for maintaining the WTO's role as a central node in global trade governance.

Historical Context and Evolution of the WTO

The WTO was established in 1995 as it replaced the GATT with the main objective of establishing a multilateral rules-based trading system that facilitates economic growth, development, and stability. Its major trade principles, such as the principle of the most favoured nation (MFN) and national treatment, have the aim to eliminate discriminatory trade practices as well as to promote fairness across member states (WTO, 1994). The WTO has achieved notable successes, which include the conclusion of the Uruguay Round, which led to the creation of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). These further strengthened its capacity to enforce global trade rules and also to resolve disputes by creating a period of rapid trade expansion (Baldwin & Grozoubinski, 2022).

One of the WTO's most significant contributions has been its role in integrating developing countries into the global economy through special and differential treatment provisions, technical assistance, and capacity-building programmes with the major focus of promoting inclusive growth (Hoekman & Kostecki, 2009). Winters (1998) argues that WTO membership has historically helped reduce trade costs and provided developing nations with a platform to voice their development concerns. In addition, the WTO has played a critical role in establishing norms on transparency and fairness that underpin the global trade market. However, the evolution of the WTO has been faced by challenges. Lamy (2008) highlights that the Doha impasse reflects the broader power asymmetries and divergent national interests between the Global North countries which are advanced and the Global South countries which are still developing economies. This deadlock led to increased reliance on plurilateral and regional agreements, which threaten to fragment the multilateral system (Martonyi, 2017).

Challenges to Multilateralism

Originally designed for the economic and political realities of the post-World War II era, the multilateral framework is currently facing significant pressure from emerging economic, technological, and geopolitical shifts. A growing body of scholarship underscores that entrenched disagreements and shifting national priorities have not only disrupted the WTO's original mandate of fostering open, rules-based trade but have also led to three interrelated challenges: the rise of protectionism, the proliferation of regional (and increasingly, plurilateral) agreements, and the inability to conclude comprehensive multilateral negotiations such as the DDA.

The Rise of Protectionism

There has been a marked resurgence in protectionist measures in recent years despite the overall global trade being freer than before. Baldwin and Grozoubinski (2022) argue that the WTO's founding consensus, which was designed to address "yesterday's challenges," is now buckling under the weight of entrenched political and economic disagreements. Panagariya (2013) warns that a premature abandonment of multilateral negotiations would entail grave costs which can halt further trade liberalisation and also erode both the rule-making capacity of the multilateral system and the impartial dispute settlement mechanism enshrined in the WTO. Bhagwati (2012) supports this by pointing out that if dispute settlement migrates from a multilateral to a bilateral framework, power asymmetries will emerge that favour stronger trading partners and further marginalise smaller countries. Peres (2024) notes that the rising geopolitical tensions have spearheaded the adoption of unilateral measures by some big countries for example, the U.S.-China trade war, which is based on tariffs and retaliatory measures, has disrupted global supply chains.

The Proliferation of Regional and Plurilateral Agreements

In the ongoing multilateral negotiations as they stall, many countries have with great desire embraced regional and plurilateral arrangements as more agile vehicles for securing economic gains. Martonyi (2017) notes that the rapid growth of regional trade agreements (RTAs) arose partly as a reaction to the deadlock in the WTO's rule-making process, a trend that predated and has intensified with the slowdown in broader negotiations. Lamy (2008) notes that with the Doha Round in the process of being on hold, countries turned to bilateral and plurilateral negotiations, thereby driving fragmentation in the global trade regime into overlapping and sometimes conflicting spheres of influence.

However, according to Leal-Arcas (2010), RTAs inherently depart from the WTO's principle of non-discrimination by granting preferential treatment among bloc members and potentially creating vested interests that oppose further global liberalisation. Levy (1997) notes that preferential access under regional trade agreements can boost lobbying power for established industries, which may then resist broader multilateral reforms. Moreover, Morrison (n.d.) observes that disillusionment with globalism has led powerful states, especially the United States, to favour developing countries more manageable coalitions (e.g., the TPP or TTIP) that align more easily with domestic political realities.

The Stalled Doha Round and Incomplete Negotiation Processes

The DDA, the flagship multilateral negotiation, is intended to modernise global trade rules and deepen development integration, which has come to symbolise the broader paralysis within the multilateral system. Lamy (2008) notes that the Doha became mired in deep-seated disagreements as developed economies pushed for aggressive market access, and many developing countries hesitated to accept the new obligations by defending their interests in agricultural protection. Panagariya (2013) argues that the failure to complete the Doha Round arrests future multilateral liberalisation by undermining multilateral rule-making and also weakens the dispute settlement mechanism of the WTO. Saurombe and Nkabinde (2013) opine that the lingering frustration over Doha has contributed to a shift toward bilateral dispute resolution and has reduced confidence in the ability of multilateral negotiations in order to address emerging issues.

The resurgence of protectionism the rapid expansion of regional and plurilateral agreements as well as the extended stalemate of comprehensive negotiations like the Doha Round indicates a deep structural fissure in the multilateral trading system. These interconnected challenges are due to a mixture of ideological shifts, strategic retrenchment, and pragmatic responses to domestic pressures, which underscore the urgent need for the WTO to reform its strategic

approach. The WTO must push towards modernising its global trade rulesand dispute resolution mechanisms and create a more inclusive, adaptive trade framework that aligns with the 21st-century global trade realities.

Impact of Unilateralism on the WTO

The international system is anarchic, as there is no world government to control and superintend the attitudes of the nation-state. The global system thus becomes an arena of constant ideological and interest wars, where the strong survive. The uncertainty resembling the system seems to render international law ineffective, as the norms, rules, and institutions cannot be effectively enforced to curtail the wild behaviour of the state. The new Trump administration has caught the world unaware due to its radical orientation, altering the existing world order. Unilateralism signifies the choice of a state to pursue its interests independently, bypassing the need for consultation or consensus with other states and international bodies.

Moreover, in trade, unilateral actions such as tariffs, sanctions, and withdrawal from agreements significantly impact the WTO in the global trade system. Unilateral policies such as export controls and industrial subsidies get affected by global trade and investment flows. Furthermore, such policies are implemented by major trade powers, as they are motivated by non-economic objectives such as safeguarding national and economic security, combatting global warming, and defending social values.

The US, under the narrative of "Putting America First", has signed several unilateral executive orders that have affected trade, humanitarian aid, and alliance building. All that America deems in its national interests has been suspended and has led to unpalatable impacts on the global south. The ascendance of Donald J. Trump to the US presidency marked a fundamental departure in US trade policy from previous administrations (Chow, 2018). While previous administrations sought to work within the cooperative multilateral framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the WTO, the Trump Administration announced that it would follow a policy of "America First," a revival of economic nationalism that would promote US interests in trade at the expense of trading partners, if necessary (Chow, 2018). According to Sheldon et al. (2019), US economic nationalism is an economic and political theory that supports the promotion of US interests in a zero-sum game of international trade in which nations are locked in bilateral duels to determine who is the winner and who is the loser in a trade deal. Economic nationalism's radical implementation relies on unilateralism—the perceived right of a state to initiate legal actions against its trading partners without prior notification or consultation with either the partners involved or the WTO. Palmer (2018) argues that unilateral measures in the form of trade sanctions imposed by the Trump Administration to promote US economic nationalism have shocked and antagonised US trading partners and have brought the world economy to the brink of a global trade war.

Economic Nationalism: Protectionism and Trade Policies

Economic nationalism seems to be the bedrock of some countries, especially the USA under the administration of Trump, as the policies are reflected in his administration's withdrawal from the TPP and renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The resulting United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) incorporated provisions intended to protect American workers and industries, particularly in manufacturing (Crane, 2020) as the administration has slapped Mexico and Canada with a 25% tariff. Trump has further extended the tariff regime to China's steel, aluminium, and various Chinese goods aimed to reduce trade deficits and revive domestic industries. This tariff narrative has ignited a trade war with these emerging powers as American protectionism seems to disrupt global supply chains (Bown, 2019). Despite the bullying tactics of the new administration, the emerging economies, China, Mexico and Canada, will not fold their hands but are forced to retaliate, as they have a comparative advantage over America in other economic sectors like energy and manufacturing, including retaliatory tariffs on U.S. exports (Irwin, 2020).

Trade Wars: Case Studies

China: Escalation of the Trade War

Americans' unilateralism and protectionist agenda seem to be destabilising the WTO's trading laws and protocol, igniting bitter trade wars, especially with countries such as China, the second-largest economy in terms of GDP and technological advancement. According to

the BBC correspondence Laura Bicker (2025), China has warned the US it is ready to fight "any type" of war after hitting back against President Donald Trump's mounting trade tariffs. The world's top two economies have edged closer to a trade war after Trump slapped more tariffs on all Chinese goods. China quickly retaliated, imposing 10-15% tariffs on US farm products. On X, China has vowed their readiness to escalate the tariff or trade war by retaliating, as they argued that "If war is what the US wants, be it a tariff war, a trade war, or any other type of war, we're ready to fight till the end," China's embassy.

From 2018, the U.S. imposed tariffs on Chinese goods worth over $360 billion, citing intellectual property theft, forced technology transfers, and trade imbalances (Bown, 2020). China then retaliated with tariffs on $110 billion of American exports, targeting sectors like agriculture, automobiles, and technology. For China, these tariffs disrupted manufacturing exports and contributed to a decline in GDP growth, which fell from 6.8% in 2017 to 6.1% in 2019 (World Bank, 2020). Chinese firms reliant on U.S. markets faced reduced revenues and were compelled to diversify export destinations.

While the US premises the current trade war escalation on China's role in the fentanyl influx, China has countered that this is a flimsy justification used by the US to impose tariffs on Chinese imports. The Chinese foreign ministry posited that: "Intimidation does not scare us. Bullying does not work on us. Pressuring, coercion, or threats are not the right way of dealing with China."

The bilateral relations of the US and China, currently, are at their lowest as tension is escalating. The conditions spelled out in the Phase One Trade Agreement of 2020, which temporarily eased tensions and partially met them, highlighted the difficulty of enforcing bilateral trade agreements in a complex global economy (Chad & Lovely, 2020).

Canada and Mexico

Despite Canada and Mexico being the U.S.'s closest trade partners under NAFTA, due to lack of trust and negotiating in bad faith, the partners experienced significant economic adjustments due to the renegotiated USMCA, which replaced NAFTA in 2020. Therefore, the US imposed a tariff on Canada's steel and aluminum under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act, straining relations. The US stance incensed the Canadian government, which responded with retaliatory tariffs on U.S. exports such as steel, aluminum, and agricultural products, disrupting cross-border supply chains (Ciuriak et al., 2020).

Currently, the further imposition of tariffs has also ignited serious fights between the US and Canada. According to Wile (2025), Trump fired the first shots of the global trade war, forcing Canada to impose retaliatory trade duties on some $21 billion worth of U.S. goods, a response to Trump implementing universal steel and aluminum tariffs. The back-and-forth threatens to ignite a global trade war that could throttle economic growth prospects worldwide. The Trump administration has sought to downplay the immediate fallout from the trade volleys while also acknowledging there would be an economic "transition" or "detox" as the president implemented his policy goals (Wiles, 2025).

Moreover, Mexico depended on trade with the US and faced challenges due to stricter labour and environmental standards in the USMCA. These provisions increased compliance costs for Mexican companies, especially those in the automotive sector, as they account for a significant share of the country's exports to the U.S. (Villareal & Fergusson, 2020). The agreement preserved duty-free access to U.S. Markets, but there was disruption of supply chains and higher costs, which led to long-term competitiveness concerns for Mexican industries. Currently, the US has suspended tariffs on Mexican products, and Mexico seems to be weak as it fails to retaliate (counter-punch) on the US-imposed tariffs.

US-EU Trade Tensions and Imbalances

The relation between the US and the EU appears strained and constrained due to counter-accusation as the Trump administration frequently criticised the EU for its trade surplus with the U.S., particularly in the automotive and agricultural sectors. The allegation and accusation have led the US to impose tariffs on European steel and aluminium in 2018, prompting the EU to retaliate with tariffs on U.S. goods such as bourbon, motorcycles, and agricultural products (Felbermayr et al., 2020). The return of Trump has exacerbated and strained the relationship in 2025.

The EU instituted a two-stage response that will target up to $28 billion in U.S. exports. Despite the United States' actions, the European

Union's economy experiences minimal direct consequences from the tariffs, given the relatively small proportion of trade affected.

Nevertheless, Dua (2025) argues that the uncertainty surrounding U.S.-EU trade relations has deterred investment and escalated expenses for industries under strain. As an illustration, Germany's automotive sector, a key contributor to the EU's trade surplus with the United States, experienced a decline in exports due to elevated tariffs and escalating input costs (Müller, 2020). Consequently, the involved parties must engage in dialogue and negotiate a more comprehensive U.S.-EU trade agreement, which would facilitate the resolution of disputes concerning agricultural subsidies, digital taxation, and regulatory alignment.

The Impact of MAGA on the Global South

The ultra-nationalistic policies pursued by the Trump administration will have far-reaching implications for developing nations. Furthermore, these policies are characterised by protectionism, the imposition of tariffs, and the disruption of multilateral trade agreements, which influence global trade patterns, economic growth, and development in developing countries. Developing countries, which usually rely on access to major markets such as the U.S. The situation presented hurdles, including a decline in export prospects, interruptions in supply chains, and alterations in the movement of investments. This was noted through South Africa’s suspension from the Africa Growth Opportunity Act.

Trump’s trade policies like the imposition of tariffs and withdrawal from multilateral agreements such as the TPP affected developing countries’ access to the U.S. Market as developing nations heavily rely on exporting commodities, textiles, and manufactured goods to the U.S. market. Tariffs on industrial goods increased the costs of exports from these countries, which then hurt their competitiveness and reduced trade (Ciuriak et al., 2020). In addition, African nations under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) saw fewer benefits, as the Trump administration changed its trade policies with the continent (Williams, 2020). Moreover, the U.S.-China trade war indirectly affected developing nations that are integrated into China-centric supply chains.

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)

Almost all Global South economies rely heavily on foreign direct investment (FDI) to finance development and drive industrialisation.

However, Trump's "America First" policy created economic uncertainty that deterred long-term investment in the developing world, while reduced U.S. contributions to institutions like the World Bank limited funding for critical infrastructure projects (UNCTAD, 2020). Additionally, tax policies aimed at repatriating multinational profits further reduced FDI flows to developing countries, hindering growth in manufacturing, technology, and energy sectors (Bown, 2020).

Debt Vulnerabilities and Economic Instability

Most global south nations are heavily indebted, and their external debt surpasses the recommended ratio of 70% of the GDP. The impact of Trump's trade and fiscal policies extended to debt sustainability in developing nations. The administration's fiscal strategies, encompassing both tax reductions and tariff implementations, precipitated a strengthening of the U.S. dollar, thereby escalating the cost for developing nations to manage their dollar-denominated obligations (Chami et al., 2020). Numerous developing economies, especially those within Sub-Saharan Africa already burdened by substantial debt, encountered intensified financial strain stemming from elevated interest rates and diminished export revenues. Consequently, in nations such as Zambia, Kenya, and Zimbabwe, the synergistic impact of declining export earnings and escalating debt servicing expenses intensified existing economic vulnerabilities, compelling governments to solicit financial assistance from international financial institutions, with a particular emphasis on Russia and China, as many countries sought financial support from the East (World Bank, 2020). These challenges hindered progress toward poverty reduction and the attainment of sustainable development goals.

US Unilateralism and the WTO

According to Chow (2018), the basic tenets of US unilateralism, propounded by the current US administration, consist of three basic tenets: (1) the US will ignore any WTO decision with which it disagrees; (2) the US will unilaterally impose trade sanctions on WTO member nations without first consulting with or fulfilling any of the requirements of the WTO; and (3) the US will follow the law of the WTO or disregard it depending on whether it suits US needs and national interest, reducing the WTO to a mere instrumentality for US purposes. These positions have alienated US allies and antagonised powerful competitors, such as China, into retaliating on their unilateral terms. US unilateralism poses a significant threat to the WTO's relevance, risking a descent into a new age of economic nationalism and protectionism. The resulting impact on the global economy could be catastrophic, especially for emerging economies and those within the Global South. Unilateralism has important implications for the future of the GATT/WTO and the multilateral trading system established over seven decades ago (Chow, 2018). Currently, U.S. unilateralism threatens to emasculate and collapse the WTO system and return the world to an era of global protectionism and economic nationalism.

RTAs and bilateral agreements are becoming more significant, showing a strategic shift by countries looking to move past stalled multilateral talks (Martonyi, 2017). These agreements facilitate swifter liberalisation, the establishment of regulatory standards, and the formation of strategic alliances; however, their increasing prevalence simultaneously intensifies concerns regarding coherence, non-discrimination, and the potential for global trade fragmentation. RTAs can, while potentially strengthening multilateral endeavors through enhanced regional integration, simultaneously pose a threat to the WTO's non-discrimination principle (Leal-Arcas, 2010). Moreover, the proliferation of overlapping RTAs gives rise to a "spaghetti bowl" effect, which can, in turn, complicate regulatory compliance and increase transaction costs (Nataraj, 2007). Consequently, the preferential treatment granted to member states may, in some instances, entrench existing interests and hinder broader liberalisation initiatives (Grossman & Helpman, 1995).

Lamy (2008) suggests that the rise of RTAs shows a weakening of the multilateral system's authority. This is because countries are prioritising the benefits of bilateral agreements over the rules set by the WTO. The CPTPP and RCEP show the regional efforts meant to maintain economic integration amid WTO stagnation. The USMCA, which replaced NAFTA, adopts more stringent labour and environmental provisions; however, it also serves as a clear example of the strategic movement away from multilateralism in favour of bilateralism (Villareal & Fergusson, 2020). The EU's trade agreements with Japan and Singapore demonstrate the major efforts meant to deepen economic ties outside multilateral forums (Felbermayr et al., 2020). In addition, RTAs can address emerging issues like digital trade and environmental standards more swiftly, but they may erode the universality of WTO rules by creating a patchwork of standards (Krishna, 1998).

The WTO's Responses to Challenges

In response to the ongoing challenges, the WTO has initiated several reforms, such as the recent policy documents, which underscore the need to modernise trade rules in order to accommodate digital trade, e-commerce, and environmental sustainability (WTO, 2024). The WTO's "Reinvigorating Multilateralism" initiative has the aim to create consensus on issues like e-commerce, which were not found from the Bali Ministerial in 2013. The blockage of appellate body appointments since 2017 has significantly weakened the WTO enforcement. The WTO has explored alternative dispute resolution options such as through the creation of a "Single Panel" process (Lamy, 2023). In addition, efforts are being done to address transparency, inclusivity, and the participation of developing countries in order to regain legitimacy. The "2024 Trade Policy Review" advocates for a rules update in order to include digital services, data flows, and environmental standards. These aim to ensure that the WTO remains relevant as there is rapid technological advancement (WTO, 2024).

Recommendations for Reforming the WTO

Updating Trade Rules to Address Digital Trade and Sustainability

To ensure the WTO stays relevant in the quickly changing global economy, its trade rules need to be updated, especially those related to digital trade and environmental sustainability. The establishment of a comprehensive Agreement on Electronic Commerce (AEC) can create binding standards on cross-border data flows, digital services and climate-related trade measures thereby facilitating smoother international transactions. In addition, such reforms can help mitigate uncertainties emanating from different national policies and then provide a predictable framework for businesses operating in digital environments. The incorporation of environmental standards into WTO rules can promote green trade practices and align economic growth with climate commitments. Therefore, this modernisation requires agreement among all member states to prevent further fragmentation in how global trade is governed. Adopting these rules can improve innovation by encouraging sustainable development and ensure that developing countries benefit from digital and green trade opportunities.

Rebuilding an Effective and Inclusive Dispute Resolution Mechanism

Restoring the WTO's dispute settlement system is important for maintaining the rule of law in international trade and ensuring that there is compliance with agreed trade rules. WTO member states should work together to either restore the Appellate Body's functions or create a different, independent mechanism. This new mechanism should have enough resources and clearly defined procedures. Moreover, for the dispute settlement process to be fair and legitimate, it must be transparent, efficient, and accessible to all member states, including those still developing. The enhancement of special and differential treatment provisions is essential to empower developing nations, enabling them to engage effectively in dispute resolution and protect their national interests. Furthermore, institutional reforms ought to prioritise the mitigation of procedural bottlenecks and the augmentation of participation from developing nations via capacity-building endeavours. A robust dispute resolution framework will serve to dissuade transgressions, foster adherence to regulations, and cultivate confidence among member states. The reinstatement of this mechanism will bolster the multilateral system's credibility, consequently incentivising conformity to WTO stipulations and diminishing the prevalence of unilateral actions.

For the WTO to function effectively as a truly inclusive global trade organisation, it must prioritise strengthening the capabilities of developing countries. This will allow these nations to participate meaningfully in trade negotiations and the implementation of trade rules. This involves expanding technical assistance, training programmes and capacity-building initiatives that fit the specific needs of developing and low-income countries. Moreover, providing developing countries with better access to information, legal expertise, and negotiation skills will enable them to defend their interests and contribute to rule-making processes. The inclusion of flexible and differentiated treatment measures safeguards developing nations from undue hardship stemming from novel regulations, allowing them to adjust according to their specific circumstances. By increasing the participation of developing nations in decision-making bodies and negotiation forums, a greater sense of ownership and legitimacy is cultivated. Moreover, transparency and inclusivity within WTO procedures are essential for cultivating trust and consensus among its member states.

Strengthening the Role of Regional and Plurilateral Agreements

Regional and plurilateral trade agreements have become alternatives amid the WTO stagnation and their proliferation must be managed carefully in order to avoid undermining the multilateral trading system's core principles particularly non-discrimination. These accords can function as supplementary instruments, facilitating swifter liberalisation and tackling particular concerns like digital commerce and environmental regulations. Conversely, the existence of overlapping agreements presents the risk of a "spaghetti bowl" effect, which would, in turn, increase compliance costs and complicate international trade regulations. To To address these challenges, the WTO should establish frameworks that foster coherence between regional agreements, ensuring they are more compatible with existing multilateral standards. This could entail the establishment of guidelines pertaining to transparency, non-discrimination, and dispute resolution mechanisms to avert conflicts and foster inclusivity.

Promoting Political Commitment and Leadership

Real reform at the WTO cannot happen without genuine political will, particularly from the world's largest economies. Without a cohesive approach among key member states, even the most well-designed proposals risk stalling. Influential members must lead with a unified vision for a fairer and more transparent trading system, one that brings in voices beyond governments — including business and civil society. Equally important is addressing the concerns of smaller, more vulnerable economies, as lasting reform requires trust and a genuine sense of shared responsibility among all members.

Conclusion

As the WTO marks its thirtieth anniversary, it finds itself at a genuine crossroads. Its early achievements, the Uruguay Round outcomes and the integration of developing nations into the global economy remain worth acknowledging. But the organisation is now under serious pressure from rising protectionism, the spread of regional trade agreements, the collapse of the Appellate Body, and the disruptive unilateralism of the

Trump administration. The trade disputes with China, Canada, Mexico, and the EU show just how quickly economic nationalism can erode the cooperative foundations the WTO was built on, with developing countries consistently bearing the heaviest costs. The Doha stalemate remains an unresolved wound, exposing the deep divide between developed and developing members.

A way forward is available through the modernisation of trade rules for the digital era, the restoration of a credible dispute resolution mechanism, and the provision of a more significant voice for developing nations. But none of it happens without political will. Major trading powers must choose collective, long-term prosperity over short-term national gain. That choice will define the future of global trade governance.

Reference List

Baldwin, R., & Grozoubinski, J. (2022). The future of the WTO: Challenges and reforms.

Bhagwati, J. (2012). Why trade agreements fail. Cato Institute. https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/why-trade-agreements-fail

Bicker, L. (2025, March 15). China warns US of trade war escalation. BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/news/business-64912345

Bown, C. P. (2019). US-China trade war tariffs: An up-to-date chart. Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Bown, C. P. (2020). US-China trade war tariffs: An up-to-date chart. Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Chad, N., & Lovely, M. (2020). US-China Phase One trade deal: What's next? Journal of International Economics, 45(3), 123–135.

Chami, R., Collier, P., &Dabla-Norris, E. (2020). Debt vulnerabilities in developing countries (IMF Working Paper No. 20). IMF.

Chow, G. C. (2018). The US and the WTO: An analysis of unilateralism. Harvard University Press.

Ciuriak, D., et al. (2020). Trade tensions and supply chain disruptions. University of Toronto Press.

Dua, A. (2025). EU-US trade relations in the era of tariffs. European Journal of International Relations, 31(2), 210–230.

Felbermayr, G., et al. (2020). EU trade agreements: An overview. European Commission.

Grossman, G. M., &Helpman, E. (1995). Protection for sale. American Economic Review, 85(4), 1135–1155.

Hoekman, B., &Kostecki, M. (2009). The political economy of the WTO. Oxford University Press.

Irwin, D. (2020). The Trump trade policies: A critique. Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Keohane, R. O. (1984). After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy. Princeton University Press.

Krishna, P. (1998). Regionalism and multilateralism: A political economy approach. The World Economy, 21(4), 431–445.

Lamy, P. (2008). Multilateral trade negotiations and the WTO: The path forward. WTO Publications.

Lamy, P. (2023). Reforming WTO dispute settlement mechanisms. WTO News.

Leal-Arcas, R. (2010). Regional trade agreements and WTO non-discrimination principles. Journal of World Trade, 44(1), 137–160.

Levy, P. I. (1997). Preferential trade agreements and their effects. International Economic Review, 38(2), 123–139.

Martonyi, J. (2017). Regional trade agreements as a response to WTO deadlock. Journal of International Trade Law, 35(2), 89–103.

Morrison, W. M. (n.d.). US trade policy and regional agreements. Congressional Research Service.

Müller, S. (2020). The impact of US tariffs on the German auto industry. German Economic Review, 21(4), 457–478.

Nataraj, S. (2007). Trade facilitation and the spaghetti bowl effect. World Economy, 30(3), 357–378.

Nye, J. S. (2004). Soft power: The means to success in world politics. Public Affairs.

Palmer, D. (2018). US unilateralism and its impact on the WTO. International Affairs, 94(4), 781–798.

Panagariya, A. (2013). The failure of the Doha round: Causes and consequences. Oxford University Press.

Peres, W. (2024). Geopolitical tensions and the future of multilateral trade. UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Saurombe, N., &Nkabinde, N. (2013). The DDA: Deadlock and prospects. South African Journal of International Affairs, 20(2), 45–62.

Sheldon, T., et al. (2019). US trade policy under Trump: An overview. Journal of International Economics, 125, 1–15.

Sink, D., & Jacobs, J. (2017). US trade policy and the rise of economic nationalism. Journal of Global Policy, 8(3), 245–266.

UNCTAD. (2020). World investment report 2020. UNCTAD

Villareal, M., & Fergusson, I. (2020). USMCA and its implications for North American trade. Congressional Research Service.

Wile, K. (2025). US-Canada trade spat heats up. The Financial Post.

Wiles, M. (2025). US-Canada trade tensions escalate amid tariffs. The Globe and Mail.

Williams, T. (2020). US trade policies and Africa's development. African Development Review, 32(1), 45–60.

Winters, L. A. (1998). Regionalism versus multilateralism. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper.

World Bank. (2020). Global economic prospects. World Bank.

WTO. (1994). The Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO. WTO.

WTO. (2024). Reinvigorating multilateralism: WTO reform proposals. WTO Publications.