



Robert Schuman



European Union Center/ Jean Monnet Chair

**Transatlantic Trade & WTO Reform:
An Institutional Change Perspective**

Beverly Barrett



**Vol. 21, No. 11
Paper Series
July 2021**

Published with the support of the European Commission

The Jean Monnet/ Robert Schuman Paper Series

The Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series is produced by the Jean Monnet Chair and the European Union Center of the University of Miami.

These monographic papers analyze ongoing developments within the European Union as well as recent trends which influence the EU's relationship with the rest of the world. Broad themes include, but are not limited to:

- The Lisbon Treaty
- The Euro zone crisis
- Immigration and cultural challenges
- Security threats and responses
- The EU's neighborhood policy
- The EU and Latin America
- The EU as a model and reference in the world
- Relations with the United States
- Consequences of Brexit

These topics form part of the pressing agenda of the EU and represent the multifaceted and complex nature of the European integration process. These papers also seek to highlight the internal and external dynamics which influence the workings of the EU and its relationship with the rest the world.

European Union Center

University of Miami
1300 Campo Sano Building, 220C
Coral Gables, FL 33124-2231
Phone: 305-284-3266
Fax: (305) 284 4406
Web: www.miami.edu/eucenter

Jean Monnet Chair Staff

Joaquín Roy Director
Beverly Barrett Associate Editor
Melanie Goergmaier Associate Editor
Maxime Larivé Research Associate
María Lorca Research Associate

Florida International University
Markus Thiel (Director, FIU)

International Jean Monnet Editorial Advisors:

Philippe de Lombaerde, UNU/CRIS, Brugge, Belgium
Carlos Hakansson, Universidad de Piura, Perú
Kurt Hübner, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
Finn Laursen, University of Southern Denmark
John McCormick, Indiana University, Purdue
Félix Peña, Universidad Nacional de Tres de Febrero, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Beatriz Pérez de las Heras, Universidad de Deusto, Bilbao
Manuel Porto, University of Coimbra, Portugal
Lorena Ruano, CIDE, Mexico
Eric Tremolada, Universidad del Externado de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia
Roberto Domínguez, Suffolk University, Boston
Francesc Granell, University of Barcelona

Transatlantic Trade & WTO Reform: An Institutional Change Perspective

Beverly Barrett ¹

Across the global trade landscape, and focusing on the EU-US trade relationship, this research presents a theoretical framework of historical institutionalism looking backward and discursive institutionalism looking forward as the reform of the World Trade Organization (WTO) is on the horizon. Presently it is a period of institutional change, at the intersection of historical institutionalism and discursive institutionalism. In 2021, new leadership has entered the United States and last year the United Kingdom has agreed to leave the European Union (EU) and its Single Market. The multilateral institutions, like the WTO, IMF, and World Bank, increasingly focus on inclusivity (social cohesion), sustainability (environment), and technology (digitalization).

The theoretical framework of historical institutionalism informs about the value of the path determinant trajectory of time (Pierson 2004, Keohane 2017:326). The WTO has persisted as an institution that serves its members. It was designed to serve the purposes of the great power nations of the EU and US, which were founding members in the predecessor institution of the General Agreement on Tariffs & Trade (GATT) in 1947. In looking forward, the language used to explain the priorities underscores the place of “communicative discourse” between policy makers and the public and “coordinative discourse” among policy makers to shape policy direction (Schmidt 2008:305). At the intersection of historical institutionalism and discursive institutionalism, there is institutional change. The ideational power that defines discursive institutionalism (Carstensen and Schmidt 2016) is as important institutional power that is the heart of policy agency. This institutional change underway defines the evolving transatlantic relationship and the WTO reform. Since China became a member in 2001, it has been a period that transitions the gravity of trade toward Asia. The institutional changes in trade recent decades have been shaped by world events, like end the Cold War in the early 1990s, the global financial crisis of 2009, and the economic recovery after the pandemic of 2020, which continues underway.

The year 2021 is a notable year to examine the transatlantic trade relationship and WTO reform through the framework of institutional change. There is a new presidency in the U.S. with the Biden Administration, following years of nationalistic policies that compromised the value placed on international institutions. The new U.S. leadership promises to re-engage with the community of nations. This year, there are 27 EU member states following Brexit, which formalized the economic relationship with the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement. That

¹ Beverly Barrett, PhD is Assistant Professor of International Economics with the University of St. Thomas, Houston. She is an alumna of the doctoral fellowship with the University of Miami, EU Center of Excellence. This is a preliminary paper for a further research program.

You may read about her research: globalizationandchange.com and listen to her podcast Global Bridges: <https://anchor.fm/globalbridges/>

was negotiated on Christmas Eve 2020 and will govern the trade relationship going forward. The UK has left the EU Single Market defined by four freedoms of goods services, capital and labor.

The EU published in early December 2020, in the month prior to the new U.S. administration taking office, a policy-driven perspective on transatlantic way forward. “A new EU-US agenda for global change” highlights global cooperation, with sustainability and technology, as recurrent themes (European Commission 2020). The EU-US economic relationship impacts the world, as together the countries account for half of global GDP, and one-third of global trade flows (European Commission 2021a).

Digital trade is high on the agenda together with security and privacy concerns in artificial intelligence (AI). Theorizing about international business and the global environment, institutions, together with industry dynamic and resources available, form a tripod to inform strategy (Peng et al. 2008). The decisions at the level of international institutions create the context in which business takes place, and that determines the growth of countries.

Beyond the increased trade activity with China, in recent decades, the world has evolved as environmental and technology issues become forefront for global trade. In the EU-US trade relationship and in global trade, the overarching present and future policy issues are framed as relevant for the environment and technology. These two objectives align with the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Since established in 2015, these objectives toward 2030 have been presented by the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) to monitor alignment with trade objectives (UNCTAD 2021).

Institutional Change: Between Historical Institutional and Discursive Institutionalism

The persistence of institutions is a core value of historical institutionalism (Keohane 2017). The institutions and their values that endure over time become shaped by language defined as discursive institutionalism (Schmidt 2008). The need of the major trade powers, the EU and U.S., to continue to rely on a rules-based system to govern trade ensures that they will look to the WTO, the largest multilateral organization. Even given the variations of leadership preferences in domestic politics, pragmatists agree that the common framework for rules-based trade, provided by the WTO, adds value that persists over time since its founding as the GATT in 1947.

Over the past decades, since the beginning of the post-World War II European project for regional integration, institutions have shaped the external economic relationships of nations (Hall 2010; Pierson 1996, 2004). Members rely on the WTO’s Dispute Settlement Mechanism (DSM) to enforce the rules represented in the WTO, with the principles of non-discrimination and most-favored nation. Values of free-trade and the rules-based global trading system emerged victorious at the end of World War II, and with even greater impetus at the end of the Cold War. The language of these institutions shapes global engagement in the economy:

After the fall of communism, the discursive victory of neo-liberal ideas in international circles was such that many predicted global market integration to lead to the veritable universal transformation of nation-states into market-enabling arbiters rather than public good providers (Schmidt and Thatcher 2013:130).

Just two decades after the end of the Cold War, the global financial crisis of 2009 reminded market actors of the essential role governments and central banks to provide liquidity to markets

during economic downturns. The coronavirus pandemic further reminds countries and markets of the role of the government to stimulate through fiscal and monetary policies to reach growth objectives. These moments between historical institutionalism and discursive institutionalism are institutional change.

The literature on institutional change informs that discursive institutionalism provides paths forward to the future in forward looking statements. Applying discourse analysis provides opening substance and structure to reveal knowledge (Wueest 2018:11). The multilateral institutions like the G7, IMF and the WTO use this forward-looking language. The IMF Managing Director's Global Policy Agendas, for 2020 and 2021, present discursive language to support social inclusivity, environmental sustainability, and technology digitalization objectives in "Navigating a Safe Exit from the Crisis," (IMF 2021).

Looking to the future, the communiqués issued by multilateral institutions, through the discourse of language implicate and set forth values for the future. This discursive institutionalism relates to aspirations for what the countries may be come in trade relations going forward. The Joint Communiqué issued by the G7 countries, at the Trade Track on 28 May 2021, uses language to state commitments to free and fair trade, to transparency, and to reform of the WTO Dispute Settlement System. A historical institutional perspective provides the lens to understand the persistence of the importance of the trade relationship between the EU and the US. A discursive institutional lens provides values for the way forward, as institutional change happens at the intersection of these two institutional perspectives.

Transatlantic Trade

A historical institutional perspective informs on how the past shapes the present. The interpretation through discursive institutionalism comes from analysis of the written contexts and spoken discourse that shape the relationships between global leaders and their constituents. The importance of the trade relationships over time, since change is incremental, is represented in historical institutionalism (Keohane 2013: 331). The discursive institutional analysis considers the written texts and rhetoric from leaders to look to the future, as the trade partners chart their relationship.

The European Commission policy document, "A new EU-US agenda for global change," presented in December 2020 proposes, "first steps as a roadmap for a new transatlantic agenda for global cooperation." The EU has introduced new language on "*European Strategic Autonomy*." This means that the EU embraces its freedom to pursue policies that are in its interests without constraints from abroad. This key signaling language, with European Strategic Autonomy, implies a self-sufficient and self-assured role for the EU in the world.

Opportunities for negotiation between the EU and US include government procurement and digital trade. Additionally, regulatory cooperation, and geographical indications (GIs) are areas where the two parties may progress in trade relations. The EU mandate does not include to negotiate in agriculture (CRS 2019:2). Under Section 232 of the U.S. Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the President has broad power to adjust imports, by application of tariffs, if imports are found to be a threat to US national security (Claussen 2020:1120). Since 2018, when the U.S. President imposed and threatened additional tariffs, European leaders led by Chancellor of Germany Angel Merkel stated that allies, given that they are allied nations, cannot be risks to

national security (Chazan and Peel 2019). During these years, the EU has stated that it would not negotiate further if the US applied additional Section 232 tariffs (CRS 2019:2).

During mid-May 2021, a Joint Statement announced plans for formal trade talks to be forthcoming to address the tariffs on metals, aluminum and steel (European Commission 2021b). The prior U.S. administration in March 2018, applied the 25 percent steel tariff and the 10 percent aluminum tariffs using the Section 232 national-security provision in the 1962 trade law as justification. The EU had been set for June 1, 2021 to raise tariffs on iconic U.S. products, up to 50 percent, on Harley-Davidson motorcycles, Levi Strauss jeans, and Jack Daniels whisky. However, on May 17, 2021 the two parties came to an agreement in the Joint Statement. Remaining in place, since 2018, the tariffs from the US and the first round of retaliatory measures from the EU, are on the negotiating table for the future. Further, they stated that it is important to address together how overproduction from China effects world prices in steel and aluminum.

That discourse shapes institutions is an application of the theoretical discursive institutionalism that frames this research. The European Commission has used the discourse of European Strategic Autonomy to indicate that the EU will be more assertive in negotiating its relationship with the U.S. This year the EU, of 27 member states following Brexit on January 31, 2020, has a renewed sense of solidarity with the language put forward no European Strategic Autonomy. This specific language, of European Strategic Autonomy, has been asserted in the face of economic national policies from the U.S. administration that launched a trade war in 2018 (Aggestam and Hyde-Price 2019:116). Even in the face of protectionist rhetoric in recent years, according to a Gallup poll, most Americans see trade as an opportunity. The figure was down to 63 percent in March 2021 from the high of 79 percent in 2019 (Younis 2021).

The year 2021 is meaningful to examine the transatlantic trade relationship at a time of institutional change. There is a new administration in the U.S. with Biden presidency. Following recent years of nationalistic policies that compromised international institutions, new leadership promises to re-engage with the community of nations. The U.S. leadership with the Biden administration in 2021 has used discourse to affirm the importance of the transatlantic relationship and working together with allies. During his inauguration address on January 21, 2021, the new U.S. president stated:

So here's my message to those beyond our borders. America has been tested, and we've come out stronger for it. We will repair our alliances and engage with the world once again. Not to meet yesterday's challenges, but today's and tomorrow's challenges. And we'll lead, not merely by the example of our power, but by the power of our example. We'll be a strong and trusted partner for peace, progress and security (Biden 2021).

The return to valuing alliances and to global engagement turns a corner on the prior U.S. administration that weakened participation with global institutions. The openness to cooperation in global sustainability, for example, is evident with the U.S. return to the Paris Accord Agreement of the UNFCCC on February 19, 2021 (UN News 2021). The EU has been leading the dialogue in sustainability with the proposal of border credits. Prior undertakings with the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS), set up in 2005 as the world's first international emissions trade system, have provided policy entrepreneurship as far as how to price carbon.

Table 1. Number of Cases between the EU-US at the WTO

Cases initiated by Complainant with the WTO Dispute Settlement Body, between two parties, from 1995 to present:

	European Union	United States
Agriculture	3	9
Goods + Manufacturing	25	6
Services + Other	7	5
TOTAL	35	20
Anti-dumping titled cases of Total	8	0

Source: WTO. 2021. Map of Disputes between WTO Members. Available from: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/dispu_maps_e.htm

At the EU-US Summit on June 15, 2021, the parties announced an agreement to end the seventeen-year running dispute against between Airbus (EU) and Boeing (US) aircraft manufacturers. This provides policy space to cooperation on addressing global trade concerns like working with China. Three months prior, there was a Joint Statement on March 5, 2021, from both parties, to suspend tariffs related to the long-standing dispute, since 2005 regarding subsidies on Airbus (EU) and Boeing (US) aircraft. The disputes on trade in large civil aircraft were initiated by both parties simultaneously. The consultations with the WTO Dispute Settlement Body were requested on the same day, October 6, 2005 (DS 316 from the U.S. and DS 317 from the EU).²

The correspondence from the EU to the WTO, of August 25, 2020, urged absence of countermeasures on both sides, which is in the interest of both producers and consumers:

We believe that the next step should be to achieve the absence of countermeasures on both sides. Only in this way will we create an environment that will best allow both aircraft manufacturers and their airline customers around the world, and indeed other sectors that would otherwise be subject to countermeasures, to weather the current economic crisis and contribute to a global recovery (WTO 2020).

To consider the governance of global trade requires considering China, with its leading exports role, as part of the equation. Together, the EU and US can enhance an alliance within the WTO to put pressure on China to be accountable to the rules-based system, to which it became a member in 2001.

² Dispute from the US to the EU on “Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft” - https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/DS316_e.htm
 Dispute from the EU to the US on “Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft” - https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/DS317_e.htm

World Trade Organization (WTO) Reform

Language emphasizes focus areas that shape agendas, and the WTO agenda remains of considerable debate (Wueest 2018:10, 32). More than ever, WTO reform is timely, with environmental impacts elevating sustainability and the digitalization effects elevating technological concerns. Substantive challenges - such as negotiating with China, the risks from the digitalization of trade, and the revival of the Dispute Settlement Mechanisms (DSM) Appellate Body - are issues where the EU and U.S. can work together within the WTO. The pandemic, since 2020, provides an opportunity to review supply chains and to make determinations not only on efficiency, but also on inclusivity with a social perspective, on sustainability with an environmental perspective, and on the effects of digitalization with a technological perspective.

It has been more than 25 years since the last WTO trade round was completed successfully with the Uruguay Round in 1995. This was particularly important to introduce the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and the judicial body of the DSM, in addition to the GATT framework. Launched in 2001, the Doha Development Round aimed to provide support to developing countries and to build their export market, particularly in agriculture. The new leadership of Nigeria's Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Director General since 2020, provides experience and knowledge from the developing world. This is welcome at a time when the world is recovering from the COVID pandemic and given the importance of inclusivity with a social perspective on global health.

The engagement with China, a strategic competitor will be more effective with an alliance approach between the EU and US, as they may leverage their power as partners. The EU and US may lead WTO reform to bring China into multilateral disciplines that develop a more leveled playing field. In dealing with China, there is sensitivity of economic markets to political events and to political comments, underscoring a discursive institutional element that shapes developments. There is confrontation with China in international trade and in technology. During December 2020, the EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment (CAI) was negotiated. However, sanctions from both parties, toward Members of Parliament in the EU and in China, threaten progress on implementation. An institutional framework for working with China on these and related issues, such as the U.S.-China Strategic Economic Dialogue launched in 2006, may be useful in the future (U.S. Dept. of Treasury 2008). The implementation of this institutional framework from former U.S. Treasury Secretary, Henry Paulson is presented in his book *Dealing with China* (2014).

Concerns that the EU and U.S. may address together in the future within the WTO are:

- A cooperative way to approach sanctions, data regimes, and subsidies that have been a source of transatlantic tensions.
- Sectoral agreements in areas like professional recognition of qualifications for trade in services and freedom of movement.
- Leveraging common transatlantic standards for advantage in global trade.
- Global cooperation to stand for democratic-based trading principles and to jointly address challenges from a rising China.

The Appellate Body (AB) of the Dispute Settlement Mechanism ceased to function when the U.S. blocked the appointments since December 2019 citing concerns about judicial overreach. The AB will continue to function once new judicial panelists are approved by WTO members to

serve. The ability for one country to stall the process, given the current requirements for unanimity, underscores the need for WTO reform to ensure that the institution will continue to function to serve the members. Given the growth in the number WTO members, to 164 from 23 at the GATT's founding in 1947, supporting the institution going forward may require a change of rules from consensus decisions to a type of majority decisions. Despite domestic political interests that have undermined trade in the U.S. and globally, the opportunity for WTO reform may move forward under the new U.S. administration which articulates the value of international alliances (Goldstein and Gulotty 2021).

Sustainability in Global Trade

Central to the WTO reform are sustainability toward the environmental together with security and efficiency in digital technologies. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted by the United Nations in 2015, provide targets toward the year 2030. The SDG Trade Monitor from UNCTAD tracks official data on global trade's contribution to the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Beyond these forefront environmental and technological concerns, the specific SDGs monitored in relation to trade are (UNCTAD 2020):

- SDG 2 – Zero Hunger
- SDG 8 – Decent Work and Economic Growth
- SDG 10 – Reduced Inequalities
- SDG 17 – Partnerships for the Goals

The goals with the corresponding metrics to measure progress are following. The SDG 17 applied to trade specifically states, “Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under WTO and concluding Doha Development Agenda” (UNCTAD 2020). As major forces in global trade, the EU and US role is central to future agreements in the WTO. Whether there will be the political will to continue with the Doha Development Agenda from 2001 or to devise a new negotiation, that carries over the most salient trade issues, will be determined by these leading voices in global trade.

Table 2.

SDG Goals Trade Monitor and Metrics to Measure Progress

	Goals	Metrics to measure progress
SDG 2	Zero hunger	Elimination of export subsidies in agriculture
SDG 8	Decent work and economic growth	Enhanced Integrated Framework for Trade-related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries
SDG 10	Reduced inequality	Implement the principle of special and differential treatment for developing countries
SDG 17	Partnerships for the goals	Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under WTO and concluding Doha Agenda.

Source: UNCTAD. 2021. SDG Trade Monitor. Available from: <http://www.sdgrtrade.org/en>

The SDG 7 for Clean and Affordable Energy and SDG 13 for Climate Action remain central to policies negotiated in the bilateral EU-US relationship and within the WTO. In recent decades, Europe has been a thought leader in incentivizing carbon reduction. The European Commission proposes enlarging the Emissions Trading System (ETS) to consumer-facing sectors such as carmakers and buildings. The challenge is to prevent financial obstacles for low-income families who live in buildings that are poorly insulated and find electric vehicles non-affordable (Khan 2021). The EU proposal for a carbon border adjustment mechanism (CBAM) to tax imports based on their carbon footprint is considered to bring the EU efforts closer toward to goal of climate neutrality. This would reduce the likelihood of cross-border production with other countries that have lower standards in emissions (Pfeifer and Kahn 2021).

Technological Digitalization in Global Trade

Development of technology is a prime example that informs a new theory of institutional change, at the intersection of historical institutionalism and discursive institutionalism. Building on the past, and racing toward the future, technology has outpaced the policy regulations. The technological landscape is evolving dramatically. Countries and international organizations must be prepared to engage with fast-moving technological developments. Research has identified the economic benefits of data flows and digital technologies (Meltzer 2019:3).

Digital trade is high on the agenda for the bilateral relationship, and within the WTO, in regard to negotiating rules around taxes and security among a host of concerns. Artificial intelligence (AI) is used in commerce for communications, health, and security applications. Concomitantly, concerns about privacy and security, which vary across national context, come before the WTO. For the WTO, the digitalization focus is e-commerce activity. Across functions beyond commerce, the digitalization of data continues to inform and to shape our lives. In areas such as critical national security and personal health, the WTO has a potentially powerful role in recommending best practices and in presenting rules agreed to by members. The digital transition requires global cooperation as countries make products with standards specifications for national destinations.

The transatlantic trade and WTO reform issues, on sustainability and the digital transition, are overlapping as far as scope and proposed solutions. The Centre for European Policy Studies underscores the key principles of human centrality, resilience and sustainability (CEPS 2021:23). The issues that are on the horizon are infrastructure sharing, connectivity in less-dense and rural areas, and addressed the risks associated with rolling out 5G technology. The 5G deployment that is energy-efficient may require greater renewable energy capacity (CEPS 2021:22).

For the digital transition, the proposal to pursue “AI for Good,” developed by the UN in support of the SDGs, can be applied at the bilateral and global levels of cooperation. The advance of these principles, by the private sector and public sector, support that technology will be used for constructive purposes. Given the enhanced ransomware risks and global security threats, the cooperation on cybersecurity can bring stakeholders closer the objectives for the AI for Good platform to effectively counter risks and threats. Key issues in AI are human centrality, to serve human purposes, together with resilience and sustainability (CEPS 2021:23).

Conclusions

This research has developed the theory that institutional change happens between historical institutional and discursive institutionalism. The examples, from the evolving bilateral transatlantic relationship between the EU and the U.S. and from WTO reform, build upon a historical trajectory of path dependency and toward forward-looking discourse that shapes institutions' objectives and effectiveness (Pierson 1996 2004; Schmidt 2008). The intersection of the past with the present, and the flashpoints of environmental concerns and technological concerns, shapes the values of nations and of global institutions.

Historical institutionalism provides the perspective of hindsight when assessing the path that history has made. In the bilateral relationship and within the WTO, theories of institutions are supported by credible commitments made at critical junctures (Keohane 2017:326). This makes trade negotiations and agreements in central to affirm and reflect the values of institutions and countries which engage in them.

The language from the EU provides an embedded importance, reflecting discursive institutionalism in the term European Strategic Autonomy. This signals that the EU is ready for a bold and self-assured role in the world. The policy issues for the EU-US new agenda, for sustainability and the digital transition, are priorities domestically and in the bilateral relationship. The ways forward are charted in language from national leaders and EU policy documents. Cooperation, as emphasized in the policy proposal "A new EU-US agenda for global change" presents key issue areas of sustainability and technology (European Commission 2020).

Correspondingly, the language from the new U.S. administration, to value alliances and international rules-based institutions cooperatively signals potential cooperation. Nearly half-way through the first year of the new U.S. administration, there is a sense of expectation and urgency to remedy the trading relationship with the key ally of the EU and within the WTO. These reparations of the relationship bilaterally and in global trade is a substantive component of the U.S. President Joe Biden's initiative to "Build Back Better" on which he campaigned for the presidency (Brown 2021).

Considering WTO reform, the 17 SDGs provide values and benchmarks to incorporate as the WTO looks forward. Given the new leadership of the WTO since 2020, together with the new US administration, movement forward may be made toward reform and to appointments for the AB of the Dispute Settlement Mechanism. The policy issues of importance, not only for the WTO yet also for the IMF, World Bank, and the G7 and beyond, rest with the centrality of sustainability and technology. Making strides to support global values takes place a pivotal time of change with the world energy from the pandemic.

Between these parties in the bilateral relationship, and in the institutional architecture of the WTO, an assertiveness of values and openness to global cooperation portend movement to resolve pressing issues as the world in recovery from a once-in-a-century pandemic. The EU and the U.S. in the transatlantic relationship, and the multilateral institutions, have presented a path forward that elevates inclusivity (social cohesion and reduction of inequalities), sustainability (environment and resiliency), and technology (digitalization and security) in a context to move the world forward as the third decade of the 21st century unfolds.

Bibliography

- Aggestam, L. and Hyde-Price, A. 2019. “Double Trouble: Trump, Transatlantic Relations and European Strategic Autonomy.” *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Volume 57. Annual Review, 114 -127.
- Béland, Daniel. 2009. “Ideas, Institutions, and Policy Change.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 16:5 (August 2009), 701-718.
- Biden, Joseph R. 2021. *Inaugural Address by President Joseph R. Biden, Jr.* The White House. “<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/01/20/inaugural-address-by-president-joseph-r-biden-jr/>”
- Brown, Chad. 2021. “To Build Back Better, Biden Needs to Fix Trade.” *Foreign Affairs*. January 21, 2021
- Carstensen, Martin B. and Vivien A. Schmidt. 2016. “Power through, over and in ideas: conceptualizing ideational power in discursive institutionalism.” *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23:3, 318-337.
- Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS). 2021. *Towards a Resilient and Sustainable Post-Pandemic Recovery*. CEPS Task Force Report on The New Industrial Strategy for Europe. Brussels.
- Chazan, Guy and Michael Peel. 2019. “Merkel attacks US isolationism.” *Financial Times*.
- Claussen, Kathleen. 2020. “Trade's Security Exceptionalism.” 72 *Stanford Law Review*, 72:1097-1164. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3439705>
- European Commission. 2021a. Trade Policy Countries and Regions: United States. Available from: <https://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/countries/united-states/>
- European Commission. 2021b. Directorate-General for Trade: Joint European Union – United States statement on addressing global steel and aluminum excess capacity. May 17, 2021.
- European Commission. 2020. “A new EU-US agenda for global change.” JOIN (2020) 22 final: Joint Communication to the European Parliament, the European Council and the Council. December 12, 2020.
- European Union and United Kingdom. EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement. December 24, 2020.
- IMF. 2021. Managing Director’s Global Policy Agenda 2021: *Bolstering the Recovery, Countering the Divergence*. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.

- IMF. 2020. Managing Director's Global Policy Agenda 2020: *Catalyzing a Resilient Recovery*. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.
- Fioretos, Orfeo (Ed.). 2017. *International Politics and Institutions in Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldstein, Judith and Robert Gulotty. 2021. "America and the Trade Regime: What Went Wrong?" *International Organization* 75:524–557.
- G7. 2021. The Joint Communiqué issued by the G7 countries at the G7 Trade Track on 28 May 2021.
- Hall, Peter A. 2010. "Historical Institutionalism in Rational and Sociological Perspective." In James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen (Eds.). *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keohane, Robert. 2017. "The Promise and Pitfalls of Historical Institutionalism in IR." In Fioretos, Orfeo (Ed.). 2017. *International Politics and Institutions in Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pages 321-335.
- Khan, Mehreen. 2021. "Who will pay? Europe's bold plan on emissions risks political blowback." *Financial Times*. May 30, 2021.
- Meltzer, Joshua P. 2019. "A WTO Reform Agenda: Data Flows and International Regulatory Cooperation." Report for Global Economy and Development at Brookings. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- North, Douglass Cecil. 2005. *Understanding the Process of Economic Change*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Peng, Mike W., Denis Y.L. Wang and Yi Jiana. 2008. "An institution-based view of international business strategy: A focus on emerging economies." *Journal of International Business Studies* 39: 920-936.
- Pfeifer, Sylvia and Khan, Mehreen. 2021. "Europe's steel industry fears abrupt end to free carbon permits." *Financial Times*. June 1, 2021.
- Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Analysis, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pierson, Paul. 1996. "The Path to European Integration: A Historical Institutional Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies* 29:2,123-163.
- Schmidt, Vivien A. 2008. "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse," *Annual Review of Political Science* 11:303-326.
- Schmidt, Vivien A. and Mark Thatcher (Eds.). 2013. *Resilient Liberalism in Europe's Political Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

United Nations News. 2021. Secretary-General Welcomes US Return to Agreement on Climate Change. Available from: <https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/01/1082602>

UNCTAD. 2021. SDG Trade Monitor. Available from: <http://www.sdgrade.org/en>

U.S. Department of the Treasury. 2008. Closing Statement by Secretary Paulson at the Fourth Meeting of the U.S. China Strategic Economic Dialogue. June 16, 2008. Available from: <https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Pages/hp1037.aspx>

Wueest, Bruno. 2018. *The Politics of Economic Liberalization*. Series Editors Colin Haye and Anthony Payne: Building a Sustainable Political Economy: SPERI Research and Policy. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

WTO. 2021. Chronological List of Dispute Cases. Available from: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/dispu_status_e.htm

WTO. 2020. Dispute 316 brought by the US and against European Union. European Communities and Certain Member States – Measures affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft. Communication from the European Union: WT/DS316/44.

Younis, Mohamed. 2021. “Sharply fewer view foreign trade as an opportunity.” Gallup Poll. March 31, 2021. Available from: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/342419/sharply-fewer-view-foreign-trade-opportunity.aspx>

Appendices:

Table 3.

35 cases brought by **European Union (formerly EC)** against **United States**

DS38 : The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act
DS39 : Tariff Increases on Products from the European Communities
DS63 : Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Solid Urea from the Former German Democratic Republic
DS85 : Measures Affecting Textiles and Apparel Products
DS88 : Measure Affecting Government Procurement
DS100 : Measures Affecting Imports of Poultry Products
DS108 : Tax Treatment for "Foreign Sales Corporations"
DS118 : Harbour Maintenance Tax
DS136 : Anti-Dumping Act of 1916
DS138 : Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products Originating in the United Kingdom
DS151 : Measures Affecting Textiles and Apparel Products (II)
DS152 : Sections 301-310 of the Trade Act 1974
DS160 : Section 110(5) of US Copyright Act
DS165 : Import Measures on Certain Products from the European Communities
DS166 : Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Wheat Gluten from the European Communities
DS176 : Section 211 Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998
DS186 : Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and Amendments thereto
DS200 : Section 306 of the Trade Act 1974 and Amendments thereto
DS212 : Countervailing Measures Concerning Certain Products from the European Communities
DS213 : Countervailing Duties on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Germany
DS214 : Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Steel Wire Rod and Circular Welded Quality Line Pipe
DS217 : Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000
DS225 : Anti-Dumping Duties on Seamless Pipe from Italy
DS248 : Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Steel Products
DS262 : Sunset Reviews of Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties on Certain Steel Products from France and Germany
DS294 : Laws, Regulations and Methodology for Calculating Dumping Margins (Zeroing)
DS317 : Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft
DS319 : Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930
DS320 : Continued Suspension of Obligations in the EC — Hormones Dispute
DS350 : Continued Existence and Application of Zeroing Methodology
DS353 : Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft — Second Complaint
DS424 : Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Italy
DS487 : Conditional Tax Incentives for Large Civil Aircraft
DS548 : Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products
DS577 : Anti-dumping and countervailing duties on ripe olives from Spain

Table 4.

35 cases brought by **European Union (formerly EC)** against **United States**

DS38 : The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act
DS39 : Tariff Increases on Products from the European Communities
DS63 : Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Solid Urea from the Former German Democratic Republic
DS85 : Measures Affecting Textiles and Apparel Products
DS88 : Measure Affecting Government Procurement
DS100 : Measures Affecting Imports of Poultry Products
DS108 : Tax Treatment for "Foreign Sales Corporations"
DS118 : Harbour Maintenance Tax
DS136 : Anti-Dumping Act of 1916
DS138 : Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products Originating in the United Kingdom
DS151 : Measures Affecting Textiles and Apparel Products (II)
DS152 : Sections 301-310 of the Trade Act 1974
DS160 : Section 110(5) of US Copyright Act
DS165 : Import Measures on Certain Products from the European Communities
DS166 : Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Wheat Gluten from the European Communities
DS176 : Section 211 Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998
DS186 : Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and Amendments thereto
DS200 : Section 306 of the Trade Act 1974 and Amendments thereto
DS212 : Countervailing Measures Concerning Certain Products from the European Communities
DS213 : Countervailing Duties on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Germany
DS214 : Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Steel Wire Rod and Circular Welded Quality Line Pipe
DS217 : Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000
DS225 : Anti-Dumping Duties on Seamless Pipe from Italy
DS248 : Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Steel Products
DS262 : Sunset Reviews of Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties on Certain Steel Products from France and Germany
DS294 : Laws, Regulations and Methodology for Calculating Dumping Margins (Zeroing)
DS317 : Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft
DS319 : Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930
DS320 : Continued Suspension of Obligations in the EC — Hormones Dispute
DS350 : Continued Existence and Application of Zeroing Methodology
DS353 : Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft — Second Complaint
DS424 : Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Italy
DS487 : Conditional Tax Incentives for Large Civil Aircraft
DS548 : Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products
DS577 : Anti-dumping and countervailing duties on ripe olives from Spain

Source for Appendices: WTO. 2021. Chronological List of Dispute Cases. Available from:
https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/dispu_status_e.htm