Chapter V

Conclusion

Media the Prime Mover

There is no denying fact that media strongly influence the ethics of public life as it provides the watch dog’s role in public policy. This dimension of media makes it the ‘Fourth Estate’ next to the elected representatives by virtue of its role and popularity. In contemporary societies people communicate in many ways: by direct personal encounters at home and in public places; by phone, mobile, public gathering or lecture or by reading the newspaper, News or watching TV. Media may not be the exclusive means of communication when there is a technology gap or when there is a policy gap. However, the influence on policy makers and the way it provides information on relevant matters to common man helps to build pressure among the key policy makers and hence contribute tremendously to the public sphere. There stakes in the international trade is very important whether it is in the context of spreading information on change in new legislations or any change in procedures across countries. In WTO which is a prime forum for negotiation there is no denying that media plays a major role in building consensus.

No one can deny the role of media in spreading and sharing information. When we talk about promoting development issues in media, we need to know the concept of ‘development support communication’ with a rights based approach. If the communities about whom the policies are made are not aware of what is going to affect their lives and their trends of livelihoods, economy and environment, they could not generate a response good or bad. This is the media, which owing to its basic responsibility of protecting the people’s Right to Know, intervenes telling the people the real story behind any development activity. Scientific Research on technical, economic, trade, socio-political,
cultural and environmental issues generates a lot of data and information covering different aspects of these issues. Certainly, this scholarly collected and analyzed data would be useless unless it is spread among the stakeholders and the people at large. The scientifically written research papers do have research material, which is not all the time fit to be published in newspapers, newsmagazines or to be broadcast on radio or television. Media operate through different formats. For example broadcast medium is linked to listening needs of the people while print medium is linked to the sight needs of the readers. Both have different ways to script writing based on the same research material. Usually the scientific research is kept in cupboards in the form of books or research papers only for the fellow researchers. This is the media, which explores the results of these studies to the masses. Since inception of the World Trade Organization (WTO), particularly the trade talks to structure the future trade relations across nations, civil society and research organizations have been active in analyzing the pros and cons of different agreements under WTO and their impacts on the livelihoods of the farming and marginalized communities. In the recent rounds of trade talks from Seattle to Cancun, three agriculture specific agreements, Agreement on Agriculture, Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) and Agreement on Application of Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary Measures, are important to most of the South Asian countries being the agriculture based economies. Farmers are marginalized communities in almost all the developing countries who are fast becoming victims of globalization, particularly the TRIPs agreement under the World Trade Organization (WTO) regime that snatches their basic right to choose and right to know, right to store, reuse, recycle and share their seed and plant varieties. They are also facing acute problems due to withdrawal of subsidies on their corps. Their vulnerability is growing with the emergence of corporatization of farming in one or the other way. It is a fact that new multilateral agreements under WTO regime are violating the rights of the people protected in natural law, the UN Declaration of Human Rights 1948, International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and similar other international, regional, bilateral and country level human rights
conventions and laws by allowing monopolies in the agriculture sector. In this regard the patents on life forms are serious violations of the rights of the farming communities. This area is an integral part of development agenda.

Limitations

The biggest limitation in any media studies is availability of enormous medium of communication making the analysis broad and very difficult to converge. Now with paper media too being liberalised and the involvement of many players makes the identification and content analysis very difficult. Since now most medium are privatised the popularity and viewer ship of public medium has gone down considerably. However, there is a strong private and public ties between the media and the political realm have the ability to determine the shape of public opinion. In order for the hegemony to unite the public there needs to be a majority of consent for its ideology. If the general public does not support the ideal presented by the dominant political forces, consent has to be manufactured by the framing of events through the media, in addition to the spin industry of strategic communications. In this way the prestige press fulfils an important role in supporting hegemonic discourses such as globalisation. Hegemony is an adequate framework for examining the process through which the media frames stories in order to promote the dominant ideology. First coined by Gramsci as “common sense,” (Brandist, 1996), the hegemonic process builds consent by discursively aligning the public interest with the interest of the elite. The process leaves only a limited number of choices for public response choices that have been filtered and approved by the dominant ideology from which the public then forms and opinion. However, since the option have been narrowed prior to public exposure, the freedom of choice is substantially limited thus offering less active alternatives.

Public discourse is thus influences to ensure the compatibility of public opinion with the view point of economic and political interests. Hence through the framing tactic of the media – the language used and objective reporting techniques employed the public is led to believe in a system of free choice,
while the influences of discursive communication methods help to control freedom of thought. This becomes especially important in considering the position of the media, aligned with the political interest of the industrialisation west during such as the event as the WTO talks in Seattle Washington. Nationally the way in which the mass media portray the talks and demonstration and the issues at hand will influence public sentiment, thus paving political agenda for both US on the global level and the future platforms of Democratic Republican and other politicians on the state and national level.

The mass media frame the WTO talks and demonstration in order to mobilise public opinion in support of the interest of largely Western controlled transnational Corporations. The global industries of the corporate west depend on the labour and the affect the environment where the working and middle classes of both the West and the non-west level. Therefore the importance of the outcome of global talks such at the WTO conference, becomes vital to the interests of the corporate west. The way in which the WTO meetings the officials involved and the conflicts both without and within the walls of the conference are presented through the media will determine the public opinion formed on critical global issues. The protestors and the global issues at stake are therefore depicted on several different fronts in line with the mainstream agenda.

Condit, 1994 modifies Gramsci’s original theory of hegemony for use in modern society. Condit provides additional considerations for advanced communication technology such as internet and mass media as well as the inclusion of the multicultural population within the US. This pose certain constrains upon the hegemony process requiring the accommodation of several ethnic groups and minority views within public discourse. As a result, Condit proposes the ‘model of concordance’ to describe the American hegemonic situation of today. Condit’s model of concordance replaces Gramsci economic universalism with a mode of social concordance defined as the “active or passive acceptance of a given social policy or political framework as the best that can be negotiated under given conditions”.
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However, Condit also notes the expense of mass media time required for the exposure and promotion of any ideological perspective to solicit public policy. Consequentially the ability of minority or marginal perspectives to garner support is hindered by the prohibitive cost of media time. In this way the dominant ideology reigns without serious challenges from ethnic minorities, the working classes, and other foreign cultures. Thus the hegemonic process is upheld at least in media frames.

**Subsidies and media: Myth or Reality**

Subsidies propped up into limelight on account of the WTO negotiations and role of media which highlighted the aspect that huge resources are sunk by developed countries to subsidise their farmer to a much greater extent than developing countries. This has the consequence of world prices being much lower than what would have been, has the subsidies not been there and in turn makes the agricultural commodities of the developing countries non-competitive in the world market. Nowhere is it more evident than in the case of cotton, where the US subsidises its farmers so heavily that the resulting low world prices render the lowest cost producing farmers of West Africa, non-competitive. What these countries like Burkina Faso, Chad and Benin get in terms of US aid is less than what they lost by not being able to export cotton. Agricultural subsidies in the north have thwarted the development of these countries. The media reports that the tax payers resource are being wasted away and with very few people linked to agriculture makes the resource allocation very irrational. Now it is time for Europe and the USA to acknowledge the truth that only substantial limitation of their trade distorting agricultural subsidies will prevent the damaging effects that these subsidies have on developing country producers. If they fail to do so, the consequences will be impasse in the WTO trade negotiation with the prospect of repeated dispute settlement challenges before the WTO in the years ahead.

Agricultural trade liberalization is without question the most contentious international trade issue. It is an issue that deeply concerns and affects a diversity of groups, ranging from Quebec dairy farmers to West African cotton
growers, multinational agri-food corporations to small-scale cooperative coffee growers in Central America. Reforming the international agricultural trade system continues to be at the very top of the globalization agenda. At the World Trade Organization (WTO), agriculture has been the key focus of the current round of trade negotiations and as any negotiator will tell you, without a deal on agriculture, there will be no deal on anything else. Something very remarkable has happened over the last couple years, something without precedent. What I am referring to is that most WTO members, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), United Nations (UN) system, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), all have adopted an identical position on a crucial and controversial farm trade issue; they have expressed their support for putting an end to rich countries’ agricultural subsidies. They argue that this step is the best way to aid struggling developing country farmers, reduce global poverty and inequality, and make the international trading system fair. This consensus is quite remarkable. Throughout the highly fragile and often turbulent current round of WTO negotiations, this diverse group of actors, many of which are antagonists in most other settings, appear to have coalesced along a single principled position. Within the WTO itself, the attack on subsidies has rallied the majority of the organization's one hundred and fifty-one members most of which are developing countries, led by Brazil, China, and India against the $US 300 billion worth of annual farm subsidies that countries such as the United States, European Union (EU) and Japan provide to their farm industries.

The political significance and long-term impacts of this development for the multilateral trading system should not be underestimated. In fact, this unified chorus of criticism has grown louder and louder at the negotiating table since the Doha Development Agenda kicked off in 2001. Perhaps its apex was in evidence when diverging positions between Northern and Southern countries on farm subsidies helped bring the WTO trade negotiations to a spectacular crash in Hong Kong in 2006, the date by which a draft agreement on agricultural trade was scheduled to be completed. WTO negotiators are still desperately picking up the pieces and the future of the agriculture negotiations, and the WTO more generally, remains uncertain. For those who follow
international trade negotiations, it is quite striking that the collapse of the WTO's Hong Kong ministerial was for much different reasons than those that led to the failure of the 1999 ministerial meeting in Seattle. The events of 1999 themselves were a defining moment in the history of the multilateral trading system. If we recall, a broad coalition of NGOs, labour, environmental and human right groups, as well as private citizens, converged on the streets of Seattle to protest the launch of a new round of WTO negotiations. They represented a diverse set of concerns and all these have been made possible with active reporting by media. Some unions expressed fear of their members' jobs being outsourced to low-wage developing countries. Most of these groups took part in peaceful protests and engaged in lively political street theatre while others took more confrontational approaches, such as making it difficult for WTO delegates to get to their meetings by blocking roads and entrances to meeting places and hotels. There were also skirmishes between protesters and riot police. These events fed a media frenzy that came to dub the protests the "Battle in Seattle." Media attention brought the WTO negotiations to a heightened level of public awareness and scrutiny as never before. Supporters of economic globalization saw Seattle as a failure to spread economic prosperity and blamed this on the pejoratively labelled "anti-globalization movement." Inside the meeting rooms, developed and developing countries disagreed on what issues should be at the core of the trade negotiations. Developed countries wanted to expand the mandate of the WTO in areas such as investment, services, and intellectual property but there was also wide disagreement between them over agricultural subsidies. Developed countries were hesitant to expand the WTO mandate any further with many feeling that the concessions they had won in the last round had yet to be implemented. Combined, the tension that permeated inside the meeting rooms as a result of disagreement between states and that produced outside as the protests intensified, delayed but did not stop a new round of trade negotiations. WTO negotiations, however, would never again happen out of sight and out of mind of public scrutiny. While the failure of the 1999 Seattle ministerial was a result of diverse concerns emanating from within and outside the WTO over its future scope and advancing neo-liberal globalization, the failure in Hong Kong six years later was largely attributable to the prominence of one highly
A short and simple answer is to say that agriculture matters significantly to developing countries' economies, much more so than to those of developed countries. It is important to consider that seventy-five percent of the developing world's inhabitants live in rural areas and work in agriculture. Many poor countries depend heavily on export earnings from products such as coffee, cocoa, and cotton. By contrast, farming is of fairly minor economic importance in developed countries and employs less than one percent of the labour force in Europe and North America. Agriculture is highly protected in developed countries. This means that Northern farmers are much more insulated from price volatility and changes in consumer demand. In addition, many Northern farmers benefit from government-run insurance programs in the case of extreme weather or natural disasters, tariffs to keep out foreign goods, and subsidies to enhance international competitiveness. If you are a farmer in a developing country, you are likely to feel the repercussions of market volatility far more than your Northern counterpart. Developing country farmers do not have access to the same forms of assistance their Northern counterparts do. And in very poor countries, farming is already a very unstable and tenuous existence. Farming is not just a job for those in the poorest regions of the planet, it is often the only source of survival. But the problem of subsidies is not just one of inequality of the resources available to farmers in the North and South (i.e., the North has them and the South does not). The problem lies in the effects of Northern subsidies, which are not just local but have global ramifications. Economic globalization has led to an expansion of international food trade, meaning that Northern and Southern farmers increasingly compete with one another in the global market place. Economists have long-argued that subsidies encourage Northern farmers to over produce. According to laws of classical economics, when supply goes up and demand remains constant, this causes prices to drop. That means farmers receive less and less for what they produce. In the case of poor farmers, declining prices mean lower incomes which can drive them out of there is also another more complicated and more convoluted dimension to this situation arising out of
international politics, international trade rules, and fifty years of development policy. One of the main reasons agricultural trade is so contentious is that international trade rules have long favoured rich countries. In fact, multilateral agricultural trade rules did not come into existence until relatively recently. It was only during the recent Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations (1986-1994) that agriculture was put on the multilateral negotiating table. By contrast, trade rules on industrial goods have been negotiated successively since the implementation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1948. Whereas subsidies to industrial goods had been gradually reduced over time and later prohibited as international trade expanded in the post-World War II era, no limits existed on how much countries could subsidize their farm sectors. In fact, agriculture was considered exempt from GATT rules in part due to the refusal of the United States to cede authority over its farm policy. Historically, agricultural subsidies had helped to mechanize farming in order to build massive productive and export capacity in developed countries. Such subsidies were particularly important in the post-war reconstruction of Europe. However, once agricultural sectors in developed countries had stabilized by the 1960s, subsidies became an increasing source of political friction between countries. As global trade in farm goods increased, the absence of any meaningful constraints on subsidization meant that rich countries would end up in a vicious cycle of outspending each other on subsidies in order to keep their farm goods "competitive" and maintain their shares of export markets. This competition came to a head in the early 1980s when a farm trade war erupted between the United States and European Union. At that time both provided their farm sectors with egregious amounts of subsidies. This conflict became the final straw for many developed and developing countries which saw the subsidy conflict as dangerously destabilizing international agricultural markets and prices, in addition to directly and negatively impacting their farm sectors. They called for more disciplinary policies on the use of farm subsidies and this was a central issue during the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations which led to the creation of the WTO.
The end result was the Agreement on Agriculture. This agreement sought to progressively reduce, but not eliminate, the level of rich country farm subsidies. Proponents of the WTO claim the agreement was a good start and would make the international market for farm goods less distorted and allow developing countries to take advantage of their so-called comparative advantage in agricultural production. The minimizing of trade distortions which the agreement was argued to provide was supposed to have led to higher farm gate prices, and thus higher income for all producers. No one could deny, however, that these rules mostly benefited developed countries because they institutionalized and legalized their ability to provide farm subsidies, instead of prohibiting subsidies altogether as in the case of industrial goods. Developing countries, the majority of which did not significantly provide subsidies prior to the agreement (nor could afford to for that matter), felt they failed to get the parity in trade rules for which they were looking. To make matters worse, the agreement ended up with a subsidy reduction formula calculated by the United States and European Union to minimize the overall impact. Over the ensuing years, developing countries' frustration with the existing WTO farm subsidy rules was increasingly vocalized within the WTO. With the launch of the Doha Development round of multilateral trade negotiations, most developing countries (and a handful of developed countries) adopted the position that a new agriculture agreement would have to see developed countries end their subsidy programs as a minimum requirement. This concern over Northern farm subsidies took on special significance after Brazil launched a trade challenge in 2002 against the United State's cotton subsidy program arguing that the program did not conform to WTO subsidy rules. The United States is by far the world's biggest cotton exporter and its cotton industry is significantly subsidized. It was not uncommon in some years for more than half of the price received by American cotton producers to be made up of subsidies. Because of its status as the world's major exporter of cotton, these subsidies had major impacts on international cotton prices. When they had the effect of lowering world cotton prices, they harmed the economies of poor African cotton producing states which are highly dependent on cotton exports for a significant share of national income and employment. The United States lost the case and was
ordered by the WTO to reform and reduce its cotton subsidy program. This decision marked a major legal and political victory, as well as a moral one for those who saw Northern subsidies as major impediments to economic development in the South. In the years leading up to the Hong Kong meeting of trade ministers, the call for ending rich farm subsidies took on greater and greater symbolic significance. It became a major rallying point for developing country WTO members, NGOs, and WTO critics alike. Ending farm subsidies was seen as more than just another trade concession to be made by the developed world. Rather, it was cast as a necessary step to right the injustices of the international trading system. In particular, the NGO community criticized the paucity of efforts by developed countries to reduce agricultural protection as a rejection of their commitments to developing countries to help reduce poverty and hunger in the developing world, especially in Africa.

International financial institutions such as the World Bank and IMF also support the end of Northern farm subsidies. They view efforts to further liberalize agricultural trade (which includes eliminating subsidies and tariffs, and privatization) as inherently desirable because this, they argue, will lead to greater incomes in the developing world and reduce poverty. Moreover, the World Bank and IMF hope that liberalizing agriculture will help foster growth in African states, the very same region where these institutions' own neoliberal policy programs failed to usher in the growth and economic stability. The UN supports efforts to reduce Northern subsidies. Like the World Bank and IMF, the UN views agricultural trade liberalization as a path towards economic development in developing countries. Moreover, the UN promotes agricultural trade liberalization as a tool to meet the Millennium Development Goals of reducing poverty and hunger by half by 2015. Exactly how we are to interpret the meaning of the agreement of developing countries, NGOs, and international organizations on the subsidy issue is far from clear. Is it an indication that we are moving toward a more just trading system where the voices of the poor will be heard? Does it suggest new possible alliances between civil society, governments, and international organizations? Maybe these are plausible interpretations. But there are also very good reasons to be
cautious and scrutinize this broad agreement in terms of what it suggests in the longer term for agricultural trade and development in the South.

One particular concern is the way these groups are framing the problem and the solution to the Northern farm subsidy issue. The way the debate has been articulated by these groups has been to characterize rich countries' farm subsidies as the primary obstacle in the way of facilitating economic growth and poverty reduction in the South. In essence, they argue that Northern subsidies unequivocally reap havoc on developing country farmers. While Northern subsidies are harmful to developing countries, the problem of poverty in the South is much more complex and there is considerably more than just farm subsidies to consider.

In this debate, it is important to be sceptical and to try to separate the rhetoric of trade politics and the potential impacts of different policy options. While there is certainly a global and popular appeal, and political points to be won in the North and South by those groups critical of farm subsidies, there is also much reason to be concerned with the broader implications of this position. It is clear that the elimination of subsidies will likely be painful for certain farming groups in developed countries and this will certainly cause domestic political strife. However, it is much less clear if the elimination of subsidies will necessarily help improve the livelihood of developing country farmers. The first and most obvious reason is that most subsidies, with the exception of cotton and sugar, are directed to agricultural commodities that the poorest developing countries do not grow. The poorest developing countries are still dependent on cocoa, coffee, and tropical fruits and vegetables. These commodities receive minor amounts or no subsidies in the North (the major exception being the European Union which subsidizes its fruits and vegetables). One has to be cautious about putting too much faith in the argument that ending subsidies will have major positive impacts on developing countries. Many economists suggest that reducing subsidies may lead to increases in commodity prices. While this might benefit some developing country producers, it is sure to make life more difficult for many developing countries in Africa and Asia which are net-food importers by
increasing their food bills. Outlays for food already represent a high proportion of income in developing countries, especially for the poorest. Even small increases in food prices disproportionately disadvantage the people in the worlds' poorest states. Development economists Nancy Birdsall, Dani Rodrik, and Arvind Subramanian (2005, 5) argue that ending Northern subsidies will mostly benefit Northern taxpayers and consumers while the economic benefits to developing countries are likely to be negligible. When we examine the position taken by states, international organizations, and NGOs on farm subsidies more closely, it becomes highly problematic because what they are in effect doing is naturalizing and reaffirming neo-liberal approaches to trade and development. The main intellectual thinking underpinning their position is that by ending rich countries' farm subsidies, markets will correct themselves and efficiency gains will be accrued by all. Most observers concede that economic liberalization is subject to social and political forces. Trade policy is not immune from such forces. In fact, the politics of trade are always highly visible in the process. Markets and trade flows do not operate as textbook economics suggest they do. This should make us aware that eliminating farm subsidies alone will not fix the injustices, unfairness, and the structural inequalities inherent in global farm trade. While states, international organizations, and NGOs place such high expectation on the subsidy problem, they are also demonstrating a lack of imagination and do not offer constructive alternatives to addressing the serious structural problems and power imbalances at play in the global trading system or some of the domestic problems facing agricultural economies in developing countries. Leaving the solution to the market has been a key problem with neo-liberal thinking for over two decades now. The current group supporting the elimination of subsidies misses a key point. Many of the problems that affect the prospects for improving developing country agriculture are going to need much more constructive approaches. As I stated earlier, developing countries remain dependent on a small group of export-oriented commodities, a continuing legacy of imperialism in many cases. A key issue that has yet to be raised and addressed is the large degree of market concentration in agriculture. Unfortunately, these sorts of market "distortions" arising from the oligopolistic structures of agri-business are not on the WTO negotiating table because the
behaviour of private actors are beyond the scope of international trade rules. However, states play a major role in creating conditions for monopoly and oligopoly control of commodity chains. Many decades ago, the UN system was entrusted to look at these issues and to examine commodity specific solutions. While this mandate still exists, there seems very little interest in or political support for reviving this sort of role for the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) or UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). Looking back at the WTO ministerial collapse in Hong Kong, the friction over agricultural subsidies suggests to us that the major disagreements at play are not really about alternative visions to the existing agriculture trade system. It appears that the subsidy debate reflects an intensification of the neo-liberal policy paradigm instead of constituting a challenge to it. The agenda and support around eliminating subsidies suits middle-income developing countries like Brazil and Argentina who have powerful domestic farm oligopolies, international organizations such as the WTO, IMF, and World Bank who unquestionably believe in the benefits of trade liberalization for the South, and even NGOs that see subsidies as manifestations of inequality and injustice in the global trading system. While the position taken on subsidies by these diverse actors meets a variety of strategic objectives, in the end it supports the status quo of neo-liberal economic globalization by promoting free-market ideals. Despite the time, energy, and political will expended in order to achieve the objective of reducing Northern subsidies, it seems unlikely to result in radical improvements to the livelihoods of hundreds of millions poor farmers in the developing world.

**Future Roadmap: Media and WTO**

In light of the above study it is shown that there is glaring difference in the new content perspective when it comes to international trade. In developing countries like India only once editor has shown interest in highlighting the aspect of agricultural subsidies. All the coverage of news on agricultural subsidies has come during the negotiation period especially during the Cancun round. On biggest constraint which the media faces is the language content wherein most papers are in English and in the India the largest circulation of
media paper is in vernacular language. There is bias in the coverage wherein local papers do not give importance to the agricultural subsidies when it comes to the WTO negotiation. The main concern in agricultural trade has remained the market access or barriers to trade. Another glaring gap that is seen is the lagged nature of reporting in the news item. Indian media has been slow in reporting the aspect of box shifting which was reported in the medium only during the later periods. As discussed earlier the WTO processes follow a select procedure of putting a proposal and finally reaching an agreement and many countries are not aware of the processes. The media too lacks capacity especially in the South Asian region to cogently present the facts and build awareness and thereby build pressure on countries to mend their ways. Similarly the main drawback has still dogged the WTO and bringing agriculture within the ambit of the international trade regime had not so far realised the benefits hoped for, either by developed country advocating strongly for liberalisation or developing countries that rely on the export of agricultural produce. This is not surprising given the ability of agricultural policy communities in major developed countries to generate resistance to policy change. Non-governmental organisation concerned with developing countries have developed their own discourse on the subject organised around the concept of food sovereignty. This is viewed in terms of giving priority to peoples and communities right to food and to food production over trade concerns. For example, entails the support and promotion of local markets and producers over production for exports and food imports. The Indian main media have not mentioned any of these frames in the aspect agricultural negotiation and trade.

There have been some discussions of whether agriculture should be removed once again from the international trade regime. However, it has been recognised that trade negotiations at least offer the potential of dealing with such issues as the dumping of food imports in developing countries, whether as food aid or heavily subsidised exports. What is needed is the redesign of trade policies to allow more marginalised groups in rural areas to prosper. The call for food sovereignty is not seen as one for liberalisation or protectionism. With developing countries displaying increased capacity to influence the
course of negotiations greater attention will have to be given their concerns. The countries that provide large agricultural subsidies have greater ground if any agreement has to be reached and further progress can be expected if all countries can take advantage of the potential agricultural markets. However, media will play a key role in building awareness of developing countries in connecting with all the latest developments at WTO. Building media partnership will help reduce distrust among countries at the same enable better solution to the endless rounds of negotiations. The media needs to be well equipped to take on the aspects of international trade especially when in come to WTO. This will go a long way in harnessing the true potential of international trade and usher in a more prosperous world.