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#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the plan text and standard text to their new AC on the NDCA wiki

#### Violation: I asked and you chose not to disclosure – check the doc

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

Graphical user interface, text, application, Word, email

Description automatically generated

#### [1] Limits -- Unbroken standard are unpredictable because they can plan any part of the resolution making it impossible to know which part he’s going to specify, which means the neg has to prep every single one of thousands of different standards to have a shot at engaging whereas the aff only has to prep one, creating a massive prep skew. Turns aff flex, even if affirming is harder, which I will contest, you shouldn’t be able to eliminate 99 percent of neg prep. My interpretation is key to me being able to have any shot at engaging.

#### [2] Argument quality: standard text text disclosure discourages cheap shot aff’s with frings authors and shoddy solvency. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose. They had a month to prep – the neg is entitled to some research time to make sure the AFF is inherent, topical, and controversial. Otherwise bad AFF’s can win on purely surprise factor, which is a bad model b/c it encourages finding the most fringe surprising case possible instead of a well researched and defensible aff. Also impacts to evidence ethics, without any disclosure you could have an aff where you make up everything about the authors evidence ethics comes before any impact of the ac It calls into question everything else. If they would lie about their evidence then anything else they may have said could be a lie as well and should be disregarded.

**Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation and ow other voters on irriversibilty we cant get education from cutting cards but we will never get a level playingfield without theory. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted—also the shell indicts your whole aff—justifies severance which skews my strat. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear briteline. No RVIs—**

**a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect**

**b. its not logical—you don’t reward them for meeting the burden of being fair. Logic is a meta constraint on all args because it definitionally determines whether an argument is valid.**

## 2

#### Pharma innovation high now – monetary incentive is the biggest factor.

**Swagel 21** Phillip L. Swagel, Director of the Congressional budget office 4-xx-2021, "Research and Development in the Pharmaceutical Industry," Congressional Budget Office, <https://www.cbo.goc/publication/57126#_idTextAnchor020> SJ//DA

**Every year, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry develops a variety of new drugs that provide valuable medical benefits. Many of those drugs are expensive and contribute to rising health care costs for the private sector and the federal government. Policymakers have considered policies that would lower drug prices and reduce federal drug expenditures. Such policies would probably reduce the industry’s incentive to develop new drugs.** In this report, the Congressional Budget Office assesses trends in spending for drug research and development (R&D) and the introduction of new drugs. CBO also examines factors that determine how much drug companies spend on R&D: expected global revenues from a new drug; cost to develop a new drug; and federal policies that affect the demand for drug therapies, the supply of new drugs, or both. What Are Recent Trends in Pharmaceutical R&D and New Drug Approvals? T**he pharmaceutical industry devoted $83 billion to R&D expenditures in 2019. Those expenditures covered a variety of activities, including discovering and testing new drugs, developing incremental innovations such as product extensions, and clinical testing for safety-monitoring or marketing purposes. That amount is about 10 times what the industry spent per year in the 1980s, after adjusting for the effects of inflation.** The share of revenues that drug companies devote to R&D has also grown: **On average, pharmaceutical companies spent about one-quarter of their revenues (net of expenses and buyer rebates) on R&D expenses** in 2019, which is **almost twice as large a share of revenues as they spent in 2000.** That revenue share is larger than that for other knowledge-based industries, such as semiconductors, technology hardware, and software. The number of new drugs approved each year has also grown over the past decade. On averace, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved 38 new drugs per year from 2010 through 2019 (with a peak of 59 in 2018), which is 60 percent more than the yearly average over the previous decade. **Many of the drugs that have been approved in recent years are “specialty drugs.” Specialty drugs generally treat chronic, complex, or rare conditions, and they may also require special handling or monitoring of patients**. Many specialty drugs are biologics (large-molecule drugs based on living cell lines), **which are costly to develop, hard to imitate, and frequently have high prices.** Previously, most drugs were small-molecule drugs based on chemical compounds. Even while they were under patent, those drugs had lower prices than recent specialty drugs have. Information about the kinds of drugs in current clinical trials indicates that much of the industry’s innovative activity is focused on specialty drugs that would provide new cancer therapies and treatments for nervous-system disorders, such as Alzheimer’s disease and Parkinson’s disease. **What Factors Influence Spending for R&D?** Drug companies’ R&D spending decisions depend on three main factors: Anticipated lifetime global revenues from a new drug, **Expected costs to develop a new drug**, and Policies and programs that influence the supply of and demand for prescription drugs. Various considerations inform companies’ expectations about a drug’s revenue stream, including the anticipated prices it could command in different markets around the world and the expected global sales volume at those prices (given the number of people who might use the drug). The prices and sales volumes of existing drugs provide information about consumers’ and insurance plans’ willingness to pay for drug treatments. Importantly, when drug companies set the prices of a new drug, they do so to maximize future revenues net of manufacturing and distribution costs. A drug’s sunk R&D costs—that is, the costs already incurred in developing that drug—do not influence its price. **Developing new drugs is a costly and uncertain process, and many potential drugs never make it to market. Only about 12 percent of drugs entering clinical trials are ultimately approved for introduction by the FDA. In recent studies, estimates of the average R&D cost per new drug range from less than $1 billion to more than $2 billion per drug**. Those estimates include the costs of both laboratory research and clinical trials of successful new drugs as well as expenditures on drugs that do not make it past the laboratory-development stage, that enter clinical trials but fail in those trials or are withdrawn by the drugmaker for business reasons, or that are not approved by the FDA. Those estimates also include the company’s capital costs—the value of other forgone investments—incurred during the R&D process. Such costs can make up a substantial share of the average total cost of developing a new drug. The development process often takes a decade or more, and during that time the company does not receive a financial return on its investment in developing that drug. The federal government affects R&D decisions in three ways. First, it increases demand for prescription drugs, which encourages new drug development, by fully or partially subsidizing the purchase of prescription drugs through a variety of federal programs (including Medicare and Medicaid) and by providing tax preferences for employment-based health insurance. Second, the federal government increases the supply of new drugs. It funds basic biomedical research that provides a scientific foundation for the development of new drugs by private industry. Additionally, tax credits—both those available to all types of companies and those available to drug companies for developing treatmentscof uncommon diseases—provide incentives to invest in R&D. Similarly, deductions for R&D investment can be used to reduce tax liabilities immediately rather than over the life of that investment. Finally, the patent system and certain statutory provisions that delay FDA approval of generic drugs provide pharmaceutical companies with a period of market exclusivity, when competition is legally restricted. During that time, they can maintain higher prices on a patented product than they otherwise could, which makes new drugs more profitable and thereby increases drug companies’ incentives to invest in R&D. Third, some federal policies affect the number of new drugs by influencing both demand and supply. For example, federal recommendations for specific vaccines increase the demand for those vaccines and provide an incentive for drug companies to develop new ones. Additionally, federal regulatory policies that influence returns on drug R&D can bring about increases or decreases in both the supply of and demand for new drugs. Trends in R&D Spending and New Drug Development Private spending on pharmaceutical R&D and the approval of new drugs have both increased markedly in recent years, resuming a decades-long trend that was interrupted in 2008 as generic versions of some top-selling drugs became available and as the 2007–2009 recession occurred. **In particular, spending on drug R&D increased by nearly 50 percent between 2015 and 2019.** Many of the drugs approved in recent years are high-priced specialty drugs for relatively small numbers of potential patients. By contrast, the top-selling drugs of the 1990s were lower-cost drugs with large patient populations. R&D Spending R&D spending in the pharmaceutical industry covers a variety of activities, including the following: Invention, or research and discovery of new drugs; Development, or clinical testing, preparation and submission of applications for FDA approval, and design of production processes for new drugs; Incremental innovation, including the development of new dosages and delivery mechanisms for existing drugs and the testing of those drugs for additional indications; Product differentiation, or the clinical testing of a new drug against an existing rival drug to show that the new drug is superior; and Safety monitoring, or clinical trials (conducted after a drug has reached the market) that the FDA may require to detect side effects that may not have been observed in shorter trials when the drug was in development. In real terms**, private investment in drug R&D among member firms of the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA), an industry trade association, was about $83 billion in 2019, up from about $5 billion in 1980 and $38 billion in 2000**.1 Although those spending totals do not include spending by many smaller drug companies that do not belong to PhRMA, the trend is broadly representative of R&D spending by the industry as a whole.2 A survey of all U.S. pharmaceutical R&D spending (including that of smaller firms) by the National Science Foundation (NSF) reveals similar trends.3 Although total R&D spending by all drug companies has trended upward, small and large firms generally focus on different R&D activities. **Small companies not in PhRMA devote a greater share of their research to developing and testing new drugs,** many of which are ultimately sold to larger firms (see Box 1). By contrast, a greater portion of the R&D spending of larger drug companies (including those in PhRMA) is devoted to conducting clinical trials, developing incremental “line extension” improvements (such as new dosages or delivery systems, or new combinations of two or more existing drugs), and conducting postapproval testing for safety-monitoring or marketing purposes.

#### The aff crushes innovation in the pharma sector---incentivizes them to focus on non-important issues.

Glassman 21 [Amanda; 5/6/21; Executive vice president and a senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, a nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank in Washington and London; “*Big Pharma Is Not the Tobacco Industry*,” Barron, <https://www.barrons.com/articles/big-pharma-is-not-the-tobacco-industry-51620315693>] Justin

But here is the crux of the problem: The pharmaceutical industry is not the tobacco industry. They are not merchants of death. The companies are amoral and exist to make money, but their business is not fundamentally immoral. Big Pharma (mostly) develops and sells products that people need to survive and thrive. Their products improve health and welfare. Fights over access to medicines are possible because medicines exist in the first place—medicines that were usually developed by Big Pharma. And yes, the pharmaceutical industry benefits from public subsidy and publicly financed foundational research. But the companies also put their own capital at risk to develop new products, some of which offer enormous public benefits. In fact, several of them did just that in the pandemic: invested their own money to develop patented manufacturing technologies in record time. Those technologies are literally saving the world right now. Public funding supported research and development, but companies also brought their own proprietary ingenuity and private investments to bear toward solving the world’s singular, collective challenge. Their reward should be astronomical given the insane scale of the health and economic benefits these highly efficacious vaccines produce every day. Market incentives sent a clear signal that further needed innovation—greater efficacy, single doses, more-rapid manufacturing, updated formulations, fast boosters, and others—would be richly rewarded. Market incentives could also have been used to lubricate supply lines and buy vaccines on behalf of the entire world; with enough money, incredible things can happen. But activist lobbying to waive patents—a move the Biden administration endorsed yesterday—sends exactly the opposite signal. It says that the most important, valuable innovations will be penalized, not rewarded. It tells innovators, don’t bother attacking the most important global problems; instead, throw your investment dollars at the next treatment for erectile disfunction, which will surely earn you a steady return with far less agita. It is worth going back to first principles. What problem are we trying to solve? We have highly efficacious vaccines that we would like to get out to the entire world as quickly as possible to minimize, preventable disease and deaths address atrocious inequities, and enable the reopening of society, trade, and commerce. Hundreds of millions of people have been plunged into poverty over the past year; in the developing world, the pandemic is just getting started. What is the quickest way to get this done? Vaccine manufacturing is not just a recipe; if you attack and undermine the companies that have the know-how, do you really expect they’ll be eager to help you set up manufacturing elsewhere? Is the plan to march into Pfizer and force its staff to redeploy to Costa Rica to build a new factory? Do the U.S. administration or activists care that this decision could take years to negotiate at the World Trade Organization, and will likely be litigated for years thereafter? Does it make sense to eliminate the incentive for private companies to invest in vaccine R&D or in the response to the next health emergency? And if the patent waiver is only temporary and building a factory takes months or years, will anyone bother to do so, even if they could? No, none of it makes sense. Worse still, we could solve the policy problem more easily by harnessing market incentives for the global good by ponying up cash to vaccinate the entire world. No confiscation necessary.

We’ll conceded aff impacts – extinction
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#### THE COLLAPSE OF APPALLETE BODY, THE INABILITY TO MANAGE CHINA AND CHANGING TRENDS IN TRADE ALL MEAN THE WTO IS ON THE VERGE OF COLLAPSE

Suh et al 21 Jin Kyo Suh et. al, (Senior Research Fellow, Trade Agreement Team, Department of International Trade) 6/1/21, The Crisis of the WTO and New, Direction for Negotiation Strategies of Korea, Korean Institute for International Economic Policy. {bracketed for ableist language} SJEP

The WTO is facing a historical crisis. Its main functions ‒ namely, providing a negotiating forum, administrating WTO trade agreements and monitoring national trade policies, and resolving trade disputes ‒ have been significantly ~~paralyzed~~ [weakened]. Since launching the Doha Development Round in 2001, the WTO has failed to produce meaningful outcomes to this day. Further, China’s entry into the WTO has neither opened up its economy, nor created a level playing field when it comes to potentially market-distorting subsidies. The surveillance of trade policies based on the Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM), a fundamentally important activity running throughout the work of the WTO aimed at fostering transparency, is criticized for its lack of effectiveness. **The Dispute Settlement Mechanism (DSM), once praised as the WTO’s “crown jewel,” is now on the verge of collapse due to the absence of an appeal court.** Although the cause of the crisis is partly institutional, higher uncertainty is also a considerable problem aggravating the fate of the multilateral trading system. Such uncertainty comes from two factors: rising protectionism, and trade frictions between developed and developing countries including those between the United States and China. Meanwhile, the WTO also needs to respond to rapid structural changes in global trade. The center of the world’s trade is shifting towards trade in services. The development and spread of information and communication technology (ICT) are making it easier to supply services across borders. The regionalization or localization of global value chains (GVCs) continues and GVCs are shifting towards knowledgebased goods. Therefore, the WTO faces a historical challenge it is highly unlikely to survive without proper reflection on the new trends of global trade.

#### AN EFFECTIVE RESPONSE TO COVID, INJECTS THE WTO WITH LEGITIMACY AND GIVES IT MOMENTUM TO REFORM

Meyer 18 David Meyer (Senior writer, Fortune magazine), 6/18/2021, The WTO’s survival hinges on the COVID-19 vaccine patent debate, waiver advocates warn, Fortune, <https://fortune.com/2021/06/18/wto-covid-vaccines-patents-waiver-south-africa-trips/> SJEP

The World Trade Organization knows all about crises. Former U.S. President Donald Trump threw a wrench into its core function of resolving trade disputes—a blocker that President Joe Biden has not yet removed—and there is widespread dissatisfaction over the fairness of the global trade rulebook. The 164-country organization, under the fresh leadership of Nigeria's Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, has a lot to fix. However, one crisis is more pressing than the others: the battle over COVID-19 vaccines, and whether the protection of their patents and other intellectual property should be temporarily lifted to boost production and end the pandemic sooner rather than later. According to some of those pushing for the waiver—which was originally proposed last year by India and South Africa—the WTO's future rests on what happens next. "The credibility of the WTO will depend on its ability to find a meaningful outcome on this issue that truly ramps-up and diversifies production," says Xolelwa Mlumbi-Peter, South Africa's ambassador to the WTO. "Final nail in the coffin" The Geneva-based WTO isn't an organization with power, as such—it's a framework within which countries make big decisions about trade, generally by consensus. It's supposed to be the forum where disputes get settled, because all its members have signed up to the same rules. And one of its most important rulebooks is the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, or TRIPS, which sprang to life alongside the WTO in 1995. The WTO's founding agreement allows for rules to be waived in exceptional circumstances, and indeed this has happened before: its members agreed in 2003 to waive TRIPS obligations that were blocking the importation of cheap, generic drugs into developing countries that lack manufacturing capacity. (That waiver was effectively made permanent in 2017.) Consensus is the key here. Although the failure to reach consensus on a waiver could be overcome with a 75% supermajority vote by the WTO's membership, this would be an unprecedented and seismic event. In the case of the COVID-19 vaccine IP waiver, it would mean standing up to the European Union, and Germany in particular, as well as countries such as Canada and the U.K.—the U.S. recently flipped from opposing the idea of a waiver to supporting it, as did France. It's a dispute between countries, but the result will be on the WTO as a whole, say waiver advocates. "If, in the face of one of humanity's greatest challenges in a century, the WTO functionally becomes an obstacle as in contrast to part of the solution, I think it could be the final nail in the coffin" for the organization, says Lori Wallach, the founder of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch, a U.S. campaigning group that focuses on the WTO and trade agreements. "If the TRIPS waiver is successful, and people see the WTO as being part of the solution—saving lives and livelihoods—it could create goodwill and momentum to address what are still daunting structural problems." Those problems are legion.

#### THE WTO UNDERMINES INITIATIVES THAT FIGHT CLIMATE CHANGE AND FOSTERS A GLOBAL ECONOMIC ORDER THAT PRIVILEGES PROFIT OVER ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH. IN ORDER TO STOP CLIMATE CHANGE THE WTO MUST DIE.

Campesina 13 Via Campesina (international farmers organization founded in 1993 in Mons, Belgium, formed by 182 organisations in 81 countries,[1] and describing itself as "an international movement which coordinates peasant organizations of small and middle-scale producers, agricultural workers, rural women, and indigenous communities from Asia, Africa, America, and Europe), 9/9/13, To confront the climate emergency we need to dismantle the WTO and the free trade regime, VIA CAMPESINA, https://viacampesina.org/en/to-confront-the-climate-emergency-we-need-to-dismantle-the-wto-and-the-free-trade-regime/SJEP

These existing WTO trade rules are currently undermining initiatives to tackle climate change and they can be further aggravated by the attempt of new negotiations in the upcoming 9th Ministerial meeting in Bali, Indonesia. How the corporate rules of the WTO work Under the WTO logic, each country should specialize in what they can produce best -what is called their “comparative advantages”- and then trade these products in exchange for products that other countries produce best. This logic however promotes the construction of market-oriented and imbalanced economies that focus on the demands of the market rather than the needs of their people on the ground. These export-oriented economies also bleed Mother Nature in order to exploit the most out of it provoking disruptions in the environment as we are seeing now with climate change, biodiversity loss and the destruction of ecosystems. This is the capitalist logic – nature is just a thing to be exploited for profit. The real beneficiaries of this imbalanced trade rules of the WTO are the transnational corporations since in reality, they are the ones that have more “comparative advantages” than fledgling national and domestic infant industries. In a world of free trade flows – as the WTO aspires – transnational corporations are free to enter and move between countries, choosing those with cheap labor and relaxed regulations and at the same time able to exit and move out just as easily after it has exhausted and grabbed the natural resources, leaving in several cases, their toxic waste. At the same time, the losers are many – the farmers who lose their farms as they cannot compete with cheap food imports that flood the local markets, the workers whose jobs are made even more unstable and precarious with the pressure to lower labor standards, the persons who are forced to migrate because of loss of livelihood, the women who are most times those who bear the brunt of economic distress on the family and community, the indigenous people who are displaced from their lands, and Mother Earth. Global Trade Rules and the Environment The WTO, of course, claims to be committed to “environmental protection” and “sustainable development.” Citing Article XX from the old GATT[[1]](https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?shva=1" \l "140f3245da855c0a__ftn1" \o ")regime that was grandfathered into the WTO, any country can be exempted from the WTO rules to bring in policy measures “necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health” [Article XX–b] or measures “relating to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources…” [Article XX–g]. At first glance this may sound ‘environmentally friendly,’ but it is conditioned by a big caveat in the Article’s preamble [or ‘chapeau’] which, in effect, puts the onus on countries initiating environmental protection measures to prove that their actions will not cause “arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination” or pose a “disguised restriction on international trade.” In other words, global trade rules guaranteeing the free flow of capital, goods and services trump environmental protection priorities. As a result, environmental protection measures are often challenged and struck down for being a “disguised restriction on international trade.” Indeed, under the overarching ‘most favored nation’ and ‘national treatment’ clauses of the WTO regime, those transnational corporations based in member countries effectively have ‘sovereign rights.’ Moreover, even the scope of environmental protection covered by Article XX is too narrowly defined to adequately safeguard measures urgently needed today to combat climate change, let alone the further commodification of nature. Recent WTO ruling against climate initiatives In the province of Ontario, Canada, the WTO recently struck down a law and program designed to promote the development of renewable energy as a measure for mitigating climate change while also creating jobs. The program allots the majority of producer power rights to Ontario companies thereby making it possible for the province to make the transition from coal, oil and gas without completely damaging its local economy. Its ‘domestic content requirements’ ensure that new manufacturing jobs will be created in Ontario by requiring that 25 percent of the content of all wind projects and 50 percent of the content of all solar projects are produced by workers and industries in the province. This program also guaranteed preferential 20-year purchase price per kilowatt-hour for electricity from wind and solar generators from companies that had a certain percentage of their costs originating from Ontario. In its first two years, this program created more than 20,000 climate jobs in Ontario and was on track to create a total of 50,000. It was accelerating the production of renewable energy while simultaneously reducing both greenhouse gas emissions and unemployment. While there are particular concerns about the program’s implementation, it is recognized as an innovative step toward tackling climate change. In 2010/2011, however, Japan and the European Union representing the interest of their transnational corporations filed cases in the WTO against Ontario’s renewable energy incentives program claiming that it was violating the “national treatment” rule of the WTO. This rule establishes: “The products of the territory of any contracting party [country member of the WTO] imported into the territory of any other contracting party [country member of the WTO] shall be accorded treatment no less favourable than that accorded to like products of national origin in respect of all laws, regulations and requirements affecting their internal sale, offering for sale, purchase, transportation, distribution or use.” [Art. III. 4 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) of the WTO] This means that you can give more benefits to foreign transnational corporations but never less than what you have given to a domestic enterprise. When it comes to climate change, this implies that a State cannot promote the development of a national industry of solar panels, wind energy or renewable energy by using national regulations primarily designed to benefit domestic companies or products. If a State wants to give subsidies or preferences to those national companies or products it must also give the same incentives to foreign transnational corporations. In other words an infant domestic effort at generating renewable energy, will have to compete from the first day with a big foreign transnational corporation of “clean energy”, most of them main actors of the so-called “Green Economy”, that care much more about their markets than the climate of the world and that in reality still promote a market-based and exploitative model of “renewable energy”. On May 2013, the Dispute Settlement Body of the WTO in its final ruling said that Canada/Ontario was in violation of WTO rules. One month later, the Ontario Minister of Energy announced that they will “comply with the World Trade Organization’s ruling on the domestic content provision”. The WTO ruling against Ontario is just the tip of the iceberg. There are other cases, for example, in India, who is still suffering the deaths of almost 1,000 persons, the disappearances of 3,000 and the evacuation of 100,000 due to the extreme floods caused by deforestation and climate change in Uttarakhand, there was a case filed by the United States in February 2013 in the WTO challenging India’s use of subsidies and “buy local” rules in its domestic solar program. The WTO rules that the United States has based its complaints on that India has supposedly violated are the very same ones that forced Ontario to change its renewable energy program. Furthermore, there are disputes in the WTO between China, the United States and the European Union in relation to wind power equipment and solar panels. These disputes don’t aim to lower the prices of renewable energy but rather the contrary. Their main aim is to preserve the markets and profits of their respective corporations. Bali: New attempt to expand the WTO and FTAs At the next ministerial meeting of the WTO, they will not try to conclude the “Doha Development Round.” This has proven to be too difficult as it is a massive agreement encompassing numerous areas and with the “single undertaking” clause of the WTO, where everything or nothing is agreed, this has led to the impasse in the negotiations. However, with a new Director General supported by the influential developing country coalition BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), the transnational corporations and big players in the WTO have a new strategy to unlock the stalemate and promote an “early harvest” of some agreements, what they call the “Bali Package”, and push forward agreements that will include environmental goods and services like the White House has recently announced: “The U.S. will work with trading partners to launch negotiations at the World Trade Organization towards global free trade in environmental goods, including clean energy technologies such as solar, wind, hydro and geothermal… Over the next year, we will work towards securing participation of countries, which account for 90 percent of global trade in environmental goods, representing roughly $481 billion in annual environmental goods trade. We will also work in the Trade in Services Agreement negotiations towards achieving free trade in environmental services.” [[2]](https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?shva=1" \l "140f3245da855c0a__ftn2" \o ") In effect, these measures are part of the follow-up to the false ‘green economy’ agenda promoted and adopted at the Rio+20 Earth Summit last June 2012. A prime objective of this Rio+20 plan of action is to promote and accelerate the commodification of both material and non-material parts of nature. Here, for example, the functions of forests are to be extended beyond just the provision of wood products to be used for environmental services ranging from green tourism to carbon capture and storage. In turn, this calls for the establishment of markets for ecosystem services and biodiversity offsets. However, in order to create and advance markets for environmental services and goods, they must be aided and abetted by global trade rules. In other words, the false ‘green economy’ agenda simply cannot operate without the WTO regime and the FTAs. And we need to remember that the rules of the WTO are the basis for all other free trade agreements, whether bilateral or regional, (TPP, TTIP, EPAs, CAFTA, NAFTA, EU-Association Agreements and others[[3]](https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?shva=1" \l "140f3245da855c0a__ftn3" \o ")). These WTO-plus agreements are also in their own right, undermining and working counter to initiatives to care for the environment and address climate change. There are dozens of cases all over the world of foreign corporations demanding huge compensations from States, using the FTAs clause allowing lawsuits from investor to State, because of national environmental regulations. Occidental v. Ecuador, Pacific Rim Mining Corp v. El Salvador, Vattenfall v. Germany, Renco vs. Peru are just some examples of how free trade and investment rules are designed and used to undermine initiatives to heal nature. In many situations a simple threat of a lawsuit from an investor, eases national environmental regulations. International trade law has legal mechanisms to sanction and implement their rulings while environmental provisions are mainly declarations that have no compliance mechanisms and are easily trumped by trade agreements. People and Nature first! To address the climate emergency we need to not only stop the expansion of the WTO and FTAs but we need to go beyond that and call for an end to the WTO itself and the free trade regime. There is no more time for half-measures. If we are to save nature and humanity, we need to change the system and changing the system means dismantling the free trade regime. WTO rulings like in the Ontario case cannot be allowed to proliferate. Governments should not have to follow rulings that undermine initiatives to address climate change. Human rights, labor rights, indigenous rights and the rights of Mother Earth have to be above trade rules if we want to preserve life as we know it. In the WTO and the FTAs, there are clauses that guarantee the patents of transnational corporations over inventions that can save millions of lives and that can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We are living a global emergency situation, greater than any that we have lived, and intellectual property rights for profit should not have precedence over nature and humanity. Trade is needed but a different kind of trade, one that is not based on the exploitation of people and nature and whose rules benefit the communities and not the corporations. The kind of trade we need is complementary and equitable trade not corporate free trade. We need to guarantee that all countries and especially those that are least responsible and most affected by climate change have the right and the capacity to: Support their national and domestic renewable energy sector trough “buy local” regulations, subsidies and all kinds of measures that allow them to get rid of fossil fuels as soon as possible. Have free access to all patents concerning renewable energy and inventions that can help limit the impacts of climate change. Promote food sovereignty and agroecology to not only cool the planet but to feed the people without agrotoxics and GMOs. Stimulate local production and consumption of durable goods to meet the fundamental needs of the people and avoid the transport of goods that can be produced locally. Guarantee the human right to water, reverse the privatization of public water services and preserve the watersheds. Push for clean and accessible public transport infrastructure to take cars off the roads to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Establish regulations and sanctions against industries that destroy and pollute the environment without the threat of international disputes. Encourage the nationalization and control of the society over the energy sector to dismantle the dirty component and accelerate the expansion and promote community based renewable forms of clean energy. Promote economies that are diverse and resilient to climate change. To really address the climate crisis, a world without the WTO and the FTAs, one that is not dominated by transnational corporations and the global free trade regimes, is necessary! We have to change the system, and we have to do this now.

#### Climate change destroys the world.

Specktor 19 [Brandon; writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, 6/4/19; <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>] Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."