## 1

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – [a] the resolution indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation [b] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### Morality must be grounded in a priori truth to guide action, otherwise everyone would have different ethical codes and follow different rules. And, truth exists independent of human experience since certain things can be self-proving, i.e. a triangle has three sides. This is the difference between a priori and a posteriori. Things that are true by observation are just true by a matter of chance. For example, the cat may be on the mat, but we can also conceive of a world in which the cat is not on the mat. In contrast, we can’t conceive of a world in which a triangle does not have three sides since it is tautologically true. Reject a posteriori truth since they are just arbitrary states of being, not constitutive of ethics.

#### And, a priori truth has to apply to everyone: [a] absent universal ethics, morality becomes arbitrary and fails to guide action, which means that ethics is rendered useless. [b] it’s a tautological contradiction: any non-universal norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends, which also means universalizability acts as a side constraint on all other frameworks.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with willing universal maxims.

#### 1] Intellectual property is an inalienable personal right of economic use

**Pozzo 6** Pozzo, Riccardo. “Immanuel Kant on Intellectual Property.” Trans/Form/Ação, vol. 29, no. 2, 2006, pp. 11–18., doi:10.1590/s0101-31732006000200002. SJ//DA recut SJKS recut Cookie JX

Corpus mysticum, opus mysticum, propriété incorporelle, proprietà letteraria, geistiges Eigentum. All these terms mean **intellectual property, the existence of which is intuitively clear because of the unbreakable bond that ties the work to its creator.** The book belongs to whomever has written it, the picture to whomever has painted it, the sculpture to whomever has sculpted it; and this independently from the number of exemplars of the book or of the work of art in their passages from owner to owner. The initial bond cannot change and it ensures the author authority on the work. Kant writes in section 31/II of the Metaphysics of Morals: “Why does unauthorized publishing, which strikes one even at first glance as unjust, still have an appearance of being rightful? Because on the one hand a book is a corporeal artifact (opus mechanicum) that can be reproduced (by someone in legitimate possession of a copy of it), so that there is a right to a thing with regard to it. On the other hand a book is also a mere discourse of the publisher to the public, which the publisher may not repeat publicly without having a mandate from the author to do so (praestatio operae), and this is a right against a person. The error consists in mistaking one of these rights for the other” (Kant, 1902, t.6, p.290). The corpus mysticum, **the work considered as an immaterial good, remains property of the author on behalf of the original right of its creation. The corpus mechanicum consists of the exemplars of the book or of the work of art. It becomes the property of whoever has bought the material object in which the work has been reproduced or expressed.** Seneca points out in De beneficiis (VII, 6) the difference between owning a thing and owning its use. He tells us that the bookseller Dorus had the habit of calling Cicero’s books his own, while there are people who claim books their own because they have written them and other people that do the same because they have bought them. Seneca concludes that the books can be correctly said to belong to both, for it is true they belong to both, but in a different way **The peculiarity of intellectual property consists thus first in being indeed a property, but property of an action; and second in being indeed inalienable, but also transferable in commission and license to a publisher. The bond the author has on his work confers him a moral right that is indeed a personal right. It is also a right to exploit economically his work in all possible ways, a right of economic use, which is a patrimonial right. Kant and Fichte argued that moral right and the right of economic use are strictly connected, and that the offense to one implies inevitably offense to the other.** In eighteenth-century Germany, the free use came into discussion among the presuppositions of a democratic renewal of state and society. In his Supplement to the Consideration of Publishing and Its Rights, Reimarus asked writers “instead of writing for the aristocracy, to write for the tiers état of the reader’s world.” (Reimarus, 1791b, p.595). **He saluted with enthusiasm the claim of disenfranchising from the monopoly of English publishers expressed in the American Act for the Encouragement of Learning of May 31, 1790. Kant, however, was firm in embracing intellectual property. Referring himself to Roman Law, he asked for its legislative formulation not only as patrimonial right, but also as a personal right.** In Of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing, he considered the moral faculties related to **intellectual property as an “inalienable right (ius personalissimum) always himself to speak through anyone else, the right, that is, that no one may deliver the same speech to the public other than in his (the author’s) name”** (Kant, 1902, t.8, p.85). Fichte went farther in the Demonstration of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing. **He saw intellectual property as a part of his metaphysical construction of intellectual activity, which was based on the principle that thoughts “are not transmitted hand to hand, they are not paid with shining cash, neither are they transmitted to us if we take home the book that contains them and put it into our library.** In order to make those thoughts our own an action is still missing: we must read the book, meditate – provided it is not completely trivial – on its content, consider it under different aspects and eventually accept it within our connections of ideas” (Fichte, 1964, t.I/1, p.411). At the center of the discussion was the practice of reprinting books in a pirate edition after having them reset word after words after an exemplar of the original edition. Given Germany’s division in a myriad of small states, the imperial privilege was ineffective against pirate publishing. Kant and Fichte spoke for the acceptance of the right to defend the work of an author by the usurpations of others so that he may receive a patrimonial advantage from those who utilize the work acquiring new knowledge and/or an aesthetic experience. In particular, Fichte declared the absolute primacy of the moral faculties within the corpus mysticum. He divided the latter into a formal and a material part. “This intellectual element must be divided anew into what is material, the content of the book, the thoughts it presents; and the form of these thoughts, the manner in which, the connection in which, the formulations and the words by means of which the book presents them” (Fichte, 1964, t.I/1, p.411). Fichte’s underlining the author’s exclusive right to the intellectual content of his book – “the appropriation of which through another is physically impossible” (ibid.) – brought him to the extreme of prohibiting any form of copy that is not meant for personal use. In Publishing Considered anew, Reimarus considered on the contrary copyright in its patrimonial aspects as a limitation to free trade: “What would not happen were a universal protection against pirate publishing guaranteed? Monopoly and safer sales certainly do not procure convenient price; on the contrary, they are at the origin of great abuses. The only condition for convenient price is free-trade, and one cannot help noticing that upon the appearance of a private edition, publishers are forced to substantially lower the price of a book” (Reimarus, 1791a, pp.402-3). Reimarus admitted of being unable to argue in terms of justice. Justice was of no bearing, he said, for whom, like himself, considered undemonstrated the author’s permanent property of his work (herein supported by the legislative vacuum of those years). What mattered, he said, was equity. In sum, Reimarus anticipated today’s stance on free use by referring to the principle that public interest on knowledge ought to prevail on the author’s interest and to balance the copyright. Moreover, Reimarus extended his argument beyond the realm of literary production to embrace, among others, the today vital issue of pharmaceutical production on patented receipts. “Let us suppose that at some place a detailed description for the preparation of a good medicine or of any other useful thing be published, why may not somebody who lives in places that are far away from that one copy it to use it for his own profit and but must instead ask the original publisher for the issue of each exemplar?” (Reimarus, 1791b, t.2, pp.584). To sum up, Reimarus’s stance does not seem respondent to rule of law. For in all dubious case the general rule ought to prevail, fighting intellectual property with anti-monopolistic arguments in favor of free trade brings with itself consequences that are not tranquilizing also for the ones that are expected to apply the law. **By resetting literary texts, one could obviously expurgate some errors. More frequently, however, some were added, given the exclusively commercial objectives of the reprints. The valid principle was, thus, that reprints were less precise than original editions, but they were much cheaper for the simple reason that the pirate publisher had a merely moral obligation against the author and the original publisher. In fact, he was not held to pay any honorarium to the author upon handling over the manuscript, nor to paying him royalties, nor to pay anything to the original publisher. The** only expense in charge of the pirate publisher was buying the exemplar of the original edition out of which he was to make, as we say today, a free use.

#### 2]The aff encourages free riding- that treats people as ­means to an end and takes advantage of their efforts which violates the principle of humanity

**Van Dyke 2** Raymond Van Dyke, 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/> SJ//DA recut SJKS

Also, **allowing the free taking of ideas, content and valuable data, i.e., the fruits of individual intellectual endeavor**, would disrupt capitalism in a radical way. **The resulting more secretive approach in support of the above free-riding Statement** would be akin to a Communist environment **where the State owned everything and the citizen owned nothing, i.e., the people “consented” to this. It is, accordingly, manifestly clear that no reasonable and supportable Categorical Imperative can be made for the unwarranted theft of property, whether tangible or intangible,** apart from legitimate exigencies.

#### IPs are a necessary check on companies free-riding off associations of quality.

Wong et al 20 [Liana, Ian, and Shayerah; Analyst in International Trade and Finance; Specialist in International Trade and Finance; Specialist in International Trade and Finance; “Intellectual Property Rights and International Trade,” \*Updated\* 5/12/20; CRS; <https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20200512_RL34292_2023354cc06b0a4425a2c5e02c0b13024426d206.pdf>] Justin

Trademark protection in the United States is governed jointly by state and federal law. The main federal statute is the Lanham Act of 1946 (Title 15 of the United States Code). Trademarks permit the seller to use a distinctive word, name, symbol, or device to identify and market a product or company. Marks can also be used to denote services from a particularly company. The trademark allows quick identification of the source of a product, and for good or ill, can become an indicator of a product's quality. If for good, the trademark can be valuable by conveying an instant assurance of quality to consumers. Trademark law serves to prevent other companies with similar merchandise from free-riding on the association of quality with the trademarked item. Thus, a trademarked good may command a premium in the marketplace because of its reputation. To be eligible for a trademark, the words or symbol used by the business must be sufficiently distinctive; generic names of commodities, for example, cannot be trademarked. Trademark rights are acquired through use or through registration with the PTO.

A related concept to trademarks is geographical indications (GIs), which are also protected by the Lanham Act. The GI acts to protect the quality and reputation of a distinctive product originating in a certain region; however, the benefit does not accrue to a sole producer, but rather the producers of a product originating from a particular region. GIs are generally sought for agricultural products, or wines and spirits. Protection for GIs is acquired in the United States by registration with the PTO, through a process similar to trademark registration.

## 2

#### Reduce is distinct from simply changing

Finch 73 (James A. Finch Jr., judge. “State ex rel. Cason v. Bond, 495 S.W.2d 385,” Supreme Court of Missouri, 1973)

"\* \* \* The fact that this section relates solely to appropriation bills, in conjunction with the word 'reduce,' indicates clearly that the expression 'items or parts of items' refers to separable fiscal units. They are appropriations of sums of money. Power is conferred upon the Governor to reduce a sum of money appropriated, or to disapprove the appropriation entirely. No power is conferred to change the terms of an appropriation except by reducing the amount thereof. Words or phrases are not 'items or parts of items.' This principle applies to the condition [\*\*14] attached to the appropriation now in question. That condition is not an item or a part of an item. The veto power conferred upon the Governor was designed to enable him to recommend the striking out or reduction of any item or part of an item. In the present instance His Excellency the Governor did not undertake to veto the appropriation of $100,000 made by item 101, or any part of it, nor to reduce that amount or any part of it apportioned to a specific purpose. He sought, rather, as shown by his message, to enlarge the appropriation made by the General Court by throwing the $100,000 into a common fund to be used for any one of several different purposes. We are of opinion that the power conferred upon him by said article 63 does not extend to the removal of restrictions imposed upon the use of the items appropriated."

#### Violation: They just change the time of patents they’re not reducing the actual patent they’re just changing a property of it

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits and ground– their model allows affs to defend anything from pandemics to Biden’s presidency— there's no universal DA since it’s impossible to know the timeframe when there won’t be IP— that explodes neg prep and leads to random timeframe of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible — limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep (innovation, collaboration, econ, ptx: all core neg literature thrown away)

#### 2] Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 3] TVA – defend the advantage to a whole rez timeframe. We don’t prevent new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – our model allows you to specify countries and medicines.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 3

#### 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 6/18 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."