

Dear Committee Secretary,
my following submission is in relation to the TPP-11 but is equally applicable to any and all trade agreements, whether in force or in prospect.

I am a retired Australian patent and trade mark attorney and worked in the profession for over 40 years.

I have witnessed and experienced the uses and misuses of intellectual property (a limited monopoly) rights during my paid working life to the point of it all becoming another "groundhog day". Being present during the era long before the WTO and TRIPS (commenced beginning of 1995), I've witnessed the progressive transfer of authority and sovereign rights from nations to corporations under the neoliberal dogma of privatisation of public property that can be sold (essentially with a guaranteed return to groups of already wealthy rentseekers). Looking back, I'm well aware of the false promises of increasing efficiency and reducing costs of privatisation as sold to the somnambulant citizenry. All of government and its managerialism has worked toward transferring wealth upwards from the have least to the have most. I'm extremely angry at the actions of our governments, whether in ignorance or connivance, in causing an increasing disparity in Australian society, never mind the rest of the world.

As a clearly stated in this radio broadcast
<http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/latenightlive/how-to-make-free-trade-fair/9593254> there are enormous losses to our nation in pursuing the current form of wrongly named FTAs. If what is stated in this discussion is false, it is open to those with a counter view to present facts and reasons as to why that is so.

My research and experience leads me to complete agreement with the views espoused by Dr Jim Stanford. Ciobo, and Robb before him, wouldn't have a clue about the meaning and consequences of the 6000 page TPP-11 agreement but its signing sure makes a cool photo-op and overseas trip up the pointy end of the plane - this is really all they care for as it gives the appearance of doing something worthwhile and bugger the consequences, never mind the facts (that is why, during negotiation, it stayed as a document in camera for so long during the Obama presidency before the leaks got out). We wouldn't want intelligent analysis being done on an open document which could be embarrassing, now would we? Certain multinational corporations were privy to the TPP during its negotiation but not the voting public; what appalling behaviour. There are far more smarts out here in voter land than the politicians want to know. Thank goodness it is becoming harder for them to hide in the internet age.

I deplore the use of "free" when they should be called "multi or bilateral trade agreements" (it is really a trojan horse for the ISDS provisions and etc relating to IP for the benefit of multinationals ahead of the citizens of the member states). Continuing to use "free" has that brainwashing effect of putting that as an idea in the minds of all those who use and hear the word "free" when associated with "trade agreement". This is the same mischaracterisation psychology as the marketers, business and politicians use in talking of "climate change" and not "global warming". Journalists become complicit in perpetrating the lie by continuing to use that terminology.

I strongly implore the Committee to use its intelligence in assessing the facts (and not the politics as members interpret those) in coming to the view that it is not in the national interest

to support the TPP-11 and like agreements. But as was said in my profession “bullshit baffles brains”, so I don’t hold out any great hope from those members from parties that have supported Australia adopting the TPP.

Yours sincerely
Fred Schilling