The general exception clauses of the TRIPS Agreement of the World Trade Organization permit exceptions to copyrights and to the rights conferred by trademarks, industrial designs and patents. These clauses are intended to facilitate access to diverse forms of proprietary knowledge and therefore foster the interdependent pillars of sustainable development: economic progress, realization of human rights and the conservation of the environment.

In this book Edson Beas Rodrigues Jr. argues that the TRIPS Agreement, in its current configuration, does not hinder the establishment of exceptions to intellectual property rights, devised to promote vital socio-economic interests such as the freedom to carry out creative and inventive activities, freedom of expression, the strengthening of free competition and increased access to educational materials by underprivileged students and to technical knowledge for humanitarian purposes.
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Isolated knowledge is a lamp to no avail; however, when moving from brain to brain, it turns into science and culture.
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A hundred times every day I tell myself that my inner and outer life are based on the labors of other men, living and dead, and that I must exert myself in order to give in the same measure as I have received.

Albert Einstein
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