## 1

#### Interpretation – The affirmative must defend that the World Trade Organization reduces intellectual property protection.

#### Member nations of the WTO make decisions as a whole

WTO ND [(World Trade Organization) “What is the WTO?” https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/whatis\_e.htm] //recut ww dl

The WTO is run by its member governments. All major decisions are made by the membership as a whole, either by ministers (who usually meet at least once every two years) or by their ambassadors or delegates (who meet regularly in Geneva).

#### Nation and state are synonymous

Merriam Webster ND [“nation” Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nation>] //recut ww dl

Definition of nation (Entry 1 of 2) 1a(1): [NATIONALITY sense 5a](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationality)three Slav peoples … forged into a Yugoslavia without really fusing into a Yugoslav nation— Hans Kohn (2): a politically organized [nationality](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationality) (3)in the Bible : a non-Jewish nationality why do the nations conspire— Psalms 2:1 (Revised Standard Version) b: a community of people composed of one or more [nationalities](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationalities) and possessing a more or less defined territory and government Canada is a nation with a written constitution— B. K. Sandwell c: a territorial division containing a body of people of one or more nationalities and usually characterized by relatively large size and independent status a nation of vast size with a small population— Mary K. Hammond

#### Violation – they don’t – EU member states are distinct from WTO member nations

#### Prefer

#### [1] Ground – Justifies affs about any country reducing any IP protection on medicine – only our interp ensures link magnitude by ensuring it is an international reduction for IPP for medicine which is key to generics like the innovation DA, WTO bad, consult the WHO, and the IP NC -- privileges the aff by stretching pre-tournament neg prep too thin and precluding nuanced rigorous testing of aff.

#### [2] Topic ed – WTO patent wavers are the core topic controversy – their aff is just domestic policy passed in European Union Member states. Proven by their second advantage – none of their internal links are about medical trade secrets which proves their interpretation is a cheap way of getting a relations impact about any two countries that does trade – justifies the US-Mexico or China-Japan aff. Outweighs aff flex -- prep is determined by the lit and we only have 2 months to debate the topic and it provides better link magnitude to all your generics because this is the statis point the topic is centered around.

#### [3] Precision – Even if all EU member states are in the WTO that doesn’t mean all WTO member nations are in the EU – prefer our interp – we have evidence from the WTO that explains what coordinated action looks like.

#### 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

## 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater may specify either a member nation or medicine; to clarify they can do one, but not both.

#### Violation: they specify the European Union and covid vaccines

#### Standards:

**[1] Limits – affirmatives gets infinite permutations of every medicine and every member nation which creates a huge caselist. That results in shallow debates that skirts clash and pushes argumentation to the fringes to find broad theses that disagree with everything. This prevents rigorous argument testing – anyone can skim a Wikipedia article, but the process of clash is unique to debate.**

**[2] Ground – double spec destroys offense on strength of link – we lose the innovation DA, inequality DA, econ DAs, and health diplomacy DA, destroys CPs since they wouldn’t be competitive – kills testing of the 1AC and creates an unfair division of ground – kills fairness and advocacy skills**

#### TVA – defend a subset of the Member Nations of the WTO or covid vaccines.

#### Voters:

#### [1] Fairness – constitutive to the judge to decide the better debater, only fairness is in your jurisdiction because it skews decision making

#### [2] Education – the only portable education from debate that we care about

#### Cross apply DTD, No RVIs, and Competing interps

## 4

#### The meta-ethic is practical reason—

#### [1] Inescapability— I can question why to follow or the validity of an ethical theory, which concedes the authority of reason as if I question reason, I use reason to question. Outweighs on validity—any other truth risks falsity Reality may be fake, our experiences may be arbitrary, and experience may be descriptive not normative, but questioning the validity of reason requires reason, conceding its validity. Any other ethic begs the question of why, meaning it’s arbitrary and nonbinding

#### [2] Action theory— Only reason can explain why we take transitional action to an overall end. For example, setting the end of tea provides me a reason to unify the necessary actions to produce tea, like getting a pot, filling it with water, etc. Any other explanation fails since it can’t give meaning to why we take transitioning action – freezing action. 2 Impacts—

#### [a] That’s a side constraint on the AC—ethics is a guide to action so it must appeal to a structure of action.

#### [b] Bindingness—reason is intrinsic to actions since only it can provide value to transitioning action, which justifies universality

#### That justifies universality—

#### If we are all reasoners, we must all be able to determine if an action is good. An action that maximizes my freedom at the cost of others then would have to be recognized as good by everyone, but that leads to a contradiction where everyone takes other’s freedoms to maximize theirs, making it impossible to reach my end

#### Thus, the standard is respecting a system of inner and outer freedom

#### Now Negate:

#### Negates, reducing intellectual property violates rights to property

Riccardo Pozzo 06 [January 2006, "Immanuel Kant on intellectual property," https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250048266\_Immanuel\_Kant\_on\_intellectual\_property] // WW DL

**\*We do not endorse the author’s gendered language**

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 pub 1 Lecturer (Full Professor) of History of Philosophy at University of Verona. Article received on oct/ 06 and approuved for publication on dec/06. 12 Trans/Form/Ação, São Paulo, 29(2): 11-18, 2006 lisher 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 Trans/Form/Ação, São Paulo, 29(2): 11-18, 2006 13 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).

#### Reducing IP law uses people as a means to an end violating their freedom.

**Kornyo, 14** (Emmanuel Kornyo, 9-11-2014, accessed on 8-14-2021, Journals.library.columbia, "Patent Protection and the Global Access to Essential Pharmaceuticals during Patent Infringements under TRIPS| Voices in Bioethics", https://journals.library.columbia.edu/index.php/bioethics/article/view/6467)WWPP

When I think of a categorical imperative I know at once what it contains. For, since the imperative contains, beyond the law, only the necessity that the maxim be in conformity with this law, while the law contains no condition to which it would be limited, nothing is left with which the maxim of action is to conform but the universality of a law as such ... There is, therefore, only a single categorical imperative and it is this: act only in accordance with thatmaxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law.[xiv] In addition, the principle of deontology imposes an obligation on all people to never use another human being as a means to attain an end. In other words, the end does not justify the means. Hence, in dire humanitarian crises such as the HIV case, by breaking the patent, the government of these countries “used” the intellectual property of these patents to attain their own local or national needs. One cannot use the larger interest of the population to the exclusion of the investors or patent holders who have rights as well.[xv

## Case

#### Rigorous climate simulations prove that hydrophilic black carbon would cause to atmospheric precipitation – results in a rainout effect that quickly reverses nuclear cooling

Reisner et al. 18 (Jon Reisner – Climate and atmospheric scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Gennaro D’Angelo – Climate scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, Research scientist at the SETI institute, Associate specialist at the University of California, Santa Cruz, NASA Postdoctoral Fellow at the NASA Ames Research Center, UKAFF Fellow at the University of Exeter. Eunmo Koo - Scientist at Applied Terrestrial, Energy, and Atmospheric Modeling (ATEAM) Team, in Computational Earth Science Group (EES-16) in Earth and Environmental Sciences Division and Co-Lead of Parallel Computing Summer Research Internship (PCSRI) program at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, former Staff research associate at UC Berkeley. Wesley Even - Computational scientist in the Computational Physics and Methods Group at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Matthew Hecht – Atmospheric scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Elizabeth Hunke - Lead developer for the Los Alamos Sea Ice Model (CICE) at the Los Alamos National Laboratory responsible for development and incorporation of new parameterizations, model testing and validation, computational performance, documentation, and consultation with external model users on all aspects of sea ice modeling, including interfacing with global climate and earth system models. Darin Comeau – Climate scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Randy Bos - Project leader at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, former Weapons Effects program manager at Tech-Source. James Cooley – Computational scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory specializing in weapons physics, emergency response, and computational physics. <MKIM> “Climate impact of a regional nuclear weapons exchange:An improved assessment based on detailed source calculations”. 3/16/18. DOA: 7/13/19. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2017JD027331>)

\*BC = Black Carbon

The no-rubble simulation produces a significantly more intense fire, with more fire spread, and consequently a significantly stronger plume with larger amounts of BC reaching into the upper atmosphere than the simulation with rubble, illustrated in Figure 5. While the no-rubble simulation **represents the worst-case scenario** involving vigorous fire activity, **only a relatively small amount of carbon makes its way into the stratosphere** during the course of the simulation. But while small compared to the surface BC mass, stratospheric BC amounts from the current simulations are significantly higher than what would be expected from burning vegetation such as trees (Heilman et al., 2014), e.g., the higher energy density of the building fuels and the initial fluence from the weapon produce an intense response within HIGRAD with initial updrafts of order 100 m/s in the lower troposphere. Or, in comparison to a mass fire, wildfires will burn only a small amount of fuel in the corresponding time period (roughly 10 minutes) that a nuclear weapon fluence can effectively ignite a large area of fuel producing an impressive atmospheric response. Figure 6 shows vertical profiles of BC multiplied by 100 (number of cities involved in the exchange) from the two simulations. The total amount of BC produced is in line with previous estimates (about 3.69 Tg from no-rubble simulation); however, the majority of BC resides **below the stratosphere** (3.46 Tg below 12 km) and can be **readily impacted by scavenging from precipitation** either via pyro-cumulonimbus produced by the fire itself (not modeled) or other synoptic weather systems. While the impact on climate of these more realistic profiles will be explored in the next section, it should be mentioned that **these estimates are** still **at the high end**, considering the inherent simplifications in the combustion model that lead to **overestimating BC production**. 3.3 Climate Results Long-term climatic effects critically depend on the initial injection height of the soot, with larger quantities reaching the upper troposphere/lower stratosphere inducing a greater cooling impact because of longer residence times (Robock et al., 2007a). Absorption of solar radiation by the BC aerosol and its subsequent radiative cooling tends to heat the surrounding air, driving an initial upward diffusion of the soot plumes, an effect that depends on the initial aerosol concentrations. **Mixing and sedimentation** tend to **reduce this process**, and low altitude emissions are also significantly impacted by precipitation if aging of the BC aerosol occurs on sufficiently rapid timescales. But once at stratospheric altitudes, aerosol dilution via coagulation is hindered by low particulate concentrations (e.g., Robock et al., 2007a) and lofting to much higher altitudes is inhibited by gravitational settling in the low-density air (Stenke et al., 2013), resulting in more stable BC concentrations over long times. Of the initial BC mass released in the atmosphere, most of which is emitted below 9 km, **70% rains out within the first month** and 78%, or about 2.9 Tg, is removed within the first two months (Figure 7, solid line), with the remainder (about 0.8 Tg, dashed line) being transported above about 12 km (200 hPa) within the first week. This outcome differs from the findings of, e.g., Stenke et al. (2013, their high BC-load cases) and Mills et al. (2014), who found that most of the BC mass (between 60 and 70%) is lifted in the stratosphere within the first couple of weeks. This can also be seen in Figure 8 (red lines) and in Figure 9, which include results from our calculation with the initial BC distribution from Mills et al. (2014). In that case, only 30% of the initial BC mass rains out in the troposphere during the first two weeks after the exchange, with the remainder rising to the stratosphere. In the study of Mills et al. (2008) this percentage is somewhat smaller, about 20%, and smaller still in the experiments of Robock et al. (2007a) in which the soot is initially emitted in the upper troposphere or higher. In Figure 7, the e-folding timescale for the removal of tropospheric soot, here interpreted as the time required for an initial drop of a factor e, is about one week. This result compares favorably with the “LT” experiment of Robock et al. (2007a), considering 5 Tg of BC released in the lower troposphere, in which 50% of the aerosols are removed within two weeks. By contrast, the initial e-folding timescale for the removal of stratospheric soot in Figure 8 is about 4.2 years (blue solid line), compared to about 8.4 years for the calculation using Mills et al. (2014) initial BC emission (red solid line). The removal timescale from our forced ensemble simulations is close to those obtained by Mills et al. (2008) in their 1 Tg experiment, by Robock et al. (2007a) in their experiment “UT 1 Tg”, and © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. by Stenke et al. (2013) in their experiment “Exp1”, in all of which 1 Tg of soot was emitted in the atmosphere in the aftermath of the exchange. Notably, the e-folding timescale for the decline of the BC mass in Figure 8 (blue solid line) is also close to the value of about 4 years quoted by Pausata et al. (2016) for their long-term “intermediate” scenario. In that scenario, which is also based on 5 Tg of soot initially distributed as in Mills et al. (2014), the factor-of2 shorter residence time of the aerosols is caused by particle growth via coagulation of BC with organic carbon. Figure 9 shows the BC mass-mixing ratio, horizontally averaged over the globe, as a function of atmospheric pressure (height) and time. The BC distributions used in our simulations imply that the upward transport of particles is substantially less efficient compared to the case in which 5 Tg of BC is directly injected into the upper troposphere. The semiannual cycle of lofting and sinking of the aerosols is associated with atmospheric heating and cooling during the solstice in each hemisphere (Robock et al., 2007a). During the first year, the oscillation amplitude in our forced ensemble simulations is particularly large during the summer solstice, compared to that during the winter solstice (see bottom panel of Figure 9), because of the higher soot concentrations in the Northern Hemisphere, as can be seen in Figure 11 (see also left panel of Figure 12). Comparing the top and bottom panels of Figure 9, the BC reaches the highest altitudes during the first year in both cases, but the concentrations at 0.1 hPa in the top panel can be 200 times as large. Qualitatively, the difference can be understood in terms of the air temperature increase caused by BC radiation emission, which is several tens of kelvin degrees in the simulations of Robock et al. (2007a, see their Figure 4), Mills et al. (2008, see their Figure 5), Stenke et al. (2013, see high-load cases in their Figure 4), Mills et al. (2014, see their Figure 7), and Pausata et al. (2016, see one-day emission cases in their Figure 1), due to high BC concentrations, but it amounts to only about 10 K in our forced ensemble simulations, as illustrated in Figure 10. Results similar to those presented in Figure 10 were obtained from the experiment “Exp1” performed by Stenke et al. (2013, see their Figure 4). **In that scenario as well, somewhat less that 1 Tg of BC remained in the atmosphere after the initial rainout**. As mentioned before, the BC aerosol that remains in the atmosphere, lifted to stratospheric heights by the rising soot plumes, undergoes sedimentation over a timescale of several years (Figures 8 and 9). This mass represents the effective amount of BC that can force climatic changes over multi-year timescales. In the forced ensemble simulations, it is about 0.8 Tg after the initial rainout, whereas it is about 3.4 Tg in the simulation with an initial soot distribution as in Mills et al. (2014). Our more realistic source simulation involves the worstcase assumption of no-rubble (along with other assumptions) and hence serves as an upper bound for the impact on climate. As mentioned above and further discussed below, our scenario induces perturbations on the climate system similar to those found in previous studies in which the climatic response was driven by roughly 1 Tg of soot rising to stratospheric heights following the exchange. Figure 11 illustrates the vertically integrated mass-mixing ratio of BC over the globe, at various times after the exchange for the simulation using the initial BC distribution of Mills et al. (2014, upper panels) and as an average from the forced ensemble members (lower panels). All simulations predict enhanced concentrations at high latitudes during the first year after the exchange. In the cases shown in the top panels, however, these high concentrations persist for several years (see also Figure 1 of Mills et al., 2014), whereas the forced ensemble simulations indicate that the BC concentration starts to decline after the first year. In fact, in the simulation represented in the top panels, mass-mixing ratios larger than about 1 kg of BC © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. per Tg of air persist for well over 10 years after the exchange, whereas they only last for 3 years in our forced simulations (compare top and middle panels of Figure 9). After the first year, values drop below 3 kg BC/Tg air, whereas it takes about 8 years to reach these values in the simulation in the top panels (see also Robock et al., 2007a). Over crop-producing, midlatitude regions in the Northern Hemisphere, the BC loading is reduced from more than 0.8 kg BC/Tg air in the simulation in the top panels to 0.2-0.4 kg BC/Tg air in our forced simulations (see middle and right panels). The more rapid clearing of the atmosphere in the forced ensemble is also signaled by the soot optical depth in the visible radiation spectrum, which drops below values of 0.03 toward the second half of the first year at mid latitudes in the Northern Hemisphere, and everywhere on the globe after about 2.5 years (without never attaining this value in the Southern Hemisphere). In contrast, the soot optical depth in the calculation shown in the top panels of Figure 11 becomes smaller than 0.03 everywhere only after about 10 years. The two cases show a similar tendency, in that the BC optical depth is typically lower between latitudes 30º S-30º N than it is at other latitudes. This behavior is associated to the persistence of stratospheric soot toward high-latitudes and the Arctic/Antarctic regions, as illustrated by the zonally-averaged, column-integrated mass-mixing ratio of the BC in Figure 12 for both the forced ensemble simulations (left panel) and the simulation with an initial 5 Tg BC emission in the upper troposphere (right panel). The spread in the globally averaged (near) surface temperature of the atmosphere, from the control (left panel) and forced (right panel) ensembles, is displayed in Figure 13. For each month, the plots show the largest variations (i.e., maximum and minimum values), within each ensemble of values obtained for that month, relative to the mean value of that month. The plot also shows yearly-averaged data (thinner lines). The spread is comparable in the control and forced ensembles, with average values calculated over the 33-years run length of 0.4-0.5 K. This spread is also similar to the internal variability of the globally averaged surface temperature quoted for the NCAR Large Ensemble Community Project (Kay et al., 2015). These results imply that surface air temperature differences, between forced and control simulations, which lie within the spread may not be distinguished from effects due to internal variability of the two simulation ensembles. Figure 14 shows the difference in the globally averaged surface temperature of the atmosphere (top panel), net solar radiation flux at surface (middle panel), and precipitation rate (bottom panel), computed as the (forced minus control) difference in ensemble mean values. The sum of standard deviations from each ensemble is shaded. Differences are qualitatively significant over the first few years, when the anomalies lie near or outside the total standard deviation. Inside the shaded region, differences may not be distinguished from those arising from the internal variability of one or both ensembles. The surface solar flux (middle panel) is the quantity that appears most affected by the BC emission, with qualitatively significant differences persisting for about 5 years. The precipitation rate (bottom panel) is instead affected only at the very beginning of the simulations. The red lines in all panels show the results from the simulation applying the initial BC distribution of Mills et al. (2014), where the period of significant impact is much longer owing to the higher altitude of the initial soot distribution that results in longer residence times of the BC aerosol in the atmosphere. When yearly averages of the same quantities are performed over the IndiaPakistan region, the differences in ensemble mean values lie within the total standard deviations of the two ensembles. The results in Figure 14 can also be compared to the outcomes of other previous studies. In their experiment “UT 1 Tg”, Robock et al. (2007a) found that, when only 1 Tg of soot © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. remains in the atmosphere after the initial rainout, temperature and precipitation anomalies are about 20% of those obtained from their standard 5 Tg BC emission case. Therefore, the largest differences they observed, during the first few years after the exchange, were about - 0.3 K and -0.06 mm/day, respectively, comparable to the anomalies in the top and bottom panels of Figure 14. Their standard 5 Tg emission case resulted in a solar radiation flux anomaly at surface of -12 W/m2 after the second year (see their Figure 3), between 5 and 6 time as large as the corresponding anomalies from our ensembles shown in the middle panel. In their experiment “Exp1”, Stenke et al. (2013) reported global mean surface temperature anomalies not exceeding about 0.3 K in magnitude and precipitation anomalies hovering around -0.07 mm/day during the first few years, again consistent with the results of Figure 14. In a recent study, Pausata et al. (2016) considered the effects of an admixture of BC and organic carbon aerosols, both of which would be emitted in the atmosphere in the aftermath of a nuclear exchange. In particular, they concentrated on the effects of coagulation of these aerosol species and examined their climatic impacts. The initial BC distribution was as in Mills et al. (2014), although the soot burden was released in the atmosphere over time periods of various lengths. Most relevant to our and other previous work are their one-day emission scenarios. They found that, during the first year, the largest values of the atmospheric surface temperature anomalies ranged between about -0.5 and -1.3 K, those of the sea surface temperature anomalies ranged between -0.2 and -0.55 K, and those of the precipitation anomalies varied between -0.15 and -0.2 mm/day. All these ranges are compatible with our results shown in Figure 14 as red lines and with those of Mills et al. (2014, see their Figures 3 and 6). As already mentioned in Section 2.3, the net solar flux anomalies at surface are also consistent. This overall agreement suggests that the **inclusion of organic carbon aerosols, and** ensuing **coagulation** with BC, **should not dramatically alter the climatic effects** resulting from our forced ensemble simulations. Moreover, aerosol growth would likely **shorten the residence time of the BC particulate in the atmosphere** (Pausata et al., 2016), possibly **reducing the duration of these effects.**

#### No Famines—we have food stockpiles, crop relocation from high UV areas, and indoor growing that solve food production even if they win nuclear war.

Dekenberger et al 17 (David C. Denkenberger, Assistant Professor and Research Fellow at Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, B.S. from Penn State in Engineering Science, his M.S.E. from Princeton in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, and his Ph.D. from the University of Colorado at Boulder; D. Dorothea Cole, Tennessee State University; Mohamed Abdelkhaliq, Tennessee State University; Michael Griswold, Tennessee State University; Allen B. Hundley, worked as a technical consultant in a number of the countries; Joshua M. Pearce, PhD, Professor at Michigan Technological University; “Feeding Everyone if the Sun is Obscured and Industry is Disabled”; International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction; March; https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420916305453?via%3Dihub; Accessed 10/10/19, EB)

3.1 Stored Food and Agriculture in Reduced Solar Conditions Global grain production is ∼2.7 billion tons (Gt)/yr (Tilman et al., 2002), and grains are ∼29% total of fiber and moisture (Hurburgh, 2006; United States Department of Agriculture, 2006). Therefore, this is ∼1.9 Gt/yr dry carbohydrate equivalent. Grains make up half of the calories produced (Meadows et al., 2004); thus, the total food production is ∼3.8 Gt dry/yr. The food requirement with low waste is 1.5 Gt/yr (Denkenberger and Pearce, 2014). Livestock consume 35% of the world’s grain (Earth Policy Institute, 2011). Therefore, the initial state before the catastrophe shows a plant production of 210% of requirement (not including the part that goes to livestock) and 10% of requirement animal products (see Figure 1).

#### Even if there’s no rainout, no famine – plenty of foods can survive the conditions

Bendix 20 (Aria Bendix is a Senior Reporter at Insider, covering urban and environmental science, A full-scale nuclear winter would trigger a global famine. A disaster expert put together a doomsday diet to save humanity, Jan 10, 2020, BuisnessInsider, <https://www.businessinsider.com/how-to-survive-after-nuclear-war-what-to-eat-2020-1>, 3/24/20)//ww BJ

Even if a nuclear winter destroyed trillions of trees, mushrooms could feed on that dead matter, creating a regenerative food source that could potentially feed everyone on the planet for about three years, according to Denkenberger's estimates. Since mushrooms don't rely on photosynthesis, they can survive without much light. The same goes for seaweed. "Seaweed is a really good food source in a scenario like this because it can tolerate a low light levels," Denkenberger said. "It's also very fast-growing. In a nuclear winter, the land will cool down faster than the oceans, so the oceans will remain a little bit warmer. Seaweed can handle relatively low temperatures." To feed everyone on the planet, Denkenberger estimates that the world would need around 1.6 billion tons of dry food per year. Humans could potentially grow that amount of seaweed, he said, in three to six months. But in order consume the proper nutrients to ward off disease, humans can't rely on a single food source (or two). So Denkenberger put together a chart of what a typical 2,100-calorie diet might look like in a post-doomsday scenario. nuclear winter diet David Denkenberger and Joshua M. Pearce The diet involves a mixture of meat, eggs, sugar, and mushrooms. It also includes dandelions and tea made from tree needles, which contain Vitamin C. Naturally growing bacteria would serve as a source of Vitamin E, which is important for brain function. Denkenberger said he plans to study other natural food sources that could grow near the equator, where there would still be some sunlight post-disaster (though the temperature would be low). "One of the things I've learned by moving to Alaska is that, even in areas where the summers are so cool that trees cannot grow, you can actually grow potatoes," he said. Leaves also contain stringy fiber (cellulose) that could be converted into sugar, Denkenberger added. That process is already happening at biofuel plants, which convert cellulose into sugar to make ethanol.

#### Nuke war won’t cause extinction— BUT, it’ll spur political will for meaningful disarmament.

Daniel Deudney 18. Associate Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. 03/15/2018. “The Great Debate.” The Oxford Handbook of International Security. www.oxfordhandbooks.com, doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198777854.013.22. //reem

Although nuclear war is the oldest of these technogenic threats to civilization and human survival, and although important steps to restraint, particularly at the end of the Cold War, have been achieved, the nuclear world is increasingly changing in major ways, and in almost entirely dangerous directions. The third “bombs away” phase of the great debate on the nuclear-political question is more consequentially divided than in the first two phases. Even more ominously, most of the momentum lies with the forces that are pulling states toward nuclear-use, and with the radical actors bent on inflicting catastrophic damage on the leading states in the international system, particularly the United States. In contrast, the arms control project, although intellectually vibrant, is largely in retreat on the world political stage. The arms control settlement of the Cold War is unraveling, and the world public is more divided and distracted than ever. With the recent election of President Donald Trump, the United States, which has played such a dominant role in nuclear politics since its scientists invented these fiendish engines, now has an impulsive and uninformed leader, boding ill for nuclear restraint and effective crisis management. Given current trends, it is prudent to assume that sooner or later, and probably sooner, nuclear weapons will again be the used in war. But this bad news may contain a “silver lining” of good news. Unlike a general nuclear war that might have occurred during the Cold War, such a nuclear event now would probably not mark the end of civilization (or of humanity), due to the great reductions in nuclear forces achieved at the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, politics on “the day after” could have immense potential for positive change. The survivors would not be likely to envy the dead, but would surely have a greatly renewed resolution for “never again. ” Such an event, completely unpredictable in its particulars, would unambiguously put the nuclear-political question back at the top of the world political agenda. It would unmistakeably remind leading states of their vulnerability It might also trigger more robust efforts to achieve the global regulation of nuclear capability. Like the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that did so much to catalyze the elevated concern for nuclear security in the early Cold War, and like the experience “at the brink” in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, the now bubbling nuclear caldron holds the possibility of inaugurating a major period of institutional innovation and adjustment toward a fully “bombs away” future.

#### Movements will literally overthrow recalcitrant governments. Nuclear use makes the audience costs huge.

Steven R. David 18. Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. 2018. “The Nuclear Worlds of 2030.” Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, vol. 42, pp. 107–118. //reem

CATASTROPHE AND THE END OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS In the year 2025, the world very nearly came to an end. Smarting after several years of economic downturn and angry at American efforts to encircle it with NATO bases, Russia responded to a "plea" for help from co-ethnics in the Baltic states. Thousands of Russian troops, disguised as contract "volunteers" dashed across international borders allegedly to protect Russian speakers from governmental assaults. The Baltic countries invoked Article 5 of the NATO Treaty while American forces, deployed there precisely to deter this kind of aggression, clashed with Russian troops. Hundreds of Americans were killed. Washington warned Moscow to halt its invasion to no avail. The United States then prepared for a major airlift of its forces to the beleaguered countries, with Moscow threatening America with "unrestrained force" if it followed through. Washington ignored the threat and Moscow, seeking to "de-escalate by escalating," destroyed the American base of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean with a nuclear-armed cruise missile. The United States responded with limited nuclear strikes against Russian bases in Siberia. Thus far, the collateral damage had been kept to a minimum, but this bit of encouragement did not last. Fearing a massive American pre-emptive strike aimed at disarming its nuclear arsenal, Russia struck first against the range of US nuclear forces both in the United States and at sea. America responded with its surviving weapons, destroying much (but not all) of the remaining Russian nuclear arms. And then, both sides took a breather, but it was too late. Although cities had been largely spared, millions had died on each side. Making matters worse, predictions of nuclear winter came to pass - producing massive changes in the weather and killing millions more, especially in developing states. The world finally had enough. A dawning realization emerged that leaders of countries simply could not be trusted with weapons that could destroy humankind.3 Protests swept the globe calling for total disarmament. Mass demonstrations engulfed the United States and Russia demanding the replacement of their existing governments with ones committed to ending nuclear weapons. Voices calling for more moderate disarmament that would preserve a modest nuclear deterrent were angrily (and sometimes violently) quashed. The possession of nuclear weapons became morally repugnant and unacceptable. No longer were the intricacies of nuclear doctrine or force levels subject to debate. The only question remaining was how one could get rid of these loathsome weapons as quickly as possible. Under the auspices of the United Nations, a joint committee composed of the Security Council members, other countries known to possess nuclear arms, and several non-nuclear powers was established. Drawing on the structure and precedent of the Chemical Weapons Convention, this UN body drew up the Treaty that called for the complete disarmament of nuclear arms by 2030. The development, possession, and use of nuclear weapons was prohibited. An airtight inspection regime, enhancing the procedures already in existence through the Non-Proliferation Treaty, was established to first account for all nuclear arms and fissile material and then monitor the destruction of the nuclear weaponry. All countries were subject to the Treaty, whether they maintained nuclear facilities or not. Violations would produce a range of punishment from global economic sanctions to massive conventional attack.' 6 By 2030, all the nations of the world had agreed to the Treaty. No violations occurred. Armed conflicts persisted, but they proved to be of modest scale, erupting only within countries but not between them. Insofar as the fear of nuclear weapons helped keep the peace during the Cold War and post-Cold War eras, the horror of nuclear use now made war all but unthinkable. A feeling of relief swept the globe as the specter of nuclear holocaust vanished, tempered only by the painful regret that it took the death of millions to realize a goal that for so many had been self-evident since 1945.

#### Nuclear war causes social change and increased approval for disarmament

Martin 82. (Brian, Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong. “How the Peace¶ Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1982, pp. 149-159)//ww BJ

As well as encouraging moves towards repressive rule, the political and social upheaval resulting from nuclear war could also provide major opportunities for rapid social change in progressive directions. Several factors would operate here.¶ (a) There would be worldwide anguish and outrage at any significant use of nuclear weapons against populations. This emotion could easily turn against established institutions.¶ (b) A nuclear war involving the US, Soviet Union and Europe would weaken or destroy the bases for imperialism and neocolonialism in poor countries, and stimulate widespread revolutionary action that could not be contained by local elites left without rich country support.¶ (c) In areas directly affected by nuclear attack, the destruction of established institutions would allow the creation of new structures.¶ Historically, periods of economic or military crisis often have preceded revolutionary change, though not always with desirable results. Crises provide opportunities for groups which are organised and able to take advantage of them. In the case of nuclear war, present governments have made some arrangements to preserve their type of rule after a nuclear war. By contrast, the peace movement is almost completely unprepared to respond to a crisis engendered by nuclear war.

## 3

#### CP: Member nations of the European Union should enter into a prior and binding consultation with the World Health Organization over reducing intellectual property protections for Covid-19 vaccines. Member nations will support the proposal and adopt the results of consultation.

#### WHO says yes – it supports increasing the availability of generics and limiting TRIPS

Hoen 03 [(Ellen T., researcher at the University Medical Centre at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands who has been listed as one of the 50 most influential people in intellectual property by the journal Managing Intellectual Property, PhD from the University of Groningen) “TRIPS, Pharmaceutical Patents and Access to Essential Medicines: Seattle, Doha and Beyond,” Chicago Journal of International Law, 2003] JL

However, subsequent resolutions of the World Health Assembly have strengthened the WHO’s mandate in the trade arena. In 2001, the World Health Assembly adopted two resolutions in particular that had a bearing on the debate over TRIPS [30]. The resolutions addressed:

– the need to strengthen policies to increase the availability of generic drugs;

– and the need to evaluate the impact of TRIPS on access to drugs, local manufacturing capacity, and the development of new drugs

#### Consultation displays strong leadership, authority, and cohesion among member states which are key to WHO legitimacy

Gostin et al 15 [(Lawrence O., Linda D. & Timothy J. O’Neill Professor of Global Health Law at Georgetown University, Faculty Director of the O’Neill Institute for National & Global Health Law, Director of the World Health Organization Collaborating Center on Public Health Law & Human Rights, JD from Duke University) “The Normative Authority of the World Health Organization,” Georgetown University Law Center, 5/2/2015] JL

Members want the WHO to exert leadership, harmonize disparate activities, and set priorities. Yet they resist intrusions into their sovereignty, and want to exert control. In other words, ‘everyone desires coordination, but no one wants to be coordinated.’ States often ardently defend their geostrategic interests. As the Indonesian virus-sharing episode illustrates, the WHO is pulled between power blocs, with North America and Europe (the primary funders) on one side and emerging economies such as Brazil, China, and India on the other. An inherent tension exists between richer ‘net contributor’ states and poorer ‘net recipient’ states, with the former seeking smaller WHO budgets and the latter larger budgets.

Overall, national politics drive self-interest, with states resisting externally imposed obligations for funding and action. Some political leaders express antipathy to, even distrust of, UN institutions, viewing them as bureaucratic and inefficient. In this political environment, it is unsurprising that members fail to act as shareholders. Ebola placed into stark relief the failure of the international community to increase capacities as required by the IHR. Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone had some of the world's weakest health systems, with little capacity to either monitor or respond to the Ebola epidemic.20 This caused enormous suffering in West Africa and placed countries throughout the region e and the world e at risk. Member states should recognize that the health of their citizens depends on strengthening others' capacity. The WHO has a central role in creating systems to facilitate and encourage such cooperation.

The WHO cannot succeed unless members act as shareholders, foregoing a measure of sovereignty for the global common good. It is in all states' interests to have a strong global health leader, safeguarding health security, building health systems, and reducing health inequalities. But that will not happen unless members fund the Organization generously, grant it authority and flexibility, and hold it accountable.

#### WHO is critical to disease prevention – it is the only international institution that can disperse information, standardize global public health, and facilitate public-private cooperation

Murtugudde 20 [(Raghu, professor of atmospheric and oceanic science at the University of Maryland, PhD in mechanical engineering from Columbia University) “Why We Need the World Health Organization Now More Than Ever,” Science, 4/19/2020] JL

WHO continues to play an indispensable role during the current COVID-19 outbreak itself. In November 2018, the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine organised a workshop to explore lessons from past influenza outbreaks and so develop recommendations for pandemic preparedness for 2030. The salient findings serve well to underscore the critical role of WHO for humankind.

The world’s influenza burden has only increased in the last two decades, a period in which there have also been 30 new zoonotic diseases. A warming world with increasing humidity, lost habitats and industrial livestock/poultry farming has many opportunities for pathogens to move from animals and birds to humans. Increasing global connectivity simply catalyses this process, as much as it catalyses economic growth.

WHO coordinates health research, clinical trials, drug safety, vaccine development, surveillance, virus sharing, etc. The importance of WHO’s work on immunisation across the globe, especially with HIV, can hardly be overstated. It has a rich track record of collaborating with private-sector organisations to advance research and development of health solutions and improving their access in the global south.

It discharges its duties while maintaining a dynamic equilibrium between such diverse and powerful forces as national securities, economic interests, human rights and ethics. COVID-19 has highlighted how political calculations can hamper data-sharing and mitigation efforts within and across national borders, and WHO often simply becomes a convenient political scapegoat in such situations.

International Health Regulations, a 2005 agreement between 196 countries to work together for global health security, focuses on detection, assessment and reporting of public health events, and also includes non-pharmaceutical interventions such as travel and trade restrictions. WHO coordinates and helps build capacity to implement IHR.