

Paraphrase

1AC

We affirm resolved: the United States should accede to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea without reservations.

Matt **Simon** at WIRED, citing a brand new report from the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, reported on Monday that the consensus of scientists is that catastrophic global warming can only be avoided through a complete restructuring of energy production and consumption, including cutting emissions by half before 2030 and going carbon-neutral by 2050. While that may seem drastic, desperate times call for desperate measures, as he continues that the alternative of even 1.5 degrees warming would herald rising sea levels, water shortages, biodiversity loss, worsening storms and wildfires, shrinking crop yields, a massive increase in heatwaves, the destruction of marine biodiversity, and rampant poverty and resource competition. Unfortunately, as the IPCC concludes, we are on pace to hit that milestone in just a dozen years.

Fortunately, accession to UNCLOS would force the US into environmental progress in two key ways.

First, environmental lawsuits. Iain **Murray** at the National Center for Policy Analysis writes in 2013 that UNCLOS Article 194 contains provisions requiring participants to “take all measures” to control land- and sea-based pollution “to the fullest possible extent.” He continues that, unlike other countries, environmentalists would sue the US to take advantage of the Constitution, which gives international treaties the force of law. Therefore, courts would likely sustain the suit, setting deadlines to force the economy to end all fossil fuel measures. While staggered deadlines would mitigate the economic effect, Murray finds that acceding to the convention would force a switch to a carbon-free, renewable energy grid. That is our best hope to solve climate change, as Noah **Long** and Kevin **Steinberger** at the Climate and Clean Energy Program find in 2016 that renewables are the best alternative to fossil fuels, and once developed a clean energy grid will actually provide cheaper energy and create more jobs than fossil fuels.

Second, offshore wind. In the status quo, there is widespread desire to pursue offshore wind turbines. According to Carolyn **Kaplan** of Boston University in 2004, offshore turbines are more profitable than land turbines because they last twice as long, have better wind conditions, and reduce energy transportation costs. This leads Kieran **Dwyer** of the University of Minnesota to find in 2009 that there is an increasing demand for offshore wind energy. However, he concludes that companies in the status quo lack the legal rights necessary to fully convert to offshore wind power, as only UNCLOS grants the US legal sovereignty over its Exclusive Economic Zone. Thus, Nicholas **Lund** at the University of Maine confirms in 2010 that UNCLOS provides a clear legal jurisdiction to establish offshore wind farms, which Kaplan concludes are the most cost-effective form of renewable energy.

In contrast, the status quo American failure to respond to the IPCC report will only exacerbate climate change, producing two impacts.

First, ocean acidification. Matt **Huelsenbeck** at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography found in 2013 that the ocean absorbs carbon dioxide, leading it to become increasingly acidic and

harming marine ecosystems. Ultimately, he writes that millions depend on marine life for food, and many more would be put at-risk if the ecosystem was in danger.

Second, resource wars. Michael Klare at Hampshire College wrote in 2008 that as the sea level rises and land becomes dryer, a reduction in arable land will lead to political strife and ultimately conflict over increasingly scarce resources like food, water, and energy. Moreover, as national governments exceed their capacity to deal with climate migrants, their leaders will become increasingly desperate, eventually forcing international conflicts over valuable and limited resources.

Frontlines

AT Amendments Solve

Murray from case says the amendment process takes a long time and only one country has to object – any Paris signatory would do so.

AT Article 207

Murray from case says that Article 207 actually only increases the strength of Article 194 by clarifying that the treaty requires legal action to mitigate emissions.

AT No Suits

We preempted this in case – environmentalists sue in the US because they want to stop fossil fuel consumption – the US is unique because the constitution says we're bound by international treaties – that's Murray.

AT Not Binding

1. It is binding – the constitution says international treaties which the US ratifies supercede domestic law – Stephen **Mulligan** at the Congressional Research Service confirms in September that treaties become binding when ratified by the senate.
2. Even if it's not binding, Steven **Groves** at the Heritage Foundation writes in 2012 that even the threat of lawsuits would deter investors from the fossil fuel industry.

AT Onshore wind

Offshore wind turbines are more efficient because of better weather patterns, a longer lifespan, proximity to consumers, and larger farms – means they're more profitable for companies – that's Kaplan

AT No Offshoring

Proposals exist now – the only thing stopping development is legal uncertainty – that's Dwyer

AT Alt Causes

Europe proves – there's a ton of offshore wind there.

AT Vineyard Wind

This wind farm is in the territorial sea – our Kaplan evidence is specific to developing wind in the EEZ – you need to be more offshore to have more consistent wind speeds and larger farms.

Weighing

AT China Heg

The aff is a prereq – George **Harvey** at CleanTechnica writes on October 10th that, if Trump fails to react immediately to the IPCC report, countries will begin to shift towards China as a global leader on the climate, and correspondingly cede soft power on other issues.

AT SCS

The aff is a prereq – Jaqueline **Ronson** at Inverse writes in 2017 that the conflict in the SCS is at heart a resource conflict over fishing, and that warming will magnify that conflict by reducing the supply of fish as well as causing fish to migrate, leading fishers to follow them into politically disputed waters.

AT Arctic

The aff is a prereq – Jaqueline **Ronson** at Inverse writes in 2017 that as climate change melts Arctic ice, the territorial disputes in the region will become more relevant, leading to heightened tensions between the US and Russia.

AT Econ

The aff is a prereq – Justin **Worland** at TIME, internally citing Stanford research, writes in 2015 that limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees will save at least \$50 trillion in lost productivity and resources.

AT Terror

The aff is a prereq – Vasundhara **Saravade** at the University of Waterloo writes that climate change will exacerbate existing inequities by magnifying resource scarcity, especially in the global south, increasing the materialist incentives to turn to terror. Furthermore, she writes that terrorist organizations profit off the global oil trade, so decreasing dependence on fossil fuels reduces their funding.

Kyoto

Furthermore, Michael **Tennant** at the New American explains in 2012 that UNCLOS Article 194 contains provisions requiring participants to “take all measures” to control land- and sea-based pollution “to the fullest possible extent”, including joining other international treaties, continuing that environmentalists would sue to force the US to comply with the Kyoto Protocol.

Ev

1AC

Now is key to avoid catastrophic warming – it's try or die

Simon 10-8 (Matt, 10-8-2018, "[We Need Massive Change to Avoid Climate Hell](https://www.wired.com/story/we-need-massive-change-to-avoid-climate-hell/)", WIRED, <https://www.wired.com/story/we-need-massive-change-to-avoid-climate-hell/>, BS 10-11-2018)

ON SUNDAY NIGHT, the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change dropped an urgent report on the state of global warming. Simply put: The laws of the physical universe say that we can keep global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, the optimistic goal set out in the Paris Agreement, but we're quickly running out of time. As in, we may reach that 1.5 in as little as a dozen years at the rate we're spewing emissions. And the consequences will be disastrous. To correct course and avoid 1.5 C, or 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit, we'll need to cut emissions by half before 2030, and go carbon-neutral by 2050, the report says. That gives us three decades to transform our energy production into something unrecognizable, with renewable energy galore combined with carbon capture techniques like the bolstering of forests, and maybe even sucking the stuff out of the atmosphere and trapping it underground. We'll have to change our behavior as individuals, too. Meaning, we're looking at unprecedented change, what is essentially the restructuring of civilization. "The report has sent a very clear message that if we don't act now and have substantial reductions in carbon dioxide emissions over the next decade, we are really making it very challenging to impossible to keep warming below 1.5 degrees," said the IPCC's Jim Skea at a press conference announcing the report, a massive survey by almost 100 authors (and 1,000 reviewers) citing 6,000 studies. The 2015 Paris Agreement included the 1.5 goal at the urging of island nations, which rising seas are threatening to drown. The less ambitious—though still very daunting—goal is 2 degrees. Which, according to this new report, would be far more ruinous. At 2 degrees, 10 million more people will be at risk of rising seas than at 1.5 degrees. That extra half a degree also means significantly larger populations will be exposed to water shortages. You're looking at an ever greater loss of biodiversity, worsening storms, ever more people thrust into poverty, and relentlessly shrinking yields for essential crops like rice and maize and wheat. Basically, a difference of just half a degree may not seem like much when you're choosing what to wear for the day, but it's going to make climate change far, far worse, a point this report drives home in exhaustive detail. "It shows that half a degree of global warming does matter and that limiting it to 1.5°C instead of 2°C would avoid several impacts, including increases in heatwaves and hot extremes in most inhabited regions, heavy precipitation in several regions, and droughts in some regions," says Sonia Seneviratne, a climate change scientist at ETH Zurich. Plus, limiting warming would avoid certain irreversible changes related to sea level rise and the destruction of coral reefs. "Even more importantly," Seneviratne adds, "it shows that limiting global warming to 1.5°C is still physically possible and could be in principle achieved, although it requires rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society." Still, the outlook is grim. The technological and social change the world needs dwarfs anything that's come before in history. "It's not a happy report," says Thanu Yakupitiyage, spokesperson for the climate advocacy group 350.org. "They're reporting on the real needs of the now. We are in the middle of the climate crisis." "At the end of the day, what we're talking about is millions of lives at stake," Yakupitiyage adds. "We're already seeing the ways in which people are impacted by heat waves, by rising sea levels, by wildfires, by hurricanes." The Paris Agreement is a remarkable act of international cooperation to address climate change and these consequences of it, but the pledges made by individual nations are not enough to limit warming to 1.5 degrees, this report argues. It also makes clear that it's not enough to promise that we'll put more electric cars on the road, or mothball our coal energy plants, or that we'll invest in more solar farms. Hitting that target will demand a massive rethinking of global energy consumption within a decade. A bit of borderline rosy news here: While the world at large may be struggling to meet the ambition of the Paris Agreement, cities have been leading the way in cutting emissions, competing with each other to deploy technologies like electric cars on massive scales, but also sharing knowledge of what works and what doesn't when it comes to fighting climate change. Consider that in 2016 alone, Los Angeles cut its emissions by 11 percent, the equivalent of yanking 700,000 cars off the road. All the while, its economy actually grew. The IPCC report could be coming at a particularly convenient time. In December, leaders will gather in Poland for COP24, known more formally as the 24th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. And let's just say they won't not be talking about this new report. Janos Pasztor, executive director of the Carnegie Climate Geoengineering Governance Initiative and

former UN assistant secretary-general for climate change, predicts that meeting “will be a significant next step to see what governments actually say in the context of the climate negotiations about this report.” The starkness of the report may also spark talk of more elaborate strategies for fighting climate change than cutting emissions. Scientists are also toying with the notion of geoengineering. This could entail carbon capture techniques or solar geoengineering to bounce the sun’s radiation back into space by spraying aerosols in the atmosphere or by brightening clouds. “There will be some pressure from some corners to increasingly look at options like solar geoengineering,” says Pasztor. “That’s a fact of life. That doesn’t mean necessarily that we will have to use solar geoengineering, but if you want to prudently manage global climate risk, then it’s fair to say that one needs to look at all the options.” Geoengineering, though, comes with a slew of potential problems. You might spray foam on the ocean surface to reflect light back into space, but that could also change the weather. And the issue with such solar radiation management, or SRM, is that even in the best case, it doesn’t address the underlying problem. “Once emitted, CO2 stays in the atmosphere for millennia,” says Seneviratne. “Any approach related to SRM only mitigates some of the symptoms of climate change, but not its root cause, which is the elevated CO2 concentrations.” That means issues like ocean acidification, which is inflicting wide-ranging harm on marine life, would remain unaddressed. Again, we aren’t going to geoengineer our way out of this mess—cutting emissions is our number one priority. But as this new report makes abundantly clear, the disease we’ve unleashed on this planet is only getting worse, and we aren’t doing nearly enough to find the cure.

Accession causes lawsuits – means we join the Kyoto protocol

Tennant 12 (Michael, Contributor at The New American, 6-28-2012, "Will Our Freedoms Be LOST at Sea?", The John Birch Society, <https://www.jbs.org/jbs-news/news/item/16505-will-our-freedoms-be-lost-at-sea>, BS 10-11-2018)

Critics have also warned that U.S. accession to LOST will open a “back door” for radical environmentalists to impose their agenda on America. LOST, says the WebMemo, states that convention participants must “take ... all measures consistent with this Convention that are necessary to prevent, reduce, and control pollution of the marine environment from any source,” (Article 194). This provision goes on to require that such measures address “all sources of pollution of the marine environment ... including those from land-based sources, from or through the atmosphere, or by dumping...” Signatories are also required to “adopt laws and regulations to prevent, reduce and control pollution of the marine environment from or through the atmosphere.” (Article 212). That essentially grants the UN control over the environmental laws of every country that signs the treaty — a fact not lost on environmental activists, some of whom have already signaled that if the United States ratifies LOST they intend to use the convention to force America to comply with the Kyoto Protocol even though the Senate has never ratified that accord.

Independently, lawsuits end all domestic fossil fuel use – America is different and it isn’t immediate

Murray 13 (Iain, Vice President for Strategy and Senior Fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, 3-25-2013, "LOST at Sea", National Center for Policy Analysis, <http://www.ncpathinktank.org/pub/bg167>, BS 10-11-2018)

The Environmental Effects of LOST The Treaty is supposedly designed to protect the environment, but like most such measures, its adoption by the United States would open it up to endless pressure from the international environmental movement that would likely result in substantial costs to land-based extractive industries. Furthermore, the International Tribunal has embraced an approach that has significant implications for future development of marine resources. Anti-Pollution Measures. The environmental dangers of the treaty are contained in Part XII, most significantly: [3] “The measures taken pursuant to this Part shall deal with all sources of pollution of the marine environment. These measures shall include, inter alia, those designed to minimize to the fullest possible extent:” [a] “the release of toxic, harmful or noxious substances, especially those which are persistent, from land-based sources, from or through the atmosphere or by dumping...”⁴⁴ Those who are concerned that the marine

environment is being damaged by pollution could put their case before the Tribunal, but the obligations of Part XII would have a special effect on the United States, where citizens may sue to ensure the government follows its laws. Under the U.S. Constitution, international treaties have the force of law. Ratifying LOST would therefore enable environmental groups to sue to ensure the release of toxic substances is minimized "to the fullest possible extent" if there is a chance the material will enter the marine environment.

Consider: The nation's coal-fired power plants release mercury into the atmosphere. Some of this mercury consolidates in rivers, and eventually reaches the ocean. As a result, fish that swim in the ocean have slightly higher levels of mercury in their systems. Sharks that eat these fish have even higher mercury concentrations. The concern that pregnant mothers who eat shark meat are damaging the cognitive development of their unborn children has led environmentalists to demand that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency issue regulations to reduce the risk to unborn children. However, consider what the Treaty text implies. There is no requirement to prove that the emissions actually cause significant harm. If the substance emitted is "harmful" to any degree, states are simply required to minimize emissions "to the fullest possible extent." To all practical purposes, taking the Treaty at its word would require the closure of most if not all coal-fired electricity generation in the United States. This kind of activism has not taken place in any of the other signatory states, likely because they offer fewer opportunities for concerned citizens to require their governments to follow the spirit and word of the Treaty. In the United States, however, environmental groups would probably sue the day after formal ratification, and the courts would be unlikely to throw out their challenges. Global Warming. Mercury is just the tip of the iceberg. The Environmental Protection Agency has made a determination that carbon dioxide is harmful to human health, and some scientists have claimed that the substance has been accumulating in the oceans, leading to rising acidity and harm to marine life, such as shellfish. 45 Thus, environmentalists would likely sue to ban any emission of carbon dioxide beyond the natural carbon cycle. In practice, that would mean the end of fossil fuels in the United States. Oil and natural gas also emit large amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere every day. While minimizing their use "to the fullest possible extent" may not be practical, and would be extraordinarily expensive, it is possible. Wind, geothermal and solar power would become the only means of generating electricity (nuclear energy would be unlikely to survive a LOST challenge), and electric cars would become mandatory. The courts would probably set a deadline for the conversion, so as not to destroy the economy overnight, but the cost of such a conversion would cripple America for generations, especially if other nations continue to use fossil fuel, as they almost certainly will.

Renewables are key to warming

Long & Steinberger 16 (Noah, Senior Attorney and Director for the Interior West and Northwest at the Climate and Clean Energy Program, and Kevin, Policy Analyst at the Climate and Clean Energy Program, 7-26-2016, "**Renewable Energy Is Key to Fighting Climate Change**", National Resources Defense Council, <https://www.nrdc.org/experts/noah-long/renewable-energy-key-fighting-climate-change>, BS 10-11-2018)

Renewable energy is one of the most effective tools we have in the fight against climate change, and there is every reason to believe it will succeed. A recent New York Times column seems to imply that renewable energy investments set back efforts to address climate change—nothing could be further from the truth. What's more, renewable technologies can increasingly save customers money as they displace emissions from fossil fuels. Wind and solar energy have experienced remarkable growth and huge cost improvements over the past decade with no signs of slowing down. Prices are declining rapidly, and renewable energy is becoming increasingly competitive with fossil fuels all around the country. In some places, new renewable energy is already cheaper than continuing to operate old, inefficient and dirty fossil fuel-fired or nuclear power plants. In fact, the investment firm Lazard estimates that the cost of

generating electricity from wind and solar has declined by 58 percent and 78 percent, respectively, since 2009. Those cost trends are expected to continue, and coupled with the recent extension of federal tax credits for renewable energy, wind and solar growth is widely expected to accelerate over the next several years, with capacity projected to double from 2015 levels by 2021. With careful planning, **renewable energy and clean energy options like increased energy efficiency and storing energy for use later will help pave the way.** In the longer term, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Power Plan to establish the first national limits on carbon pollution from power plants will continue to drive renewable energy growth. **Wind and solar energy will play a central role in achieving the emissions cuts required,** and carbon policies like the Clean Power Plan will be critical to ensuring that low-carbon resources are prioritized over higher-emitting power plants. The benefits are huge. In addition to the climate benefits that they will help deliver, **renewables already provide a wide range of market and public health benefits that far outweigh their costs.** A recent report from the Department of Energy and Lawrence Berkeley National (LBNL) Laboratory found that renewable portfolio standards—state policies that mandate that a specific amount of the state's electricity comes from renewables—provide a wide range of economic, health, and climate benefits. The report concluded that **in 2013 alone, renewable standards across the country saved customers up to \$1.2 billion from reduced wholesale electric prices** and \$1.3 billion to \$3.7 billion from lower natural gas prices (as a result of lower demand for natural gas across the power sector). The non-market benefits of renewable energy also are considerable. The LBNL researchers estimated that **renewables supported nearly 200,000 jobs, provided \$5.2 billion worth of health benefits through improved air quality, and resulted in global climate benefits of \$2.2 billion.** At the same time, according to a separate report by DBL Investors, the top 10 leading renewable states experienced lower electricity price increases than the bottom 10 states between 2002 and 2013.

Warming causes ocean acidification—that risks extinction

Huelsenbeck 13 (Matt, marine scientist for the climate and energy campaign at Oceana and the Scripps Institute, “Acid Test: Rising CO2 Levels Killing Ocean Life (Op-Ed),” <http://www.livescience.com/38219-oceans-acidifying-with-rising-co2.html>, BS 10-12-2018)

The ocean absorbs approximately one-third of all human-caused carbon dioxide emissions at a rate of 300 tons per second, which helps slow global climate change. But, due to that carbon dioxide absorption, the ocean is now 30 percent more acidic than before the Industrial Revolution, and the rate of change in ocean pH, called **ocean acidification, is likely unparalleled in Earth's history.** With today's levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide so high, the ocean's help comes at a cost to marine life and the **millions of people who depend on healthy oceans.** For the first time in human history, atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have risen above 400 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide at the historic Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii. This observatory is where Scripps Institution of Oceanography researcher Charles David Keeling created the “Keeling Curve,” a famous graph showing that atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations have been increasing rapidly in the atmosphere for decades. Carbon dioxide levels were around 280 ppm before the Industrial Revolution, when humans began releasing large amounts of the gas into the atmosphere by burning fossil fuels. On May 9, 2013, the reading was an alarming 400.08 ppm for a 24-hour period. This number would be even higher, however, if it were not for the help of the oceans. [Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Breaks 3-Million-Year Record] **Scientists already see ocean acidification harming marine animals like oysters, mussels and clams as well as coral reefs and floating marine snails called pteropods, dubbed the “potato chips of the sea” because of their significance to marine food webs.** In the last decade, ocean acidification killed many oyster larvae at the Whisky Creek oyster hatchery in Oregon, shrunk the shells of pteropods in the Southern Ocean and slowed coral growth on Australia's Great Barrier Reef. **Society's use of fossil fuels is putting the world's marine life through a high-risk chemistry experiment with no fail-safes in place and no way to turn back. Earlier in Earth's history, changes in ocean conditions that were much slower than today still**

managed to wipe out 95 percent of marine species. If emissions continue at current rates, our planet is risking **a similar mass extinction event**, one that could begin within our lifetimes.

These impacts will ripple up to threaten people as well! who are at the top of the ocean food

web. In September 2012, an Oceana report entitled "Ocean-Based Food Security Threatened in a High CO2 World" ranked nations based on their vulnerability to reductions in seafood production due to climate change and ocean acidification. Many island nations rely on seafood as one of their main food sources, since it is the cheapest and most readily available source of protein. Threats to seafood especially threaten small-scale fishermen, who simply aren't capable of following fish into distant waters. Reducing carbon dioxide emissions is the only way to confront global ocean acidification and the primary means to stop climate change. Oceana is currently working to limit pollution emissions that threaten the ocean by halting the expansion of offshore drilling and supporting clean energy solutions like offshore wind. In the Atlantic Ocean, oil companies are trying to take their first step toward drilling for offshore oil and gas with seismic airgun surveys that would injure dolphins and whales with loud blasts. The more oil they find and the more drilling that occurs, the worse climate change becomes. The current rate of change in ocean conditions is simply too high for many marine animals to adapt, but to avoid further harm, society needs to create an even faster rate of change in energy supply options. If not, our planet risks losing the diversity and abundance of ocean life that we all depend on.

Warming causes interstate resource wars

Klare 8 (Michael, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, "The Coming Resource Wars", <http://www.alternet.org/environment/33243>, BS 10-12-2018)

It's official: the era of resource wars is upon us. In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global climate change and dwindling natural resources are combining to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy. Climate change, he indicated, "will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer" -- and this will "make the emergence of violent conflict more rather than less likely."

Although not unprecedented, Reid's prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. "The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur," he declared. "We should see this as a warning sign." Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects of global climate change. With sea levels rising, water and energy becoming increasingly scarce and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon. Reid's speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain's equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and resource effects -- rather than political orientation and ideology -- as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With

the world population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies rapidly disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources of water, food and energy.

Prior to Reid's address, the most significant expression of this outlook was a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Defense by a California-based consulting firm in October 2003. Entitled "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security," the report warned that global climate change is more likely to result in sudden, cataclysmic environmental events than a gradual (and therefore manageable) rise in average temperatures. Such events could include a substantial increase in global sea levels, intense storms and hurricanes and continent-wide "dust bowl" effects. This would trigger pitched battles between the survivors of these effects for access to food, water, habitable land and energy supplies. "Violence and disruption stemming from the stresses created by abrupt changes in the climate pose a different type of threat to national security than we are accustomed to today," the 2003 report noted. "Military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion or national honor." Until now, this mode of analysis has failed to command the attention of top American and British policymakers. For the most part, they insist that ideological and religious differences -- notably, the clash between values of tolerance and democracy on one hand and extremist forms of Islam on the other -- remain the main drivers of international conflict. But Reid's speech at Chatham House suggests that a major shift in strategic thinking may be under way. Environmental perils may soon dominate the world security agenda. This shift is due in part to the growing weight of evidence pointing to a significant human role in altering the planet's basic climate systems. Recent studies showing the rapid shrinkage of the polar ice caps, the accelerated melting of North American glaciers, the increased frequency of severe hurricanes and a number of other such effects all suggest that dramatic and potentially

harmful changes to the global climate have begun to occur. More importantly, they conclude that human behavior -- most importantly, the burning of fossil fuels in factories, power plants, and motor vehicles -- is the most likely cause of these changes. This assessment may not have yet penetrated the White House and other bastions of head-in-the-sand thinking, but it is clearly gaining ground among scientists and thoughtful analysts around the world. For the most part, public discussion of global climate change has tended to describe its effects as an environmental problem -- as a threat to safe water, arable soil, temperate forests, certain species and so on. And, of course, climate change is a potent threat to the environment; in fact, the greatest threat imaginable. But viewing climate change as an environmental problem fails to do justice to the magnitude of the peril it poses. As Reid's speech and the 2003 Pentagon study make clear, the greatest danger posed by global climate change is not the degradation of ecosystems per se, but rather the disintegration of entire human societies, producing **wholesale starvation, mass migrations and recurring conflict over resources.** **"As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change,"** the Pentagon report notes, **"many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity"** -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. **This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources.** "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survive invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. **"In this world of warring states,"** the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, **"nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable."** **As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation" as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security."** Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict.

Weighing

Specifically, failure to act cedes soft power to China

Harvey 10-10 (George, 10-10-2018, "If Trump Rejects The IPCC Report, He Is Giving China A Powerful Weapon", CleanTechnica, <https://cleantechnica.com/2018/10/10/if-trump-rejects-the-ipcc-report-he-is-giving-china-a-powerful-weapon/>, BS 10-11-2018)

After Donald Trump declared his trade war against China, he set about building a losing strategy. CleanTechnica has had numerous articles about this, including Steve Hanley's Trump's Trade War, Round One: China 1, America 0 and my own Trump's Trade War – Headed for Catastrophe. One thing Trump clearly does not understand is that trade wars are won by cutting off the competition from its suppliers and customers. This means isolating the enemy. It implies building alliances and cutting the enemy off from its friends. This is something that probably cannot be done by an isolationist country. Trade wars are not easy to win. The nations of the world conducted a successful trade war against South Africa with a view to ending apartheid. It was not short, and though it did win in the end, it was not easy to win. What Trump has done in a trade war against China has been to isolate the United States. It is precisely what the Chinese would wish in their dreams, without expecting that they could ever accomplish such a goal. While it is true that Trump has had new trade deals negotiated with Mexico and Canada, the outcome might have been condemned by Trump supporters if President Obama had achieved it. But more to the point, he has not endeared himself or this country to our trading partners by breaking our word, threatening sanctions against them, and requiring them to alter established agreements. Now the IPCC report has emerged. It is a product of many scientists of many nations. Trump said he is reviewing it, specifically looking at "which group drew it." Realistically, he has only two rational options. He can accept the report and admit that he was wrong about the climate, taking the chance of alienating about everyone who supports him. Or he can reject it, almost assuredly alienating every nation that signed onto the report, which means nearly every nation on Earth. (True enough, he may have some whack-a-doodle third option supplied to him by those people who do his policy thinking for him. But whack-a-doodle is not rational.) The IPCC report is urgent. We must act now, or face disaster. The press, full of stories about this, may actually start to deal with the issue. One story is There Is Only One Energy Future: Firmed Renewables, which appeared in the Australian Financial Review. Nearly all nations of the world are faced with a monolemma. All arguments impel us to a single choice. Ditch fossil fuels or get slammed by climate change. Ditch fossil fuels or risk illness and death from pollution, paying too much for health care as we suffer. Ditch fossil fuels or continue paying too much for energy. Ditch fossil fuels or face the condemnation of all future generations, including our own children and grand children. The fact that nations of the Earth have only one choice, and the United States has been operating to thwart progress, is giving China a superbly powerful tool in the war against Trump and the interests for which he is head actor. If Trump fails to start pushing hard to join the effort against climate change, China is in a perfect position to turn nearly all other nations of the Earth into its own allies. America is moving to become not merely isolationist, but also isolated. And if we are isolated, we will lose.

Warming turns SCS war – fish scarcity

Ronson 17 (Jacqueline, 6-13-2017, "Here's Where the Next Climate Change Wars Could Erupt", Inverse, <https://www.inverse.com/article/32785-climate-change-conflict-war-water-drought-syria>, BS 10-12-2018)

Fish Wars in the South China Sea The South China Sea is a hot potato of international diplomacy for a slew of reasons, but fishing is among the biggest. "Vietnam and China have repeatedly clashed over fishing rights in the South China Sea, including a 2005 incident where Chinese patrol boats opened fire on Vietnamese fishing trawlers, killing nine crewmen," writes Michael Thomas of the Center for Climate and Security. Climate change heightens the risk of wars over

fish in at least two ways. For one, it moves the resource around, pushing fish out of their normal ranges as environmental conditions change. If fleets follow the fish, they are more likely to sail into dicey political waters and incur the wrath of foreign vessels. Secondly, climate change can cause declines in fishing stocks by killing off crucial coral reef habitat and destabilizing the food webs that the fish depend on. The region hosts more than half of the world's fishing fleet, and the fisheries' resource has declined an estimated 70-95 percent since the 1950s. The potential for conflict is huge, and the stakes are unimaginably high. "China is the most advanced and uses its 200,000-strong fishing fleet as a 'maritime militia,' operating with impunity as an irregular naval force, claiming islands, ferrying goods and materials to assist the [People's Liberation Army] in port and military base construction, and collecting maritime intelligence inside the so-called nine-dashed line," Thomas writes. "Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia and the Philippines have all blown up or threatened to blow up vessels that enter 'their' waters and regularly use their navies to intercept and destroy foreign fishing vessels."

Warming turns arctic conflict – melts sea ice

Ronson 17 (Jacqueline, 6-13-2017, "Here's Where the Next Climate Change Wars Could Erupt", Inverse, <https://www.inverse.com/article/32785-climate-change-conflict-war-water-drought-syria>, BS 10-12-2018)

Oil Wars in the Arctic Nowhere on the planet is changing in the face of global warming as dramatically as the High Arctic. The region was very recently an impenetrable fortress of snow and ice, but today oil rigs are making forays, and bigger and bigger cruise ships are boldly making the passage. The entire Arctic Ocean could be seasonally ice-free by the middle of this century. While the Arctic is notably governed through peace and cooperation between neighbor states, that doesn't mean everyone always agrees. A border dispute still looms on the continental shelf, north of where Alaska meets Canada, which could become significant if fishing and oil extraction become profitable in the region. There's a further dispute over whether the Northwest Passage is internal water to Canada or as international strait of passage. So far, shows of military presence by the United States have not produced a major diplomatic crisis, but stakes will go up as the region becomes more accessible and valuable. The claims of Russia to the Arctic complicates matters. "Since Russia's incursion into Crimea and eastern Ukraine, each member state of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has suspended all forms of military cooperation with Russia, including in the previously apolitical zone of 'military cooperation' in the Arctic," write Francesco Femia and Caitlin Werrell of the Center for Climate and Security. "In a context of possibly greater interaction between Arctic nations (due to melting ice), but less cooperation due to diplomatic conflicts elsewhere in the world, the probability of heightened tensions between major powers increases. While the current probability of conflict in the Arctic is low, the future is uncertain due to a rapidly changing physical and geopolitical landscape."

Warming turns the economy – sea level rise, lost productivity

World 15 (Justin, Writer for TIME "Climate Change Could Wreck the Global Economy". <http://time.com/4082328/climate-change-economic-impact/>)

Temperature rise due to climate change may radically damage the global economy and slow growth in the coming decades if nothing is done to slow the pace of warming, according to new research. The researchers behind the study, published in the journal Nature, found that temperature change due to

unmitigated global warming will leave global GDP per capita 23% lower in 2100 than it would be without any warming. "We're basically throwing away money by not addressing the issue," said Marshall Burke, an assistant professor at Stanford University. "We see our study as providing an estimate of the benefits of reducing emissions." The economic effects of climate change may be even worse than this study makes them sounds. The research relies on historical data from countries around the world on how temperature increase has affected productivity. This means the study does not account for the economic impact of sea level rise, storms or any of the other expected effects of climate change beyond simple warming. "Sea level rise, increased storm intensity...if you think those things are going to worsen the effects of climate change, then our estimates would be an underestimate of the potential impacts, which is sort of terrifying," said Burke. This study is far from the first to suggest that climate change will slow economic growth. Big business has been especially keen on highlighting the potential damage. A Citigroup report released last month found that minimizing temperature rises to 2.7°F (1.5°C) could minimize global GDP loss by \$50 trillion compared to a rise of 8.1°F (4.5°C) in the coming decades. The study breaks down productivity into agricultural and non-agricultural fields. The effect of agricultural productive is easy to explain: crops grow most productively within a certain temperature range. (The effects of warming on crop productivity have been well documented.) But research still don't know why warm weather decreases productivity for workers in other fields.

Warming turns terror – resource scarcity and funding – Syria proves

Saravade 15 (Vasundhara, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development (SEED) at the University of Waterloo, 12-12-2015, "We Must Fight Climate Change to Win the War on Terror", Fair Observer, https://www.fairobserver.com/region/middle_east_north_africa/we-must-fight-climate-change-to-win-the-war-on-terror-32101/, BS 10-12-2018)

We need to learn from the Syrian situation, where a lack of resources eventually led to conflict and war. Paris, Beirut, Baghdad—all three cities were targeted by the Islamic State (IS) in November. And even with hundreds of deaths, these were only a few among countless other victims of terrorist attacks that have taken place in 2015. In November 2008, Mumbai witnessed its own terrorist attack. The "city that never sleeps" was at a standstill for four days as terrorist attacks took place across the city, killing 164 people and wounding 308 others. Among the innocent civilians and police officers who were killed was my parents' friend, Ashok Kamte, the additional commissioner in the Mumbai police department. Both my parents are police officers, and Ashok was my mother's batch-mate from her National Police Academy days. As a kid, I remember visiting his family's house when he was the superintendent of police in the Kolhapur district of Maharashtra. It was so surreal and numbing to hear that he had died on 26/11. I still remember the morning of November 26, watching in tears as news of terrorist attacks flashed on the TV screen. Even though I had only met Ashok a few times, his death in a senseless terrorist attack broke my heart. We lost not one, but 164 such people during that carnage. The same pain tugged at my heart as I read about the attacks in Paris, Beirut and Baghdad. Although it is in the name of religion that IS carries out such condemnable acts, no religion preaches the merciless killings of human beings. Instead, it is a lack of empathy created by a fight for survival that has led to such acts of terror. A fight that will only get worse when countries like Poland close their borders to refugees in the name of national security. I have always believed that the world is a place where a butterfly flapping its wings can cause a tsunami. Terrorism is not caused by an act of war or the words of a fundamentalist. It is caused by the inequalities that countries have faced in the past as well as the ones they are facing today. Inequalities that are exacerbated by problems like climate change. Religion isn't at the root of terrorism. It is scarcity of resources and a lack of empathy that causes mindless acts of terror. SYRIA'S PERFECT STORM Let me tell you the story of Syria, a country that was once peaceful, but has since become so scarred with terrorism that millions of people have had to flee. This isn't a story that was started by a religious movement or a terrorist group, but rather by manmade climate change. The story begins when Syria suffered its worst drought on record from 2006 to 2010. The drought was very intense and lasted longer than could be explained by natural variations in weather. This was no ordinary drought, but rather an impact of climate change. Nearly 85% of the livestock died and Syria's famed fields of halaby peppers withered away. President Bashar al-Assad's government offered little help to the common farmers. His administration awarded well rights along political lines, so most farmers had to drill their own illegal wells. And people who spoke out against him faced imprisonment,

torture and even death. Around a million rural villagers lost their farms to drought. These people moved into cities like Daraa to look for other means of livelihood. In cities, the water problem became even more acute, and there weren't enough jobs. The once prosperous farmers were now lucky to even find work as street sweepers. Tempers rose and frustrations festered. Finally, a group of teenage boys expressed their anger by spray painting a slogan they borrowed from new revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt. Unfortunately, the local secret police came and arrested 15 of the boys. In the cell of the nearby political security branch, police officers beat and tortured the teenagers. Without showing any empathy or remorse, these policemen burned their skin and pulled out their fingernails. The boys came from some prominent families in Daraa, and upon hearing this, the family members marched to the governor's house. Assad's Syria is a government accustomed to authoritarian rule, meaning any protests that happened in Daraa were met with violence. Soon after, Syrians in other cities gathered in support of the "children of Daraa." Protests spread following the path of the drought—from Damascus to al-Qamishli. This kind of sustained uprising was not supposed to happen in Syria. Right up until the first protests in Daraa, international security analysts had proclaimed Syria immune to the rising "Arab Spring," the popular name given to the democratic wave of civil unrest in the Arab world that began in December 2010. It was this revolutionary movement that created an ideal atmosphere for terrorism to grow and thrive. Political oppression was not the only cause of the Syrian conflict. Perhaps manmade climate change played an even bigger role. CLIMATE CHANGE AND CONFLICT According to Francesco Femia, director of the Center for Climate and Security, environmental stressors are capable of causing wide-scale conflict. When 1.5 million people lose their livelihoods and face drinking water shortages, a survival mindset sets in. The displacement of a massive population further leads to a sense of social unrest. After decades of ineffective leadership, the effects of climate change may have been the "ultimate unhinging stressor for Syria." But even if the country recovers from political instability and eradicates terrorism, Syria still stands to lose nearly 50% more of its agricultural capacity by 2050. If current rates of greenhouse gas emissions continue, more extreme droughts will return and water shortages will worsen. But this situation is not only restricted to Syria. Extreme weather events have started occurring in other parts of the world, too. From extreme flooding affecting Chennai in India to the increased forest fires in Indonesia, climate change is showing its impact. One can even compare the Syrian situation to that of the state of Maharashtra in India, where a prolonged drought has been occurring since 2009. Hundreds of farmers commit suicides every year, yet the government does not do anything to address the climate change impact that is affecting the state. With only 8% water left in the dams this year, it is essential that we address such impact of climate change. Otherwise, environmental stressors will lead to potential law and order problems in the Maharashtra. We need to learn from the Syrian situation, where a lack of resources eventually led to conflict and war. THE IMPORTANCE OF CLIMATE ACTION It may not even be a coincidence that the Paris attacks on November 13 were committed just weeks before the biggest climate conference known as the Conference of Parties (COP21). An article in The Ecologist points out that any failure of COP21 will benefit IS, as the terrorist group stands to make \$500 million a year from oil sales—together with other oil producers. Another article in the Financial Times says: "Oil is the black gold that funds ISIS's [Islamic State] black flag — it fuels its war machine, provides electricity and gives them critical leverage from its neighbours." The article goes on to state that IS derives its financial stability straight from its status as a monopoly producer of an essential commodity consumed in vast quantities throughout the area it controls. Even without being able to export, IS can thrive because it has a huge captive market in Syria and Iraq. So the last thing that IS wants is a global climate agreement that limits consumption on fossil fuels. In this time of horror and distress, it is crucial that we guard the powerful climate action mandate of COP21 in the coming years. We need to learn from the Paris attacks and the Chennai floods, because when global temperatures breach the 2 degrees Celsius threshold, extreme weather events are only going to have a domino effect on terrorism. But first, we must break out of this blame game and find a solution before it is too late. "It is through empathy [that] we build bridges and through hate that we destroy them," as Zak Ebrahim says. When countries and religions turn against each other, the world seems like an iron sky—full of hate and apathy, holding us back from making any real change. In this time of need, let us show empathy to those who need it and work toward a future that builds bridges rather than one that destroys them. Let us start by breaking out of this iron sky.

Here's an ASEAN card

Solis 10-5 (Manuel, lecturer in the Adelaide Law School and a Visiting Law Faculty in the University of Sydney Law School teaching an intensive postgraduate course on Asia Pacific

Environmental Law, 10-5-2018, "A better climate in the South China Sea", Policy Forum, <https://www.policyforum.net/better-climate-south-china-sea/>, BS 10-12-2018)

While negotiations over sovereignty in the South China Sea appear to be in a deadlock, a focus on climate change and ocean protection could lead to calmer waters, Manuel Solis writes. The South China Sea (SCS) is the world's most contested sea area with competing territorial and maritime claims from at least six coastal and seafaring states: China (including Taiwan), Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Vietnam. Out of the six claimants, five are members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). As a busy commercial and strategic gateway with abundant natural resources, the SCS is unfortunately defined by contestation. At stake is US \$3.37 trillion of global trade passing through the SCS; fisheries worth US \$21.8 billion; proven and probable oil reserves of 11 billion barrels of oil; and an estimated 900 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Competing claims for sovereignty, territory, maritime entitlements and natural resources in the SCS are all a recipe for what foreign affairs expert Robert Kaplan calls 'Asia's Cauldron'. The default international legal instrument to address the overlapping claims in the SCS is the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). UNCLOS functions as the constitution for the world's oceans and seas. It embodies novel legal concepts such as the exclusive economic zone and the extended continental shelf with its own dispute settlement mechanism. More on this: NatSecPod: A shifting maritime landscape Interestingly, UNCLOS also incorporates environmental protection clauses for the marine environment. However, climate change is not originally within the contemplation of the legal instrument. So far, legal and international relations analyses tend to focus on the merits of territorial claims and potential geopolitical outcomes of disputes under UNCLOS. However, the dispute settlement mechanism under UNCLOS can be problematic. We need look no further than the international arbitration case that the Philippines filed against China in March 2014. China remains steadfast in its argument rejecting the arbitral award to the Philippines, claiming the subject matter of the arbitration involves sovereignty and is thus outside the ambit of UNCLOS. Effectively, the arbitral decision and its enforcement remain matters of contestation. Building consensus and achieving regional cooperation on the SCS are standing challenges for both ASEAN and the future of ASEAN-China relations. Another problem is the way ASEAN has sought to peacefully resolve the disputes in the SCS. As early as 1992, ASEAN officially committed to addressing the SCS problem with the ASEAN Declaration on the SCS. It took another decade to reach a non-binding Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the SCS with China in 2002. This laid the groundwork for further consultations on a Code of Conduct in the SCS, which gained momentum after the arbitration ruling in favour of the Philippines in 2016. More on this: Bogged down in the South China Sea However, the negotiations on the Code of Conduct are tedious and only expose ASEAN's institutional weakness. Even reaching a joint statement or communique on the SCS is proving to be a difficult task, with a single dissent from an ASEAN member country enough to create an impasse in the organisation's consensus-driven decision-making process. Beyond claims of sovereignty, territory and maritime entitlements, the SCS faces serious sustainability challenges, particularly from the threats of climate and ocean change. Undeniably, the SCS narrative is not just about contestation. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the ocean is a carbon sink that absorbs 30 per cent of the anthropogenic carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere. The IPCC has highlighted in its Fifth Assessment Report that climate change negatively impacts ocean health in terms of ocean warming, acidification,

sea-level rise and de-oxygenation putting marine ecosystems, marine biodiversity and fisheries at risk. Under a business-as-usual scenario, University of British Columbia researchers predict that the ocean species in the SCS will decrease by up to 59 per cent by 2045 due to climate change. In the last three decades, fish stock has decreased by a third, while coral reefs declined at a staggering rate of 16 per cent in the last 10 years. China's State Oceanic Administration Report from the First Oceanic Research Institution admits that because of ocean warming, acidification and overfishing, coral reef systems in the SCS are degrading rapidly. The SCS is an unavoidably a hotspot for climate change and a major concern for the international climate change regime. More on this: A South China Sea code of conduct? Without a functioning and healthy ocean, the Paris Agreement goal of limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius or well below 2 degrees Celsius is not achievable. One attempt to address this has been through the Ocean Pathway initiative, which supports the goals of the Paris Agreement by increasing the role of ocean considerations in the UN negotiations and by incubating and accelerating climate action involving the ocean. Considering that all ASEAN member states and China are committed to achieving international climate policy goals, there is considerable opportunity to pursue joint regional climate policy formulation and action in the SCS. Notably, ASEAN has been instrumental in promoting cooperation and integration among its member countries on climate policy. Since 2007, ASEAN Summits have repeatedly identified climate change as a priority concern that can be tackled through regional cooperation. Established in 2009, the ASEAN Working Group on Climate Change recognises the need for cross-sectoral coordination and a global partnership to address climate change. With China's emergence as a leader on the global climate change stage, ASEAN has the opportunity to build consensus and strike a regional cooperation deal with its largest neighbour through the Ocean Pathway strategy. As a 2017 study published by the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs points out, it is time for ASEAN to take a forward-leaning role in 'creating a team spirit' around each member's international climate change policy commitments. This bottom-up approach resonates with the ASEAN way of diplomacy that puts a premium on national sovereignty, non-interference, and consensus in decision-making. By taking a proactive approach to the Ocean Pathway strategy, ASEAN can help reframe the SCS narrative from one of contestation to consensus-building and cooperation.

Frontlines

AT Amendments Solve

Murray 13 (Iain, Vice President for Strategy and Senior Fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, 3-25-2013, "LOST at Sea", National Center for Policy Analysis, <http://www.ncpathinktank.org/pub/bg167>, BS 10-11-2018)

Of course, when the Treaty was negotiated, and even when the amendments were agreed to in 1994, global warming was not the major international concern it is today. Therefore, major emitters of carbon dioxide, such as the United States, China and other rapidly industrializing states, might attempt to revise the Treaty to exclude carbon dioxide (and potentially other greenhouse gases) from Article 194. However, amending the Treaty is extremely difficult, requiring half the parties to first agree to consider an amendment, followed by a convention that would decide on the amendment by consensus. Furthermore, the parties to the Treaty are primarily developing nations that continue to express significant objections to the emission of carbon dioxide by industrialized nations. There is a simplified amendment procedure, but if a single state objects the process is derailed. Thus, amendment offers no hope to save America from this or any other aspect of the Treaty.

AT Article 207

Murray 13 (Iain, Vice President for Strategy and Senior Fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, 3-25-2013, "LOST at Sea", National Center for Policy Analysis, <http://www.ncpathinktank.org/pub/bg167>, BS 10-11-2018)

It might also be argued that Article 194 is tempered by Article 207 (Pollution from Land-based Sources), which states: States shall adopt laws and regulations to prevent, reduce and control pollution of the marine environment from land-based sources, including rivers, estuaries, pipelines and outfall structures, taking into account internationally agreed rules, standards and recommended practices and procedures. States shall take other measures as may be necessary to prevent, reduce and control such pollution. States shall endeavor to harmonize their policies in this connection at the appropriate regional level. States, acting especially through competent international organizations or diplomatic conference, shall endeavor to establish global and regional rules, standards and recommended practices and procedures to prevent, reduce and control pollution of the marine environment from land-based sources, taking into account characteristic regional features, the economic capacity of developing States and their need for economic development. Such rules, standards and recommended practices and procedures shall be re-examined from time to time as necessary. Laws, regulations, measures, rules, standards and recommended practices and procedures referred to in paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 shall include those designed to minimize, to the fullest extent possible, the release of toxic, harmful or noxious substances, especially those which are persistent, into the marine environment. But, as section 2 above makes clear, the idea that states should adopt laws to "prevent, reduce and control" harmful substances in no way reduces the burden to minimize their release "to the fullest possible extent." In fact, Article 207 increases the burden by requiring the United States to pass laws and regulations to achieve these ends and to enter into further treaties at both the regional and global level to reduce emissions, while giving developing states a pass on the same requirement.

AT Not Binding

Mulligan 9-19 (Stephen, "International Law and Agreements: Their Effect upon U.S. Law," Congressional Research Service, BS 10-11-2018)

Summary International law is derived from two primary sources—international agreements and customary practice. Under the U.S. legal system, international agreements can be entered into by means of a treaty or an executive agreement. The Constitution allocates primary responsibility for entering into such agreements to the executive branch, but Congress also plays an essential role. First, in order for a treaty (but not an executive agreement) to become binding upon the United States, the Senate must provide its advice and consent to treaty ratification by a two-thirds majority. Secondly, Congress may authorize congressional-executive agreements.