**Nihar and I negate Resolved: the united states should accede to the United nations convention on the law of sea without reservations, or unclos for short**

<http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/convention_overview_convention.htm>

**~~Before we begin, The UN explains that The~~** [**~~Law of the Sea~~**](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm) **~~convention [is an international agreement] establishing rules governing all uses of the oceans and their resources.~~**

**~~"~~**[**~~Acceeding~~**](http://ask.un.org/faq/14594)**~~" is the act where a [country]~~ ~~accepts the offer or the opportunity to~~ ~~become[s] a party to a treaty already negotiated and signed by other [countries]~~ ~~. It has the same legal effect as ratification. Accession usually occurs after the treaty has entered into force.~~**

### Contention 1 is Poking the bear~~/ cracking open a cold one~~

As the ice melts in the arctic,

 [Connor O’Sullivan NYU 2014](http://connor)

The development of Arctic energy resources poses the potential for an energy security competition between the Great Powers and Arctic stakeholders that will alter the geopolitical climate. **[Arctic] hydrocarbon reserves – [amounting to] 25% of world’s total deposits- and [have become] available under the melting ice caps**, and undiscovered oil and gas will see states shifting their economic and foreign policy priorities. **New shipping lanes could alter the world economy as trade routes become faster and safer, but will also become a source of conflict.** As world populations and energy consumption increases and supplies decrease, states will seek to maximize interests out of Arctic exploration. The United States and other Arctic Council members must check the exploration and production ambitions of Russia and China to prevent a great power game developing. A cohesive policy between member states and international institutions will be vital in preventing a resource competition that could have severe economic, political, military and environmental implications. The flag planting by a Russian submarine in August 2007 underneath the Arctic seabed symbolized

**These reserves are crucial to Russia’s economic development and influence as Sullivan continues**

**Russia’s [intentends] to use Arctic exploration as a means of securing its desired imperial status [as a regional superpower] – pursuing a zero-sum game. The Kremlin plans to establish a new international order in which it becomes a regional hegemon.** It is my opinion that Russia intends to end its role as an isolated entity in international affairs, becoming closely integrated with the global economy and dictating policy. Russian officials view the Arctic as securing its energy security ambitions for the next century. **Which is why dwindling Russian gas and energy reserves, in the underdeveloped Siberian fields, and over-reliance on European imports of its natural gas has led to a [Russian] push towards the Arctic.**Russia’s jurisdictional claim over the Arctic seabed will challenge the existing international law criteria, the UNCLOS, which specifies jurisdictional authority over international waters.Arctic stakeholders must be wary of Russian intentions over Arctic development, considering the nationalistic rhetoric of the current government in power. Russia’s nationalized energy companies maintain an influence in formulating Arctic Policy and influencing the Russian government to their advantage. Russia will also use its energy security policy in the Arctic to become a naval superpower as new shipping lanes for trade and energy production will run along its extensive northern coastline. Russia’s actions in Crimea and the Ukraine emphasize their willingness to revert to military action over issues of territorial sovereignty and that the U.S. requires an assertive foreign policy with Russia. Ensuing competition over Arctic energy resources and shipping lanes will increase geopolitical competition among the Great Powers. The Bering Sea provides the U.S. with access to Arctic shipping lanes and can act as a strategic counterbalance to Russia. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that 13% and 30% of the world’s undiscovered oil and natural gas respectively lies under the Arctic seabed. I believe that Arctic Council members, the Nordic States and Canada, will align with the U.S. to impose strict restrictions over extraction and production in the Arctic Ocean.

[Piskunova University of Montreal 2010](https://www.jstor.org/stable/25762044)

In Russia’scase, oneofthesethisvitaldomains istheenergy sector. Indeed, Russiaowes a great part of its assertiveness and renewed material capacities to oil and gas revenues. **Thus, it is not suprising that it is seen as [Russia feels it’s crucial to protect this source of wealth from any threat, and especially from [including] the US. and Vladimir Putin has called because their economy is directly tied to their security.**2 This vision is reflected in the doctrine of national security of the Russian Federation, which states: [The] national interest of the State is to preserve the fundamental stability of the constitutional institutions, national sovereignty, territorial integrity andpolitical, economic and social stability...todevelop equitableand mutually beneficial international cooperation. The implementation of Russia’s national interest is only possible on the basis of sustainable economic development. That’s why our inter- ests in this domain are crucial.3 It is very important to add that soft- balancing strategies are guided by zero-sum game logic. As such, they exclude the option of absolute gains and of long-term cooperation in a vital domain. Since the main source of the economic development in Russia is its oil-and-gas industry, not only will Moscow try to reinforce this sector by seeking new fields and transportation routes, but, according to the logic of soft balancing, it will **meaning that they will do everything possible to [defend their arctic territory] protect this economic area from any threatening rivals. This leads to the efforts to establish a dominant, perhaps monopolist, at least at the regional level, position on the world energy market.**

**Joining UNCLOS provokes a confrontation with Russia in two ways**

**First is by making claims**

[**Paul Stronski State Department**](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/9/2/arctics-trillions.html)

**“Washington cannot [make] claim[s in the Arctic now] an exclusive zone off the coast of Alaska because it never ratified [UNCLOS] the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea, which dates back to 1982,” writes Paul Stronski, who served as a senior analyst on Russian domestic politics for the State Department’s Bureau on Intelligence and Research.**

**The US would use UNCLOS ratification to block Russian access to arctic resources and claim them for the US which angers the Russian Government**

[Frolov global Research Institute](https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-%20coming-conflict-in-the-arctic/6344)

The latest findings are likely to prompt Russia to lodge another bid at the UN to secure its rights over the Arctic sea shelf. If no other power challenges Russia’s claim, it will likely go through unchallenged. **But Washington seems to have a different view and is seeking to block the anticipated Russian bid.** On May 16, 2007, Senator Richard Lugar (R-Indiana), the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Commi ee, made a statement encouraging the Senate to ratify the Law of the Sea Convention, as the Bush Administration wants. The Reagan administration negotiated the Convention, but the Senate refused to ratify it for fear that it would unduly limit the U.S. freedom of ac- tion on the high seas. Lugar used the following justification in his plea for the United States to ratify the convention: “Russia has used its rights under the convention to claim large parts of the Arctic Ocean in the hopeof claiming potential oil and gas deposits that might become available as the polar ice cap recedes due to global warming. If the United States did not ratify the convention, Russia would be able to press its claims without the United States at the negotiating table. This would be directly damaging to U.S. national interests.” President Bush urged the Senate to ratify the convention during its current session, which ends in 2008. **The United States** has been jealous of Russia’s attempts to project its dominance in the energy sector and **has sought to [use UNCLOS] to limit opportunities for Russia[‘s] to control export routes and energy deposits outside Russia's territory.** ButtheArctic shelf is something that Russia has traditionally regarded as its own. For decades, other countries have pressed no claims to Russia’s Arctic sector for obvious reasons of remoteness and inhospitability, but no longer. Now, as the world’s major economic powers brace for the battle for the last barrel of oil, it is not surprising that the United States would seek to intrude on Russia’s home turf. **It is obvious that Moscow would try to resist this U.S. intrusion and would view[s] any U.S. efforts to block Russia’s claim to its Arctic sector as unfriendly and overtly provocative.** Furthermore, such a policy would actually help the Kremlin justify its hardline position. **It would certainly prove right Moscow’s assertion that [making them think that] the U.S. policy towards Russia is really driven by the desire to get access to Russia’s energy resources.**

**Second, by creating a military buildup**

[**Konyshev St. Petersburg State University**](http://www.russia-direct.org/analysis/can-un-law-sea-stop-militarization-arctic)

If the U.S. Senate ratifies the Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982, Russia will not witness any significant changes in bilateral relations in the Arctic. It is obvious that the U.S. intends to apply the Convention only when it coincides with its national interests. Potential conflicts will be resolved through bilateral negotiations rather than UNCLOS provisions directly. Since the Convention does not oblige all contentious issues to be de- cided within its rules and institutions, the United States can either appeal to precedent or refuse to discuss an inconvenient problem in terms of the Convention. Apparently, some Russian experts underestimate the fact that under international law, common law prevails over codified law. This allows the U.S. to bypass the Convention and is all the more reason to not consider it a universal source of law on Arctic issues. In line with this logic, experts from the Ministry of Defense and the Department of State sub- mi ed their official conclusions to the U.S. Senate in which they found that ratification would not impose any restrictions on the military**. Moreover if the Convention was ratified, the U.S. could appeal to the right of transit in territorial waters [in UNCLOS] as grounds for legal military presence not only in the Barents Sea**, but also anywhere in the world. In case of complaints about the inadmissibility of covert pres- ence or military activities in territorial waters, the United States could exercise the right of self-interpretation, challenging what is meant by military activities in the particular case (Article 298-1 of the Convention). U.S. military activities cannot be a ma er of con- tention within the framework of the Convention. Similarly, Russia will not receive any positive changes to the delimitation of the Bering Sea or defining the boundary line in the Chukchi Sea and beyond the exclusive economic zone towards the pole.

And because Secretary of Defense Mattis explains that the arctic “is **A key strategic terrain”** “that we cannot leave behind”, we will certainty contest the region

**The impact is Russian Cyberattacks**

Historically, in response to Western provocations, Russia has launched devastating cyberattacks in return.

For example [DAVID PILDITCH](https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/946497/russia-latest-syria-cyber-war-uk-vladimir-putin)

This April, BRITAIN [was struck[ is bracing for a devastating wave of Russian cyber attacks in revenge for the allied missile strikes in Syria. Experts believe [Russian hackers] are already trying to smash[ed] their way into vital computer networks in the UK that could bring the country to a standstill. Key targets include airports and rail links, hospitals, water, electricity and gas supplies and banks. Sources said that critical facilities including the national grid and the NHS have been placed on high alert.

To prevent the US from expanding into the arctic, they would shut down our communications and power grid, crippling our military.

[~~Brookings Institution~~](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/03/22/the-next-russian-attack-will-be-far-worse-than-bots-and-trolls/)

~~The next Russian attack on the U.S. could be massive in scope and debilitating~~ ~~in its effects. It will make social media bots and trolls look benign by comparison. It could be as straightforward and easily traced back to Russia, or it could be far more ambitious.~~  ~~hackers infiltrated critical infrastructures in the U.S.—including “energy, nuclear,~~ ~~commercial facilities, water, aviation,~~ ~~and critical manufacturing sectors~~ ~~The Russian malware, which has been sitting in the control systems of various U.S. utilities,~~ ~~while allowing the Russians to shut off power or sabotage the energy grids~~

[Constance Douris 2018](https://www.forbes.com/sites/constancedouris/2018/02/06/cyber-assault-on-electric-grid-could-make-u-s-feel-like-post-hurricane-puerto-rico/#1d1a21041aa6)

**If a mass power outage were to result from a successful cyberattack on the electric grid, [critical infrastructure would fail] national security and economic stability would be threatened. This is because hospitals, banks, factories, pipelines, financial networks, water systems, telecommunications and military bases would simply not function without electricity.**

**Contention 2 is poking the panda [1:50 target]**

**Tensions have decreased in the South China sea in recent months**

[Carl Thayer Diplomat 2018](https://thediplomat.com/2018/08/a-closer-look-at-the-asean-china-single-draft-south-china-sea-code-of-conduct/)

**On August 3,** the foreign ministers of the 10 member states of **the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and their Chin[a]** counterpart **announced agreement on [signed a]** Single Draft **South China Sea Code of Conduct** Negotiating Text (SDNT) that will serve as the basis for the adoption of a Code of Conduct in the South China Sea. China’s contribution overlaps in part with the other options but it is notable for the detail **that provides** on six areas of cooperation [on] – conservation of fishing resources, **maritime law, security [and**the**],** navigation and search and rescue, maritime scientific research and environmental protection, marine **economic [cooperation]**including aquaculture and oil and gas cooperation, and marine culture.

#### U.S. accession to UNCLOS breaks the fragile peace that exists now and dramatically increases tensions with china for 2 reasons

##### Conducting Freedom of Navigation operations, or fonops

[**Casey Egan 2018**](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/06/26/china-south-china-sea-expansion-neighbors-nervous/711006002/) **explains**

**To challenge China’s claims and militarization over disputed island groups, the U.S. Navy regularly conducts freedom-of-navigation operations (FONOPs) through the South China Sea. In this case, the [FONOP] operations involve sailing a [warship] through the disputed waters to show the United States does not recognize China’s [territorial] claims.**

**Joining UNCLOS gives us the authority to conduct more aggressive fonops.**

[Jonathan Vanecko of the Naval War College](http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA546081)

As mentioned previously, the enhanced legitimacy gained through **ratification of UNCLOS** would aid PACOM in several ways. First, legitimacy **gives FONOPS assertions and diplomatic protests more weight**, and leaves nations such as China constrained in their ability to challenge U.S. action. **Because UNCLOS is almost universally accepted, U.S. actions would receive “tacit support” from the 160 nations party to the convention allowing [our military] to more aggressively assert navigational rights** within the approved framework of UNCLOS should diplomacy fail.66 In other words, after military capability, **legitimacy is the** second **prong necessary to unilaterally conduct effective FON assertions in the SCS**.

**However, Instead of backing down, china only becomes more confrontational**

[Shi South China Morning Post](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy-defence/article/2101078/pla-warships-and-fighter-jets-sent-warn-us-destroyer)

[The last time the US sailed warships in the South China Sea], Beijing sent its own warships and fighter jets to [fend] off the US naval destroyer that sailed close to a disputed island in the South China Sea, calling the passage a serious provocation that strained bilateral ties.

##### 2. Shifting Alliances[1:12]

Using trade relationships and the code of conduct, China has established itself as the main geopolitical leader in the region However, china fears Asian countries aligning with the US instead of them.

**The US would use UNCLOS to double down and engage in multilateral efforts in the south china sea**

**Glaser finds in 2016 that**

**“Ratifying UNCLOS would bolster American moral authority and legitimacy on international maritime issues at an important time.” She continues that “Becoming a treaty member [and] would help advance U.S. interests in promoting multilateral cooperation on a range of issues globally” by reassuring “America’s allies that the U.S. calls for all nations to uphold proper values in the sea.**

**This cooperation is seen as containment angers china**

[**https://thediplomat.com/2016/05/u-s-credibility-in-the-south-china-sea/**](https://thediplomat.com/2016/05/u-s-credibility-in-the-south-china-sea/)

By drawing closer to the U.S., China’s **Southeast Asian** adversaries seek to acquire some degree of balance in the region, so as to dissuade China from brazen invocations of military might to enforce its sweeping claims. Which is to say, they **hopes a more visible, active American military presence will deter China.** There is no doubt that the United States has, for the time being, adequate military resources to more than balance anything China can put into the South China Sea. But, as aficionados of the Cold War will recall, a fundamental component of deterrence is credibility. It is one thing to possess assets, it is another to convince an adversary of your willingness to use them, and another still to convince friends of your willingness to use them on their behalf. A further step requires that your friend believes that your adversary is intimidated by your posture. It is this last element that seems to be at play in the South China Sea. **The United States seeks to assure [nations like] the Philippines and Vietnam, perhaps others, that China will be sufficiently intimidated by growing U.S. involvement** t to move toward more reasonable, more accommodating policies, and accept the need to resolve the conflict through serious multilateral negotiation. There is little to indicate that the approach is working.

However, [Nyshka Chandran 2018](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/03/22/us-japan-india-and-australia-security-talks-could-anger-china.html)

Security dialogues between the U.S. [and its asian allies] aimed at upholding regional stability in Asia Pacific will not sit well with China, experts say. If cooperation between the four countries grows, it [and] could potentially push Beijing to further strengthen its military capabilities in the region.

**Increased tensions leads to Chinese aggression which has two impacts**

1. **Territorial Assertions**

[**https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/south-china-sea-tensions**](https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/south-china-sea-tensions)

**China asserts its territorial claims by blocking off fishing access in the south china sea for other countries.**

**Annual fishing bans and arrests of fishermen are a convenient proxy for sovereignty claims since they can be presented as legitimate attempts to yenforce marine resources protection, according to a report by the International Crisis Group. “This is an issue that doesn’t make big headlines, but 1.5 billion people live there and rely heavily on fisheries for food and jobs,” Rosenberg says. “That’s where most of the conflict goes on, and most of these have been dealt with on a routine conflict management basis.”**

**The Second Impact is conflict**

[**Tellis 2014, Carnegie Endowment**](https://carnegieendowment.org/files/balancing_without_containment.pdf)

As Avery Goldstein has persuasively argued, these hazards could materialize rather quickly because China is currently pursuing provocative policies on territorial disputes over islands in the East and South China Seas.9 That these disputes, which a former U.S. official described as involving “uninhabited and uninhabitable rocks,”10 do not appear prima facie to implicate a systemic crisis should not be reassuring to the United States because every serious contestation that occurs in future Sino-American relations will materialize against the backdrop of a possible power transition so long as China’s growth rates—even when diminishing—continue to exceed those of the United States. This dynamic, as William R. Thompson has pointed out, **[disputes] can produce** extended **“crisis slides” in which even “relatively trivial incidents or a string of seemingly minor crises” may suffice to escalate** what was up to that point a precarious structural transformation **into full-fledged geopolitical polarization and major war.**11 Since the relative disparity in Sino-American economic performance is likely to persist for quite some time, even trifling quarrels will push bilateral ties ever more concertedly in the direction of greater abrasion as accumulating Chinese power further constrains U.S. freedom of action

[Pham 17](https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterpham/2017/12/19/why-is-tension-rising-in-the-south-china-sea/#2e0f227d1fa4) Kill billions

~~These moves were not routine patrols or exercises, but the latest activity in a multi-dimensional chess game in one of the world’s most contested and sensitive regions~~**~~. The smallest miscalculation from either side could have huge consequences for trillions of dollars in trade and billions of lives, not just in the immediate vicinity but around the globe too.~~**

**NEGATE**

When tensions are high, investment in the region decreases because companies feel that violence will break out.

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/deve.12002

Focusing on the results for the political risk and financial risk variables, we observe that not only the initial level of political risk but also a change in the level of political risk does appear to affect FDI inflows. Specifically, a **one point [decrease in political risk] leads to a 41.7% increase of inward Foreign Direct Investment.**13 As a result, it appears that even where the initial level of political risk is high, a perceived significant reduction in political risk can help the country attract greater FDI. Unlike the political risk index, the financial risk index enters with negative coefficients (for both initial level and change) and significant at the 10% level for change. Thus, multinationals do not seem to give serious consideration to the financial risk of the host country.

Angering China.

~~U.S. intervention also derails any effort at peace in the region~~

[~~Scimia from the SCMP~~](https://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/united-states/article/2158455/south-china-sea-progress-between-china-and) ~~(JW)~~

**~~China and the~~** [**~~Association of Southeast Asian Nations~~**](https://www.scmp.com/topics/asean) **~~now have a single text to negotiate a~~** [**~~code of conduct~~**](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy-defence/article/2158017/china-and-asean-reach-milestone-draft-deal-south-china) **~~in the~~** [**~~South China Sea~~**](https://www.scmp.com/south-china-sea)~~,~~ ~~where four Asean member countries – Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines and Vietnam – are locked in territorial disputes with Beijing. The announcement, which came on Thursday during the Asean-China ministerial meeting, was hailed as a milestone by both sides.~~~~However, the concerned parties are a long way from reaching a consensus on a final document, and~~**~~the United States is likely to try to sabotage any agreement that could weaken its position in the region.~~**~~The bottom line is that~~**~~the US will never accept a status quo where China maintains military outposts in the disputed Spratlys and Paracels~~**~~,~~ ~~turning the stretch of the South China Sea between the two groups of islands into a “Chinese channel”. In that event,~~ **~~Washington is likely to work to derail a final deal between Asean and Beijing.~~**

If china chooses to cut off fishing access, then innocent victims will starve.

https://theconversation.com/fishing-not-oil-is-at-the-heart-of-the-south-china-sea-dispute-63580

Fishing boats are not just used to catch fish. Fishing vessels have long been used as proxies to assert maritime claims.

China’s fishing fleets have been characterised as a “[maritime militia](http://thediplomat.com/2015/08/chinas-maritime-militia-upends-rules-on-naval-warfare/)” in this context. Numerous incidents have involved Chinese fishing vessels operating (just) within China’s so-called nine-dashed line claim but in close proximity to other coastal states in areas they consider to be part of their exclusive economic zones (EEZs).

**This is bad don't read below**

### Impact: retal->trade war->death

**CNBC Explains in August 2018: (the nyt + 2 cnbc cards below)**

**China’s response to increased containment strategies by the U.S. is an increase in tariffs and an ensuing trade war**

**Fong 13 – Commander in the US Navy**

**Arthur Chi Wing Fong, March 2013, *Dancing with the Dragon: U.S.-China Engagement Policy*, Dancing with the Dragon: US-China Engagement Policy, Date Accessed: 6-23-2016 //NM**

23 In 1995, six years after the brutal Tiananmen Square suppression of a student demonstration, then-Defense Secretary William Perry defended the policy in the public. He stressed that engagement did not mean that the U.S. would ignore such issues as human rights, island disputes, or China’s weapons proliferation and arms build-up. He believed that the best way to change the Chinese was through firm diplomacy and dialogue. Furthermore, Perry emphasized that **containment would only shut down U.S.-China trade, create a split between the U.S. and its Asian allies, and precipitate a possible political confrontation that would likely escalate into military conflict**

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/china-u-s-tariffs-trade-war-will-push-prices-up-growth-down/>

**A full-fledged trade war, economists at Bank of America Merrill Lynch and elsewhere warn, risks tipping the U.S. economy into recession.**

And those caught in the initial line of fire — U.S. farmers facing tariffs on their exports to China, for instance — are already hunkered down and fearing the worst. The price of U.S. soybeans has plunged 17 percent over the past month on fears that Chinese tariffs will cut off American farmers from a market that buys about 60 percent of their soybean exports.

<https://www.economicshelp.org/blog/416/economics/problems-of-recession/incr>

**Unemployment. The biggest problem of a recession is a rise in cyclical unemployment. Because firms produce less, they demand fewer workers leading to a rise in unemployment.**

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3070776/>

These results show that **unemployment is associated with a 63% higher risk of mortality** in studies controlling for covariates. Table 3 also shows that the exclusion of data where either the death rate or the standard error had to be estimated does not alter the direction, magnitude, or level of statistical significance of the mean HRs.

**“CNBC Card”**

**Tariffs = containment**

**https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/05/world/asia/china-trade-war-trump-tariffs.html**

**“The latest U.S. measures against China carry a sense of containment, wh**ich purportedly is commonplace among U.S. politicians,” s**aid an editorial in Global Times, a nationalist state-run tabloid.** “But they have overlooked the fact that China has grown to be another economic center of the world.”

**https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/02/china-says-it-must-retaliate-to-defend-nations-dignity.html**

**China is not taking the United States'** latest **[containment]** tariff **threat[s] lightly and vows to hit back if the U.S. moves forward.**

**"China is fully prepared and will have to retaliate to defend the nation's dignity and the interests of the people**, defend free trade and the multilateral system, and defend the common interests of all countries,**" the Chinese Ministry of Commerce said in a statement** on Thursday, according to a translation provided by Bleakley Advisory Group's Peter Boockvar. "The carrot and stick tactic won't work."

**https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/08/china-announces-25percent-tariffs-on-16-billion-worth-of-us-goods-including.html**

**China said Wednesday it will retaliate against the latest round of U.S. tariffs on Chinese imports.**

**The Chinese Ministry of Commerce announced a 25 percent charge on $16 billion worth of U.S. goods. The 333 goods being targeted by China include vehicles such as large passenger cars and motorcycles. Various fuels are on the list, as well as fiber optical cables.**

SP Global

~~https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bO061N7BaV4J:https://www.spglobal.com/platts/en/market-insights/latest-news/oil/033018-rosneft-delays-arctic-offshore-drilling+&cd=14&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us~~

~~Russia's top crude producer, Rosneft, is in talks with government authorities to delay work at its Arctic offshore projects as it has failed to drill some wells after Western sanctions blocked cooperation with international majors in the region, natural resources minister Sergei Donskoy said Friday. "Rosnedra is considering their proposals now - to delay by another 1.5-two years," he said.~~

Acceding to UNCLOS reverses this trend in two ways

First is by establishing claims

while highly interested, the US has refrained so far from arctic drilling because Almond of the Diplomat in 2017

Roncevert Ganan Almond. "[***U.S. Ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention***](https://thediplomat.com/2017/05/u-s-ratification-of-the-law-of-the-sea-convention/)." [**The Diplomat**](https://www.unclosdebate.org/citations/source/The%20Diplomat). (May 24, 2017)

Given that the United States has not ratified UNCLOS, U.S. nationals may not serve as members of the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf**. It is not clear whether the United States, as a non-state party, can even make a legally recognized** submission to the commission to assert its **claim and fully protect its proprietary rights and energy interests. In contrast, Russia [who ratified UNCLOS]** , which may be entitled to almost half of the Arctic region’s area and coastline, has already **made** its submission for vastly extending its continental margin, including **a claim to the undersea Lomonosov Ridge [where], an undersea feature** spanning the Arctic from Russia to Canada. Russia and Canada are the two countries with which **the United States has potentially overlapping extended continental shelf claims.** This maritime boundary dispute is no small matter. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that the Arctic holds 22 percent of the world’s undiscovered oil and gas, amounting to more than 412 billion barrels of oil equivalent. Legal certainty in maritime delimitation is critically important for Arctic states and their respective energy companies. On June 8, 2012, Rex Tillerson, as chairman and CEO of ExxonMobil, wrote to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to vociferously urge U.S. accession to UNCLOS: “Perhaps the best example of the need for certainty in an area with great unexplored potential involves the Arctic Ocean…Several countries, including the United States, are provided with a claim to extended exploitation rights under the application of UNCLOS in the Arctic. The legal basis of claims is an important element to the stability of property rights.”

In other words, If other nations can lay claim to these regions, and have the lawful backing of the treaty and the ISA, then american businesses can legally be forced off these claims.

**That’s why US companies want complete certainty before they invest**

**State Department**, "The Law of the Sea Convention (Treaty Doc. 103-39): The U.S. National Security and Strategic Imperatives for Ratification", May 23, 2012, https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2012/05/190685.htm

U.S. oil and gas companies are now ready, willing, and able to explore [the arctic] this area. But they have made it clear that they need the maximum level of international legal certainty before they will or could make the substantial investments, and, we believe, create many jobs in doing so needed to extract these far-offshore resources. If we were a party to the convention, we would gain international recognition of our sovereign rights, including by using the convention’s procedures, and therefore be able to give our oil and gas companies this legal certainty. Staying outside the convention, we simply cannot.

**Acceding causes an influx of american drilling ships to flood the arctic.**

**Second is a race for the arctic**

**When Russia sees the US begin drilling, it forces them to step up their drilling operations as well to make sure they get to the gas before all of it is gone.**

**As the telegraph explains, the mentality of both sides is that:**

if we don’t find [energy deposits] in the ice, then [the other side will]

**As both sides compete**

**There are two impacts to a massive increase in drilling operations**

**First is a war with russia**

**Problematically, Russia has been overstepping its arctic boundaries**

Paula J. **Dobriansky**, **WSJ**, "A Cold War in the Arctic Circle - WSJ", Jan 12, **2018**, https://www.wsj.com/articles/a-cold-war-in-the-arctic-circle-1514823379

, Russia has been pressing ambitious territorial claims that overlap with those advanced by other Arctic nations. Denmark and Russia have asserted ownership of the North Pole and swaths of Arctic sea bed. Canada is expected to submit a major competing claim this year. The disputed territory amounts to some 200,000 square miles and may hold up to 10 billion tons of hydrocarbon deposits, according to Russian estimates.

**To protect their interests in the region,**

[**Sergey of the Jamestown Foundation**](https://jamestown.org/program/russias-push-for-militarization-of-the-arctic-continues/) **explains this June**

Now, the latest news coming from the region points to an even larger push by **Russia [is] pursuing a comprehensive military build-up in the Arctic, including by bolstering local tank forces, air-defense missile systems, naval forces, strategic aviation and locally based special operations forces.**

**Even worse, unannounced russian military drills that can’t be predicted increase the chance of hostile interactions in disputed territory**

Birnbaum of The Washington Post

Russian soldiers woke **in early March** to **unannounced, snap exercises** that **eventually grew to encompass more than 80,000 service members**. Above the Barents Sea, **strategic bombers** practiced attacks. Near the Latvian border, airborne troops performed landings as **attack helicopters and** artillery gave them cover. In the Baltic Sea, **the Russian Navy** practiced with missiles.

As drilling operations happen in close proximity to russian military activity, any dispute or accidental collision would be disastrous.

The terminal impact is a deadly miscalculation

**Birnbaum finds that miscalculation is extremely likely for 3 reasons**

**First, communications links between the two sides are frayed** [in the arctic making it hard to prevent escalation],

**Second, intentions can quickly be misread, raising the risk of accidental confrontation** [there’s barely any time to act].

**Third, Already, there have been near-misses with Russian military aircraft getting dangerously close to civilian jetliners above the [arctic] Seas.**

That’s why he concludes that The risk of escalation is high, with each side watching the other, and concluding that even more military exercises are necessary.

Any encounter turned sour between US civilian operations and the russian military would quickly escalate to full scale war and kill billions of people.

Second is a biodiversity collapse

Speeds up the collapse of marine ecosystems

**Sjogren, Death by Lil Dudes**

Kristian Sjorgren, Science Nordic, "Even tiny oil spills may break Arctic food chain", 30 January 2014, http://sciencenordic.com/even-tiny-oil-spills-may-break-arctic-food-chain

However, according to a new study, drilling for oil in these areas can have disastrous consequences if the increased ship traffic, and the possible oil spills, increase the amounts of oil in the ecosystem.

**One of the cornerstones of the Arctic food web – the copepod species Calanus hyperboreus – responds particularly poorly to even the tiniest amounts of oil in the water, and once these copepods run into problems, the entire food chain – with everything from fish to humans in it – also runs into problems**. So says Professor Torkel Gissel Nielsen, of DTU Aqua at the Technical University of Denmark, who co-authored the new study, published in the journal Ecotoxicology. “**There are huge oil reserves in the Arctic. When we start extracting them, there will inevitably be spillage at some poin**t,” he says. **“Our research shows that it only takes tiny amounts of oil in the sea to significantly reduce copepod egg hatching rates. If there are no copepods in the sea, there is no food for the fry. Even tiny oil spills in the Arctic can end up breaking the food chain entirely**.”

**The reason that the C. hyperboreus is a key species in the food chain is that it is the food source of virtually all fish in the ocean. The copepods feed on algae and thus convert the algae into food for other animals.**

The **total weight of the copepod population also exceeds the weight of all other aquatic animals**, so even though each individual copepod is less than one centimetre in length, they collectively make up a considerable amount of food for fish, birds and crustaceans.

**A reduction in the copepod population, or a mere displacement of the various copepod species, will therefore have catastrophic consequences for a wide variety of other animals, too.**

The problem with the C. hyperboreus is that its eggs are much more susceptible to oil exposure than eggs from other species.

Most copepods have hard eggshells, but C. hyperboreus eggs are only covered by a thin membrane. This membrane is permeable to organic substances such as oil, which can penetrate the egg and kill it.

“An oil spill can therefore have the consequence that an entire generation of C. hyperboreus is wiped out. This will result in an entire generation of fry also losing a key food source, as they have no fatty copepods to feed on when preparing for the cold winter,” says the professor.

**Eger, Drilling and Oil Spills Harm Biodiversity**

Karl Magnus Eger, CHNL, "Effects of Oil Spills in Arctic Waters", 2010, http://www.arctis-search.com/Effects+of+Oil+Spills+in+Arctic+Waters

Oil in the Arctic marine ecosystem originates mainly from two sources: drilling activity and oil spills during transportation. **Drilling activity causes long-term exposure and thus chronic effects on Arctic marine ecosystems, such as changes in species composition, dominance and biomass, while oil spill effects are acute and can cause severe damage locally**1 . However, the **oil products, whether it originates from shipping activities or drilling activity, destroy all aspects of the environmental integrity of the marine ecosystems including fisheries, marine mammals, corals, ocean and shore birds, and the coastal wildlife and thus lead to changes in e.g. behaviour (feeding, activity and motility, avoidance reactions etc.), growth, and reproduction**2 **.**

Oil spills in ice are more complicated to address than oil spills in open waters. Should this occur at the wrong place at the wrong time, for example in the marginal ice zone, in polynyas, during the high production period, the impacts could be serious. Shallow waters are the most sensitive to such pollution, and these areas are important to organisms of all levels of the Arctic food chain. Apart from the normally long distances from existing infrastructure, the oil is less accessible in ice-covered waters. The slow rate of biological degradation of oil at near-zero temperatures has led biologists to suggest that **oil spills in the Arctic Ocean might remain there for periods of 50 years or more**. The dynamics of the ice pack combined with the long life of the oil could allow an oil spill to have a major effect on the albedo in certain regions of the Arctic. It is estimated that the transit time of an oil spill on the fringes of the Beaufort Sea around the circumference of the Beaufort gyre would be about 7–10 years. Several mechanisms act both to diffuse the oil and to put the oil on the surface of the ice. Therefore, **as the source continued, the area affected by the spill would grow. By the time the original spill site returned to its original approximate geographic coordinates, a considerable area of the Beaufort Sea could have its albedo changed**. The significance of the resultant albedo change for the Arctic heat balance is moot, but most scientists agree that the Arctic environment will require special precautions to minimize the risks of accidental oil spills3 .

**Loss of biodiversity causes extinction – disruption spillsover to human survival**

Sielen 13​ ALAN B. is Senior Fellow for International Environmental Policy at the Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 13 [“The Devolution of the Seas,” Foreign Affairs, November/December, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140164/alan-b-sielen/the-devolution-of-the-seas]

Of all the threats looming over the planet today, one of the most alarming​ is the seemingly inexorable

descent of the world’s oceans into ecological perdition. Over the last several decades, human activities have so altered the basic chemistry of the seas that they are now experiencing evolution in reverse​: a return to the barren primeval waters of hundreds of millions of years ago. A visitor to the oceans at the dawn of time would have found an underwater world that was mostly lifeless. Eventually, around 3.5 billion years ago, basic organisms began to emerge from the primordial ooze. This microbial soup of algae and bacteria needed little oxygen to survive. Worms, jellyfish, and toxic fireweed ruled the deep. In time, these simple organisms began to evolve into higher life forms, resulting in the wondrously rich diversity of fish, corals, whales, and other sea life one associates with the oceans today. Yet that sea life is now in peril. Over the last 50 years -- a mere blink in geologic time -- humanity has come perilously close to reversing the almost miraculous biological abundance of the deep. Pollution, overfishing, the destruction of habitats, and climate change are emptying the oceans and enabling the lowest forms of life to regain their dominance. The oceanographer Jeremy Jackson calls it “the rise of slime”: the transformation of once complex oceanic ecosystems featuring intricate food webs with large animals into simplistic systems dominated by microbes, jellyfish, and disease. In effect, humans are eliminating the lions and tigers of the seas to make room for the cockroaches and rats. **The prospect of vanishing whales, polar bears, bluefin tuna, sea turtles, and wild coasts should be worrying enough on its own. But the disruption of entire ecosystems threatens our very survival​, since it is the healthy functioning of these diverse systems that sustains life on earth. Destruction on this level will cost humans dearly in terms of food, jobs, health, and quality of life.** It also violates the unspoken promise passed from one generation to the next of a better future.

Don’t let this happen, negate.

OV: Prefer long term impacts

**~~structural violence experiences a policy bias in government and the PF community, so vote for us to further discourse and norm-set in the PF community~~**

Weighing:
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the Arctic is inhabited by four million people, roughly 10 percent of whom identify as indigenous peoples,

Minerals Gold Copper

**The Alaska journal**

**The Arctic holds** an estimated **2.4 billion pounds of** indicated **copper** resources at a 3.07 percent grade; 3.3 billion pounds of indicated zinc at 4.23 percent; **and** precious metal resourcesincluding estimated at 55 million ounces of indicated silver and **730,000 ounces of gold**, according to the Feb. 20 report.