# Roshni and I negate.

# Contention One is Transition Wars

#### Valencia of the National Institute for South China Sea Studies explains in June that the South China Sea conflict reflects the battle for control of the international order between the U.S. and China.

## Unfortunately, ratifying UNCLOS would make this *political* battle a real one.

#### Sutton of the Center for American Progress warns in 2016 that Beijing has made it clear that its physical control of the South China Sea is its number one priority. As a result, ratifying UNCLOS would “play to the suspicions of hardliners in China who view international legal regimes as a vehicle for advancing U.S. interests.”

#### That’s disastrous, as Zhang of National University corroborates in 2016 that undermining Chinese hegemony would confirm hardliner views that the United States wants to contain China, undermining moderates and empowering war-hawk hardliners.

#### Inflaming hardliners would be devastating as Zhang continues that hardliners wish to abandon diplomacy and maximize China’s military self-interest, making military aggression viable.

## Giving hardliners power increases the chance of military confrontation due to miscalculation.

#### Browne of CNN reports in March that when a US destroyer sailed within 12 nautical miles of a Chinese island, Chinese ships took immediate action. He concludes, these infringements damage military relations and could easily trigger miscalculation.

#### Indeed, Yimiao of the South China Morning Post reports in August that Beijing’s recent retaliatory strategy holds potential for further miscalculation.

#### Worryingly, Kulacki of the US Global Security program furthers in 2016, that such miscommunication is why the U.S. and China are “a few decisions away from a war that could escalate rapidly.”

# Contention Two is Climate Change.

## There are two reasons that U.S. cannot drill the Arctic right now.

### First, maritime property rights.

#### Gardener of the American Security Project writes in 2012 that though oil deposits lay *600* miles away, without signing UNCLOS, the U.S. cannot make claims to the Arctic seabed beyond 200 miles of its coastline.

### Second, legal risk aversion.

#### Gardner continues that U.S. companies won’t invest or drill in the Arctic without the legal framework and certainty that UNCLOS provides.

## Unfortunately, affirming the resolution means the U.S. will drill the Arctic.

#### Indeed, Gardener confirms that business leaders have written to the Senate urging them to ratify the treaty so that they can invest in the Arctic.

#### As a result, Vella of Offshore Technology claims that signing the treaty would resolve border disputes and codify business arrangements, “resulting in undisputed, uninterrupted” offshore drilling.

## This is disastrous, as transit in the Arctic is dependent on heavy oil fuel.

#### Indeed, Shankman of Inside Climate News reports in April that heavy fuel oil, the sludge-like substance left after the oil refining process, is one of the dirtiest fuels on the planet.

#### Unfortunately, this sustainable and inexpensive oil is the go-to choice for Arctic ships.

### This is catastrophic because burned heavy fuel oil releases black carbon soot. Its effects on warming are three-fold.

#### First, Shankman continues that its chemical composition makes it far more potent than other greenhouse gases.

#### Second, fallen soot darkens the ice, increasing warming by absorbing, rather than reflecting, UV radiation. As a result, black soot is five times worse for warming in the Arctic than globally.

#### On net, Shankman concludes that black carbon is 2,000 times worse for global warming than CO2.

#### Third, black ice accelerates the melting of the Arctic permafrost. This is catastrophic as Walsh of Time Magazine writes in 2012 that melted permafrost would release 1.7 trillion cubic feet of methane into the atmosphere, which is 20 times worse for warming than carbon dioxide.

## These three factors escalate warming faster than humans can adapt, creating three impacts.

### First, conflict.

#### Economists at Stanford University report in February that the empirical connection between violence and climate change persists across 12,000 years of human history.

#### For example, President Barack Obama confirms in 2015, “drought and crop failures helped fuel early unrest in Syria.”

#### Overall, Professor Hsiang of UC Berkeley quantifies in February that every one standard deviation transition in climate change increases the chance of violent conflict by 14%. This only gets worse when you affirm and increase climate change.

### The second is economic damage.

#### Hope of the University of Cambridge reports that a warming Arctic could create 60 trillion dollars of economic damage. For perspective, the value of the *global* economy is only 70 trillion dollars.

### The third is increasing poverty.

#### The World Bank studies a 25-year period and quantifies that 44% of impoverished people cite weather events as a cause. Voting pro only exacerbates this poverty.

# Thus, we negate.