

We negate, and our sole contention is **Royalties**.

Historically, companies have used land-based mines to extract rare earth metals, or REMs, which **Vincent of Verge** writes are crucial for modern technology. However, **Ives of Yale** writes that the supply of land REMs is running out, moving companies towards deep sea mining. Investment and innovation will continue as this drilling is incredibly profitable, which is why [Hagenmeier of Day Trading Academy](#) writes that in recent years, investment in it has increased by 500%.

The US has a wealth of REMs in its extended continental shelf. According to **Wagner of HufPo**, the US has the second most REMs in the world, trailing only China's highly guarded reserves

Because Broad of NYT explains that new advances are making it more feasible and American companies like Odyssey and Ocean Minerals are already finding REMs, **MIT** predicts that deep sea mining will be widespread by 2035.

These U.S. companies are able to pursue mining under U.S. domestic law. **Groves of the Heritage Foundation** writes that the Convention on the Continental Shelf, which recognizes each states' sovereign rights to its entire continental shelf, was ratified by the U.S. in 1961 and is still in effect. As such, mining in the U.S. ECS is a matter of domestic law, and **Groves** explains that the **Deep Seabed Mineral Resources Act**, which regulates companies' mining activities, provides legal certainty for companies to explore the ocean floor. Mining will thus happen whether or not the U.S. joins UNCLOS.

The only difference is that under UNCLOS, the International Seabed Authority will collect royalties on mining operations in the ECS. [USGS](#) reports that the resources in the US ECS are worth 1.7 trillion dollars, and thus [Groves](#) explains that US royalties will quickly amount to hundreds of billions if not trillions of dollars.

This aid would likely end up in a fragile region, as **Arvis of the World Bank** writes that landlocked countries are among the least developed countries in the world, and most have a recent history of conflict. [Easterly of the CGD](#) writes that despite low rates of success, the U.S. has increased its aid to fragile states over the past decade, and is already up to 76%.

To make matters worse, [Groves](#) explains that the UN imposes no guidelines for how the royalties should be spent and doesn't even require the disclosure of spending, leaving no obstacle to leaders using it for military purposes.

Unfortunately, aid to these regions only exacerbates conflict for two reasons.

First, by driving interstate conflicts. [Kono of PRQ](#) finds that when not given to patronage networks, most aid ends up being spent to bolster a country's military to protect the ruling regime's authority. In fact, [Collier of Oxford](#) quantifies that a 1% increase in aid as a share of GDP increases military spending by 3%. This in turn makes these countries more trigger happy in initiating interstate conflicts-- [Wallace of UMichigan](#) finds that a 10% increase in military spending increases the incidence of international war by roughly 7.5%.

Second, by catalyzing intrastate conflicts by increasing rebel groups' power and aggression. Findley of BYU explains that rebel groups are eager to steal aid. In addition, Friedersdorf of The Atlantic writes that corrupt militaries sell weapons to armed factions, leading to more weapons in rebel hands.

In addition to increasing the power with which they wage conflict, aid increases insurgent groups' propensity to do so. [Moyo of WSJ](#) finds that civil clashes are often motivated by the knowledge that by seizing the seat of power, the victor gains access to the package of aid that comes with it, and **Grossman 92** finds the potential payoff is an important factor in whether insurgent groups follow through on threats to rebel. **Strandow of Uppsala University** finds that in initiating these conflicts, such groups first fight in places where the now-strengthened state military isn't stationed, leading to devastating civilian casualties.

As a result, [Strandow of AidData](#) quantifies that increasing aid increases deaths from interstate conflict by 138%.

For these reasons, **Findley** writes that increased aid increased both the occurrence and intensity of conflict in Angola, Mozambique and Sierra Leone, and [Humphreys of Columbia](#) quantifies that a 20% increase in aid doubles the chance of conflict.

Increasing such conflict leads to death and destruction in two ways.

First, from direct battle casualties. **Crost of UColorado** quantifies that foreign aid to the Philippines doubled the number of deaths resulting from conflict. This perpetuates death on a detrimental scale, as [Reinberg of ABC News](#) writes that 300,000 people die from such conflicts in the developing world every year.

Second, from the spillover effects of war. [The World Bank](#) writes that 1.2 billion people are affected by conflict in the developing world. [Bendavid of Stanford](#) finds that because a state of war disrupts trade, public services, and vaccinations for preventable diseases, over the last 20 years 10 million people have been killed just by the aftereffects of African war.

Thus, Felix and I are proud to negate.