

We affirm.

Our first contention is Dealing with the growing threat

Wang in 2018 writes that

The risk of “miscalculation” and armed conflict in the South China Sea is rising as China starts to challenge US dominance in the disputed waters, according to the Philippines’ envoy to Beijing.

However, Affirming allows the United States to check Chinese aggression in the South China Sea, and reduce tensions.

Currently China accuses the US of hypocrisy, to serve as an excuse to continue militarization of the South China Sea. Stripes in 2016 finds that as the,

The United States is tell[ing] a defiant China that it must follow an international court ruling that rebuked [rebuking] its illegal actions in the South China Sea[.]. The Obama administration does so knowing the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague can’t hold Washington to the same standards. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea makes it clear that its member states are bound by decisions at the PCA, which found Tuesday that China’s perceived “historic right” to 90 percent of the South China Sea was both inaccurate and legally meaningless. The ruling found against China on at least 14 other main contentions, ranging from environmental destruction to illegally building artificial, militarized islands in the Philippines’ exclusive economic zone. With its legal arguments largely discredited by the court, Beijing has continued to make a moral argument. **China accuses Washington of hypocrisy[.]. [stating that]“The US is always selective** when it comes to the application of international law: **[in] citing international law when it sees fit and discarding international law when it sees otherwise,”** China Foreign Ministry spokesman Lu Kang said Wednesday. “It keeps urging [The US urges] others to abide by the United Nations Convention on the Law Of the Sea while refusing to ratify the convention to this day.”

However, by joining UNCLOS, the narrative is proven wrong. FP in 17 continues,

The single best measure available would be for Congress to ratify UNCLOS. — a move which is scarcely discussed in Washington nowadays. From there, the United States should urge sympathetic states in the Western Pacific to take their cases against China to the Law of the Sea tribunal, like the Philippines has done. If China continues to build artificial islands and equip them militarily, it may be necessary to steam into waters claimed by Beijing on dubious grounds. But **calling China out legally allows a range of smaller countries to take a stand on a rules-based international order[.]** — which is what the United States should stand for — rather than reducing this to a dangerous contest of military might.

If China were to stick with their narrative, they would quickly lose their international support.

Thus, Hart from the CAP concludes, unilateral actions historically fail as China views them as American efforts to contain their rise, but multilateral efforts uniquely succeed as it presents wide-ranging problem for Beijing

Melanie Hart, 9-29-2015, "Assessing American Foreign Policy Toward China," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/reports/2015/09/29/122283/assessing-american-foreign-policy-toward-china/>

When the United States is the only party [unilaterally] challeng[es] [China] a particular action, Chinese officials often suspect that the United States is doing so as a tactic to block or contain China's rise[.]. That can lead[ing] China to harden its positioning rather

than accommodate American interests. When the United States works in concert with other nations, the dynamic changes, and Beijing can view[s] the issue as a wide-ranging problem rather than a U.S. containment strategy.

For example, on the commercial front, engaging partners in Europe and the United Kingdom played a critical role in convinc[ed]ing China to table a controversial cyberbanking law earlier this year. To be clear, this is not about the United States furthering its own interests through third parties; rather, this is about recognizing that when an issue affects multiple parties, it is generally not helpful to frame that issue as a U.S.-China problem.

Absent this strategy, tensions rise out of control, causing two impacts.

The first is Investor Confidence.

Bloomberg in 2018 writes,

"We predict 22 new oil and gas projects, **\$8.5 billion of capital investment** and 28 exploration wells across [the area] Indonesia, Malaysia, Brunei, Vietnam and the Philippines **could be at risk if China continues to press its defense of its territorial claims,**" he said.

As Tensions increase, investment drops. TodayOnline in 2018 finds

"I think when you have **tensions in the South China Sea,** there is **[have] an impact** when people make decisions **on investments**" he added, noting that although investors will not say publicly that it is a decisive factor, it will be one of the things that affect their decisions.

Indeed tensions have already negatively affected the growth and investment in countries in the region.

The Business Times in 2018 finds Singapore could see 10% drop in annual growth from tensions increasing.

Vivien Shiao, News Reporter, The Business Times, 7/18 <https://www.businesstimes.com.sg/government-economy/singapore-warns-of-significant-impact-should-trade-war-escalate>
The two countries have the highest participation rates in global value chains, as well as being some of the most open economies in terms of trade. **She is maintaining a 3 per cent forecast for Singapore's 2018 economic growth, but sees a potential shave of 0.3 percentage point if the trade war escalates from tensions.** Similarly, an earlier DBS research note forecast that Singapore's growth this year will be 3 per cent, with a downside risk of 0.8 percentage point. DBS' chief economist Taimur Baig had said: "Given the trade openness and exposure to the supply chain, there will no respite whatsoever for Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan in this tail-risk scenario."

Critically, the OECD reports that decreases in economic growth drastically hinder poverty reduction. This is crucial, as the [CFR in 2014](#) writes that 1.5 billion people make up the South China Sea economy.

Economic growth is the most powerful instrument for reducing poverty and improving the quality of life in developing countries. Both cross-country research and country case studies provide overwhelming evidence that rapid and sustained growth is critical to making faster progress towards the Millennium Development Goals – and not just the first goal of halving the global proportion of people living on less than \$1 a day. Growth can generate virtuous circles of prosperity and opportunity. Strong growth and employment opportunities improve incentives for parents to invest in their children's education by sending them to school. This may lead to the emergence of a strong and growing group of entrepreneurs, which should generate pressure for improved governance. Strong economic growth therefore advances human development, which, in turn, promotes economic growth.

The second impact, is a conflict in the South China Sea.

As tensions rise, countries increase their military spending. The CFR continues in the past decade military spending in the South China Sea has risen 57%. Problematically, the Gettysburg college finds arms races increase the chance of war by 10% and The National Interest quantifies a conflict would kill millions.

Contention two is Is revolutionizing the future.

Conathan writes, companies currently refuse to deep sea mine due to legal uncertainty, but that ratifying UNCLOS would give them the legal backing to go in and drill.

Until we ratify the treaty, no U.S. companies will operate on the extended continental shelf. Aside from a small pocket of territory in the western Gulf of Mexico where we have bilaterally negotiated a boundary with Mexico, companies cannot be granted the certainty that leases of these regions would not be challenged in international courts. Without becoming party to the treaty and gaining a seat at the negotiating table where decisions are made about how to partition out extended-shelf claims, we will be unable to assure industries that the international community will recognize a U.S. lease. Businesses, even those with extremely deep pockets such as Big Oil and Lockheed Martin, have been very clear: If we don't ratify, they won't operate. Companies want to create those jobs, generate revenue, and increase domestic production. But no certainty means no investment. No treaty means no security, no jobs, no dollars, no resources. It's that simple.

The impact is two-fold.

The first is spreading the internet.

Currently, Smartphone costs are high because of China's monopoly on Rare Earth Metals. PBS in 2013 writes that,

Rare earth elements are peppered throughout [phones], from the glass display, making it harder, to magnets in speakers, headphones, and vibrating motors, making them more powerful despite their small size. China's monopoly has driven up prices on rare earth [metals], raising costs for manufacturers.

However, by mining the Deep Sea, we decrease China's Monopoly, lowering the cost of REMS and thus phones, meaning developing nations have greater access to smartphones.

ITN in 2017 writes that,

African countries continue to experience a degree of volatility due to factors such as currency and economic instabilities, lack of locally relevant content and technical literacy and affordability. However, falling smartphone and data prices should lead to the next African smartphone boom in the longer term.

This leads to more access to the internet. Trulio in 2015 writes,

"In order to make access to the Internet affordable in developing countries, it's not enough to provide a free signal. The vast majority of people in emerging markets do not have access to a computer, thus the primary means of getting these people online is the smartphone. It's small, portable, and basic models [as they] are far more affordable than computers."

Deloitte in 2014 contextualises the impacts to developing nations finding, a 10% increase in broadband access increases GDP by 1.3% and wages by 15%. In India and Africa, where income levels are lowest and broadband penetration potential is highest, internet access could increase income up to 29%. This increase in wages is caused by the unique info sharing created by the internet, which provides new knowledge and expertises to low income people.

A World Bank study examining this relationship in developing economies shows that a 10% increase in broadband penetration increases per capita GDP growth by 1.3%. On this basis, personal income levels in developing countries could see a massive increase. Deloitte estimates that an expansion in internet access [and] is worth between \$450 and \$630 per year to individuals in the developing world. This is an average increase[s] in per capita incomes of about [by] 15%. In Africa and India, where personal income levels are the lowest and increases in penetration have the potential to be the highest, internet access could increase per capita income by 21% and 29% respectively.

This would have dramatic effects in reducing poverty. To give an idea of the scale of the impact, The BP quantifies that,

According to the World Bank's 2016 World Development Report, 60 percent of the world's population do not have access to the Internet. In the United States alone, 60 million people do not have Internet access at home. However, for the rest of the world's population, technological advancement has provided enormous levels of wealth and development. A recent report by Price Waterhouse Cooper's consulting and strategy firm, Strategy&, states that giving internet to the world could bring extraordinary results. **If the 4.1 billion people without Internet were given access, 500 million people could be brought out of poverty.** For those in poverty, the Internet provides a multitude of opportunities, including jobs, access to global current affairs and education. In 1998, the World Hospitals and Health Services Journal released an article discussing the advantages of Internet access, arguing that "Access to information is an essential condition to development." Almost twenty years on, researchers and institutions are still looking to the Internet as a technique for reducing global poverty. According to the World Bank's 2016 World Development Report, 60 percent of the world's population do not have access to the Internet. In the United States alone, 60 million people do not have Internet access at home.

Furthermore, he concludes that allowing people in developing countries to increase health literacy through internet access decreases mortality rates by 57%.

The second impact is promoting green tech.

The Financial Times in 2017 writes that global demand for green-tech products such as wind turbines and solar panels depend on rare earth metals, and will outpace China's current monopoly. This is crucial, as Columbia University writes that, in order for clean energy tech to make a significant dent in global warming, the supply of REMs will need to increase by 8%.

in order for clean technologies to contribute significantly to reducing greenhouse gases, we would require an increase of [REMs] neodymium and dysprosium of over 700% and 2600% respectively in the next 25 years. The supply of these metals is currently increasing at 6% a year, and is under threat. In order to meet demand for clean technologies, the supply would have to increase by 8% and 14%.

By expanding deep-sea mining, we are able to meet this demand, and therefore reduce the cost of green energy.

Critically, Forbes in 2018 furthers that,

If renewable energy is indeed able to undercut the cost of legacy fuels, then governments and large corporations building new power plants will almost certainly turn to green energy for any new capacity, which will reduce demand for oil, natural gas and coal.

Stopping Climate Change is crucial, as The Canadian government quantifies, climate change will kill 250,000 people per year from malnutrition. By 2030, the effects could push 122 million people into poverty.

climate change is expected to contribute to approximately 250,000 additional deaths per year from malnutrition, [and] malaria, by 2030, up to 122 million more people could be forced into extreme poverty due to the effects of climate change

And thus, we affirm.

Frontlines

Frontlines	5
A/T don't prove brightline to cost of green tech dec. enough to cause switch to green tech	5
A/T no brightline for war/ OV: war likely	6
A/T Not enough/no brightline for how much there is on floor	7
A/T Japan has semi-infinite resources	7
A/T Old WTO thingy solves	7

A/T Evidence only cites one example of a company not mining deep sea

Fine take another example: Exxon Mobile

Donohue 12 (Thomas J. Donohue, President and Chief Executive Officer U.S. Chamber of Commerce, US Chamber of Commerce, "BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE Hearing on the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea," June 28, 2012, <https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Donohue%20Testimony.pdf>, July 8, 2018) ED

Offshore operations are capital-intensive, requiring significant financing and insurance. **Oil and natural gas companies do not want to undertake these massive expenditures if their lease sites may be subject to territorial dispute.** They operate transnationally, and need to know that the title to the petroleum resources will be respected worldwide and not just in the United States. Availability of clear legal title is crucial to realizing the potential of U.S. offshore areas both now and in the future, as drilling technology continues to advance and make new projects feasible. **As ExxonMobil emphasized** in its recent letter to this Committee, **before it undertakes the immense investments required to explore and develop resources beyond 200 miles, "legal certainty in the property rights being explored and developed is essential."**

ALL US companies refuse to engage in deep sea-bed mining until accession.

Conathan 12 (Michael Conathan, *the Director of Ocean Policy at the Center for American Progress*, 6-13-2012, ThinkProgress, "Conservatives Disregard Traditional Allies to Oppose the Law of the Sea,"

<https://thinkprogress.org/conservatives-disregard-traditional-allies-to-oppose-the-law-of-the-sea-2a814f04a717/>, July 8, 2018) ED

Until we ratify the treaty, no U.S. companies will operate on the extended continental shelf. Aside from a small pocket of territory in the western Gulf of Mexico where we have bilaterally negotiated a boundary with Mexico, companies cannot be granted the certainty that leases of these regions would not be challenged in international courts. **Without becoming party to the treaty** and gaining a seat at the negotiating table where decisions are made about how to partition out extended-shelf claims, **we will be unable to assure industries that the international community will recognize a U.S. lease. Businesses** even those with extremely deep pockets **such as Big Oil and Lockheed Martin, have been very clear: If we don't ratify, they won't operate.** Companies want to create those jobs, generate revenue, and increase domestic production. But no certainty means no investment. **No treaty means no security, no jobs, no dollars, no resources.** It's that simple.

A/T don't prove brightline to cost of green tech dec. enough to cause switch to green tech

The UN Environment Programme finds in 2012 that

Near-term **worldwide shortages of R[are] E[arth] E[lements]s used in renewable and energy-efficient technologies,** such as wind turbines, solar cells, plug-in electric vehicles, and energy-efficient lighting is an emerging issue that may well **affect the development of clean energy technologies and the growth of Green Economy.** ^{Any} **restriction in the production and supply of these rare earth elements could have serious consequences for the world's transition to a clean energy supply** and would affect the global economy since the technologies are important in helping create jobs, promoting economic growth, and fighting climate change.

Because of the potential impact of such shortages on clean energy technologies and the Green Economy effort, UNEP may wish to play a role in helping to address the issue at national and international levels. Potential actions include improving its understanding of rare earth issues, and identifying activities it might undertake to inform and advise interested governments about them. The latter could include gathering and providing scientifically credible data and information at the global level, especially about availability in Africa and other developing regions, and alerting governments about the potential environmental consequences of rare earth minerals shortages, such as the effect on the deployment of clean technologies, as well as the impacts of rare earth mining on ecosystems and their services.

A/T no brightline for war/ OV: war likely

We are currently on the brink of war, in three places:

1st. The First Island Chain.

Gordon Chang of the Daily Beast reports that on Christmas of 2015 that for the first time, China sent 3 armed vessels, one modified to carry cannons into the Senkaku Islands in attempt to grab the islands.

2nd. Taiwan.

Christopher Cavas of Defense News in 2016 writes that China is actively overwhelming Taiwan with submarine forces with short range ballistic missiles. Zachary Keck from The Diplomat explains that China is acquiring the capabilities to mount a full scale attack on Taiwan by 2020.

And 3. Miyako Strait.

Ankit Panda from the Diplomat explains as of September and November 2016, China has actively flown bombers, air tankers, and surveillance aircraft all through the Miyako Strait.

Overall, Slate's Eric Posner elaborates that if World War III takes place anytime soon, this is where it will start. Even though a war in general may be unlikely, as tensions rise so does the chance for miscalc. Thus, By increasing tension in the region, the likelihood of war increases significantly.

A/T Not enough/no brightline for how much there is on floor

In the 1960s, the book *Mineral Resources of the Sea* **predicted nearly limitless amounts of rare earth elements**, forecasting a mining boom that would enrich nations and lead to rapid advancements in technology.

A/T Japan has semi-infinite resources

- Only 3 REMs they have, 20 total, non-responsive
- PBS says 17 REMs specifically in cell phones, no responsive

A/T Old WTO thingy solves

Threat still looms, financial times writes that,

A solution was brokered and the price shock faded, but the threat of future supply problems for rare earths and other so-called “critical elements” still looms.