

We negate, Resolved: The United States should accede to the United Nations Convention on the Law of Seas without reservations,

## **Contention One is South China Sea.**

The US's presence in the South China Sea, is currently maintaining stability.

[Stashwick in 2017](#) identifies the historical success of the current military strategy by writing, For the last 20 years American hard power, has frozen disputes and prevented conflict escalation between China and the US.

In fact, [Valencia of the Diplomat 18](#) writes that the most contentious disputes between the United States and China have now reached a state of 'new normalcy'. It concludes that because of current US policy, neither side will escalate tensions by taking confrontational actions in the south china sea.

By sticking with current US Hard Power Policy, we will eventually be able to end the conflict. **[Boe of National Interest in 2018](#)** writes that US Hard Power in the region has consistently checked back Chinese aggression, and as time goes on will eventually force China into a Stalemate. Boe concludes that this stalemate will eventually lead both sides to pursue a diplomatic end to the South China Sea.

**Our Hard Power in the region is bringing an end to the conflict, but acceding to UNCLOS would reverse this trend away from our current trajectory towards peace.**

[Kumar of the National Maritime Foundation in 2011](#) writes that by acceding to UNCLOS, the US military's flexibility in the South China Sea will be harmed by the many legal implications and hurdles created by UNCLOS.

Indeed, if the US accedes to UNCLOS, its military would be constrained by China for 2 reasons:

1st is Article 301 and 88,

The [National Center in 2006](#) writes that inside of UNCLOS, article 301 states that, Countries must refrain from any threat or use of force against other countries and article 88 states "the high seas shall be reserved for peaceful purposes. The National Center furthers, writing that once the US joins, these articles, when cited by others, have the potential of constraining U.S. defense operations on the high seas.

The 2nd way our military would be constrained is because of No go Zones,

**[Bolton of the Wall Street Journal in 2011](#)** writes that China will exploit the ambiguities inside of UNCLOS to constrain U.S naval activities. Specifically China will deny american access to nearby waters

by declaring No go Zones, where the US is prohibited from entering or using its naval or aerial forces. This effectively means China can block the US from using its hard power.

Thus, if the US Navy left the region, China would be able to freely take over the South China Sea. [Pham of the Diplomat in 2018](#) writes that backing down to China in the South China Sea would only embolden Beijing to accelerate its expansion in the area, and reinforce the perception that Beijing is a rising dominating power, while the US is a declining one that can be intimidated out of the region, creating long term appeasement.

The impact of letting China freely expand across the South China Sea is harming trade.

[Crabtree '16 of CNBC](#) writes that “ \$5 trillion of trade annually passes through the region, supplying 1.5 billion people with food and jobs,” thus, any type of disruption would be jeopardizing vital trade for millions.

With full control of the South China Sea, China would harm trade in two ways:

First, [IFPA](#) in 2017 finds that if China were to gain control the of the South China Sea they would be able to freely harass commercial shipping which would increase the insurance rates on ships.

Second, the IFPA also finds that China would be able to impose targeted trade disruptions against smaller nations, in order to gain leverage.

Trade is crucial to maintain. Even short term disruptions can spike prices of basic goods and push millions into poverty. [PBS](#) finds the last time food prices spiked it pushed 44 million into poverty.

### **Contention Two is Going into the Arctic:**

According to [Robertson of Newsroom](#), the Arctic Circle has an estimated 90 billion barrels of undiscovered oil and 1,670 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas.

Ryan of the University of Dayton in 2010 furthers, The US claim under article 76 [of UNCLOS] would add an area in the Arctic roughly equal to the area of West Virginia.

Dayton furthers, companies want legal certainty that is secured through the Convention on drilling.

[Gardner in 2012](#) finds “ Companies like Lockheed Martin have made it clear investment in the region is only going to be secured within the established treaty-based framework.”

However, this is problematic as US drilling accelerates climate change,

**Walsh of Times finds in 2012** that greenhouses gases, will be emitted in significant amounts from arctic drilling. **Wadhams of Yale in 2016** furthers that warming in the Arctic is equivalent to a 25 percent boost in global CO2 emissions, and could add as much as 50 percent to the global heating effect.

**Mckinnon of Greenpeace furthers in 2015** that US scenarios of Arctic oil exploration are consistent with at least a 5 degrees Celsius increase of global warming – a level widely considered to be disastrous.

This is crucial as the **SA in 2017** finds that for every celsius increase in temperatures, 20,000 additional people die from pollution every year.

Thus, we *Negate*.

<https://www.nationalreview.com/2007/10/lost-sea-john-fonte/>= new tribunal stff

2nd is because of No go Zones,

**Bolton of the Wall Street Journal in 2011** writes that China will exploit the ambiguities inside of UNCLOS to constrain U.S naval activities. Specifically China will deny american access to nearby waters by declaring No go Zones, where the US is prohibited from entering or using its naval or aerial forces. This effectively means China can block the US from using its hard power.

Thus, **Mckinnon** concludes by saying, that now more than ever, pressure and action is critical to ensure companies never produce oil from the U.S. in the Arctic Ocean.

Even if Conflict does not happen, high tensions are enough to hurt trade, as when tensions and the perception of conflict are high, the **Wall Street Journal in 2016** writes that traders are incentivized to take longer routes avoiding the South China Sea altogether and increase insurance rates.

This is critical as the **Canadian Government in 2018** quantifies that by 2030, the effects of Climate Change could push 122 million people into poverty and kill an additional 250,000 per year from malnutrition.