# AC\_LAYFlame

### Contention 1 is Lawsuits

**Bill McKibben of the New York Times** Writes that the Trump’s climate policies are putting the US in a terrifying place regarding our environment by cutting back on regulations and environmentally friendly technology.

**Groves of the Heritage Foundation** writes that joining UNCLOS will open up the US to environmental lawsuits, as UNCLOS would authorize other countries to sue when the U.S. does not follow the treaty’s stringent environmental laws.

Currently multiple island nations have already threatened to bring a case against the US, and tried in 2002, but we weren’t in UNCLOS.

**Groves** explains that America’s massive historical and present contribution to global emissions makes them the most likely target, and the most successful potential suit.

This is furthered by **Yale** who finds that the US loses more than 80% of international suits.

Moreover, **Groves** explains that the panel charged with adjudicating this dispute is full of representatives from American enemies or countries sympathetic to the plight of these island nations.

But even if countries do not sue or we win these suits **Bando of Forbes** finds that the threat of being sued is enough for US government to pass policies.

**Murray of the National Center for Policy Analysis** thus concludes that joining UNCLOS could catalyze a lawsuit which would require the closure of the majority of American coal plants.

The reason why is because **Murray** and **Michigan University** writes that coal plants release Mercury into the atmosphere and kill up to 52,000 people each year.

And when we close coal plants and reduce our carbon emission **Lucas of Duke** finds that we can save up to 153 million people this century.

### Contention 2 is Seabed Mining

**In his testimony to the US Senate Jay Timmons** statesthe US would have access to a wealth of rare-earth minerals, or REMs if they acceded to UNCLOS.

Right now, the only way the U.S could have any REMs is if they mined for them on land, but mining for these valuable minerals in the ocean is much easier for two reasons.

**First**, the concentration of their ore is much greater, so there is less rock to process

**Second**, there is a greater diversity and availability of minerals in the sea.

Thus, **Broad of the NYTimes** finds that every day, deep-sea mining becomes more and more feasible and realistic. And **MIT** finds that the technology for mining is in its latter stages of development.

Acceding to UNCLOS lets American companies mine these REMs for two reasons:

**First is codifying our ECS claims.**

**Magnusson of the Ocean Development and International Law Journal** writes that the US could assert its claims to its ECS without acceding to UNCLOS by requesting permission from the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf (CLCS). However, this request would likely be rejected because the CLCS doesn’t take territory requests from non-UNCLOS member states.

Unilaterally declaring access to the land isn’t the answer either, because it would open the US up to lawsuits from the ISA and developing countries.

Thus, **Houck of Penn State Law** finds that the if the US declared unrestricted access to its ECS, it would likely be sued.

That’s why **Timmons** furthers that companies are unable to secure sponsors from the US government without the government acceding to UNCLOS.

**Second, UNCLOS provides mining companies with legal certainty.**

**Conathan of Think Progress** writes that companies are refusing to mine the vast majority of the US ECS out of fear of being sued.

Even if there’s a risk that companies will be sued for mining in the ECS, **Timmons** explains that they won’t begin mining for REMs, because in the event of a lawsuit, they would lose all of the capital they poured into the doomed mining project.

For those two reasons, **Khalifa of Seapower** writes that REM mining companies have a huge interest in the ratification of UNCLOS, and **Lockheed Martin** itself stated that US oceanic REM mining cannot begin until the US ratifies UNCLOS.

### The Impact is increasing royalties to the developing world.

Under UNCLOS, the ISA will collect royalties from companies’ mining profits. These royalties are significant, as **Forbes** explains that over time, United States royalties will amount to hundreds of billions if not trillions.

**The ISA** and **Hellman of Foreign Policy Magazine** writes These royalties are sent to the developing world, prioritizing landlocked countries that could prevent them from collapsing.

**Alvi of the Journal of International Development** writes that a meta-analysis of 49 countries concluded that a 1% increase in aid decreases poverty by 1.8%

This is also furthered by the **World Bank** who writes that an increase of aid by .7% could reduce poverty by 40% at the end of this decade.

 Preventing poverty matters more than any other impact in the round, as

1. [**Rice of Brookings**](https://www.brookings.edu/research/u-s-foreign-assistance-and-failed-states/) writes that a poverty leads to widespread conflict and stalls development indefinitely within the country, even severely affecting nearby states.
2. According to **UNICEF**, 22,000 children die each day due to poverty. And they die quietly in some of the poorest villages on earth, far removed from the scrutiny and the conscience of the world. Being meek and weak in life makes these dying multitudes even more invisible in death
3. **UNICEF** as well as the **World Health Organization** find preventable diseases like diarrhea and pneumonia take the lives of 2 million children a year who are too poor to afford proper treatment because of lack of aid.

**Thus, we affirm.**

### Marine Research

**First, Brown of the NOAA** explains that researchers must get approval from foreign countries before conducting research, which often takes years while countries process their requests. Brown thus concludes that vital research does not take place because of back logging and lack of consent.

**Allen of Washington University** explains that UNCLOS speeds up the process through its implied consent provision: if countries fail to respond in 6 months, research can begin.

Thus, acceding to the convention would allow the U.S. to conduct more research abroad.

Marine research is critical, because **Bruckner of Issues in Science and Technology** finds that the prospect of finding a novel life-saving drug from the sea is 300 to 400 times higher than from land.

**Forbes:** **https://www.forbes.com/sites/dougbandow/2012/03/19/dragging-america-into-court-law-of-the-sea-and-global-litigation/#6d726b2f4903**

# AC\_LayFlame Frontlines

## [C1] Lawsuits

### AT: Trump/GOP Circumvention

#### No circumvention—treaties are binding under SCOTUS. Groves 12

Steven Groves xx, Heritage Foundation, xx-xx-xxxx [Accession to U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea Would Expose the U.S. to Baseless Climate Change Lawsuits, https://www.heritage.org/global-politics/report/accession-un-convention-the-law-the-sea-would-expose-the-us-baseless-climate, 9-7-2018]//DW

The domestic enforceability of UNCLOS tribunal judgments was confirmed by U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens in Medellin v. Texas, a landmark case in 2008.27 In Medellin, Justice Stevens, writing in a concurring opinion, cited Article 39 of Annex VI for the proposition that UNCLOS members—presum- ably including the United States if it accedes to the convention—are obligated to comply with the judgments of the convention’s tribunals. The Medellin case concerned whether the ICJ’s judgment in 2003 against the United States in the Case Concerning Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (the Avena case) is domestically enforceable. Justice Stevens concluded that the relevant treaties in the Avena case—the U.N. Charter and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (VCCR)—did not require the Supreme Court to enforce the ICJ’s ruling. Justice Stevens contrasted the permissive language of the U.N. Charter and the VCCR with the explicit language of UNCLOS and concluded that the convention would indeed oblige the Supreme Court to enforce the judgments of UNCLOS tribunals within the United States.28 […] In sum, by acceding to UNCLOS the United States would unnecessar- ily expose itself to baseless environmental lawsuits, including a claim that its GHG emissions have caused harm to other nations. Because of its membership in the convention, the U.S. could be compelled to appear before a tribunal to defend itself in any such lawsuit. International courts and tribunals, including those created by UNCLOS, have not hesitated to assert jurisdiction and pass judgment in controversial social, political, and environmental lawsuits. The judgment of an UNCLOS tribunal in a climate change lawsuit would be final, unappealable, and enforceable in the United States.

### AT: No Suits Happen

#### Suits will happen—countries are already ready to sue the US. Bandow 12:

Doug Bandow, Forbes, 03-19-2012 [Dragging America Into Court: Law of the Sea and Global Litigation, https://www.forbes.com/sites/dougbandow/2012/03/19/dragging-america-into-court-law-of-the-sea-and-global-litigation/#72142b1a4903, 8-4-2018]//DW

**The Pacific island state of Palau announced last September that it would seek a ruling from the International Court of Justice barring nations from allowing emissions from their territory to cause climate change affecting other countries**. Palau indicated that it would rely on LOST as well as the Kyoto Protocol. **A decade ago Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, and Tuvalu, also Pacific islands, threatened to sue under LOST**, though as yet have not filed. Groves suggested that **mountainous nations could similarly sue over shrinking glacier**s. One could imagine **other states claiming damages based on drought, desertification, or other alleged consequences of global warming.**

1. **We Will Get Sued**
	1. Gillis
		1. Largest Contributor to CO2 Emissions
	2. Groves
		1. Most Likely Target
			1. Global Hegemon- Set best precedent
			2. Plus panel is full of people sympathetic to plight of Island Nations- IE African and Caribbean Nations.
	3. Countries Have Threatened
		1. Kiribati
		2. Tuvalu
		3. Fiji
2. **Threat of Being Sued is Enough**
	1. Bandow
		1. Threat of Being Sued is Enough for the US to pass legislation

### AT: IMPX T – Increase Energy Costs

#### No link – Coal plants shutting down would lead to a phase out i.e. they would be slowly closed and then replaced with cleaner sources of energy.

#### The shift would be to renewables – renewables are readily available but no political will to shift.

### AT: US Will Win

1. **We won’t lose**
	1. Yale finds that US loses more than 80% of lawsuits
2. **Threat of Being Sued is Enough**
	1. Bandow
	2. Threat of Being Sued is Enough for the US to pass legislation

### AT: US Won’t Change its Policies

1. **Enforceability**
	1. **Confirmed by Supreme Court Justice**
2. **Also Trump is only president for a few more years**
	1. President value the environment- Other presidents can pass legislation or even congress-

## [C2] Royalties

### AT: Lockheed Martin = UK

#### Lockheed Martin has to spend billions of dollars in fees to mine under the UK.

#### Other US domestic companies would also mine but UNCLOS accession is necessary.

### AT: ALL NQs—Framing Issue

### AT: Too Expensive

#### Tests have been a success—if it isn’t viable then countries wouldn’t even be testing in the first place.

#### Investment returns are huge—our evidence indicates that it could be up to 100x. Broad 12:

https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/10/science/vast-deposits-of-gold-and-other-ores-lure-seabed-miners.html?mtrref=undefined&gwh=8BD59C6FF777F13D8AB8424CE7734905&gwt=pay

The technological advances center on new robots, sensors and other equipment, some of it derived from the offshore oil and gas industry. Ships lower exploratory gear on long tethers and send down sharp drills that gnaw into the rocky seabed. **All of this underwater machinery is making it more and more feasible to find, map and recover seabed riches.** Industrial powers — including government-supported groups in China, Japan and South Korea — are hunting for sulfides in the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Oceans. And private companies like Odyssey have made hundreds of deep assessments and claims in the volcanic zones around Pacific island nations: Fiji, Tonga, Vanuatu, New Zealand, the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea. **The** [**International Seabed Authority**](http://www.isa.org.jm/en/home), a sleepy United Nations body located in Jamaica that **presides over mineral rights on the high seas**, an area its officials like to characterize as 51 percent of the earth’s surface, has found itself besieged with sulfide queries. “We are entering a new stage,” Nii Allotey Odunton of Ghana, secretary general of the authority, told a meeting in November. Since the Pacific islands control mineral rights in their territorial waters, they can negotiate mining deals more easily than the seabed authority, which tends to plod along by international consensus. Odyssey Marine Exploration, which recently expanded from shipwreck recovery into deep prospecting, began scouring the Pacific waters in 2010, discovering far more gold, silver and copper than expected. “There’s a lot at stake,” Mr. Dettweiler said. **He added, “a billion-dollar deposit can turn into a hundred billion.**” Scientists once thought the main source of wealth in the deep sea lay in beds of potato-size rocks that could be mined for such common metals as iron and nickel. In the 1960s and ’70s, entrepreneurs tried to scoop them up, but the rewards never offset the high cost of exploration, retrieval and transportation. Things began to change in 1979 with the discovery of [“black smokers”](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rFHtVRKoaUM), sulfurous mounds and towers that gush blistering-hot water. The smokers turned out to dot the 46,000 miles of volcanic fissures that gird the global seabed like seams on a baseball. Scientists found that the smokers formed as hot water rose through the volcanic rocks, hit icy seawater and shed a variety of minerals that slowly coalesced into eerie mounds and chimneys. One, found off Washington State and nicknamed Godzilla, stood more than 15 stories high. The first wave of discovery showed that the volcanic springs harbored riots of bizarre creatures, including thickets of tube worms. The second wave showed that the mounds and chimneys — hot and cold, new and old, active and inactive — were composed of complex minerals that contained surprising amounts of copper, silver and gold. Today, **increasingly, mines on land lack rich supplies of copper, a staple of modern life found in everything from pipes to computers. Many commercial ores have concentrations of only a half a percent. But seabed explorers have found purities of 10 percent and higher** — turning the obscure deposits into potential bonanzas. The same turned out to be true of silver and gold.

### AT: Bilateral Agreements

#### Doesn’t matter—the only difference is that the US would be forced to give aid to developing nations which means that even if you win this argument we are the only side that gets access to our impacts

#### If bilateral negotiations are so easy then we already would have established them in order to mine REMs in the ECS

#### No bilateral agreements in the status quo—we only have a small one with Mexico.

### AT: Give Aid to Corrupt Countries

#### Non-Unique: The United States already does this all the time i.e. all of your aid evidence is probably talking about US status quo aid trends.

#### Won’t happen under the ISA—US has veto power that can shut down multiple proposals from even getting a vote. Conathan 12:

Michael Conathan, Center for American Progress, 6-12-2012 [Conservatives Disregard Traditional Allies to Oppose the Law of the Sea, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/06/12/11773/conservatives-disregard-traditional-allies-to-oppose-the-law-of-the-sea/, 9-3-2018]//DW

As Secretary Clinton pointed out at the Foreign Relations Committee hearing, **the treaty specifically provides the United States with a permanent seat on the ISA council**, a key decision-making body, effectively giving us veto power over how distribution would occur. Yes, as the Heritage Foundation [reports](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/un-convention-on-the-law-of-the-sea-erodes-us-sovereignty-over-us-extended-continental-shelf), final decisions would be made by the ISA’s general assembly. But **the assembly would only be voting on policies the council recommended unanimously, meaning we could block any proposal from even getting to a vote** at the general assembly. This de facto veto power means **the United States would always be able to prevent royalties from being distributed to countries we have designated as state sponsors of terrorism**. To put this in terms treaty opponents can better understand, it would be as if every senator on the Foreign Relations Committee had to approve the Law of the Sea treaty before it could be considered by the full Senate for ratificationn. Under those circumstances, would the treaty ever see a ratification vote?

**Ratification is net positive – miniscule royalty payment and veto power over ISA fund distribution outweighs**

**Langer 12** - Andrew attended the College of William and Mary in Virginia, where he received a BA in International Relations. He also holds a Masters in Public Administration. His writings have appeared in both national and international publications. He frequently appears on talk radio programs throughout the country, and has appeared on CNN, Fox News, MSNBC, and Al Jazeera. He is currently authoring a book entitled, “The War on Small Business”. He is also the host of “The Liberty Line” podcast, a show whose guests have included presidential candidates, actors from Oscar-nominated films, and entrepreneurs. Current position is President at Small Business Political Alliance. Past positions are Senior Manager Regulatory Affairs at National Federation of Independent Business Associate Director, Development at Competitive Enterprise Institute Director, Florida Project at Defenders of Property Rights, Legal Assistant at Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld (11/28/2012, Andrew, Real Clear Politics, “The Case for Ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty”, [http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/11/28/the\_case\_for\_ratification\_of\_the\_law\_of\_the\_sea\_treaty\_116272.html //](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/11/28/the_case_for_ratification_of_the_law_of_the_sea_treaty_116272.html%20//) SM)

Myth: Ratifying the treaty will create a tax on US businesses. Fact: Wrong. The treaty creates U.S. property rights for vast mineral and oil wealth. The ISA simply grants permits to countries to mine and drill for resources thereby giving companies and countries title – something vital to the very foundation of property rights. One cannot hold a property right if one does not first have title. Once title is granted and resource development takes place, certain Reagan amendments go into effect. Ronald Reagan fought for certain mineral rights for the U.S. and he got them in the 1994 amendments to the treaty. That’s why Reagan’s former Chief of Staff, James Baker, supports ratifying the LOTS. Just as with any other resource development project, there is a royalty schedule: no royalty payments of any kind for the first five years of resource development and after five years the royalties cap at 7%. Right now, Russia, China and 161 other countries are eligible to exploit global resources, enrich their nations, fill the ISA coffers with royalties, and then direct ISA expenditures around the world. Once the U.S. ratifies the treaty, we would be granted 100% veto power as to how all ISA resources from all countries are allocated. That is why Condoleezza Rice endorses the treaty – **the U.S. pays up to 7% for just our country, but we get veto power over 100% of the ISA coffers for every royalty from every country. That means zero global mineral and oil wealth payments** from anywhere in the world **going to rouge states.** The only way the U.S. can accomplish this is by ratifying the Law of the Sea Treaty and taking our seat at the ISA.

### AT: Suits Don’t Deter

#### Yes, suits deter—companies would lose lots of money and all their progress. Our evidence is great on this question. Timmons 12:

Jay Timmons, National Association of Manufacturers, [Given before the U.S. Committee on Foreign Relations, The Law of the Sea Convention: Perspectives from Business and Industry, 6-28-2012, https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/NAM%20Testimony1.pdf]//DW

The development of deep seabed claims is incredibly expensive. **Companies in the U.S. are reluctant to invest heavily in deep seabed mining because of the risk that their activities would not withstand a legal challenge** since the U.S. is not a party to the Convention. Conversely, foreign companies, because their governments have joined the Convention, have access to the international bodies that grant the legal claims to operate in the deep seabed area. **The U.S. cannot represent the interests of its companies in those bodies.**

### AT: NQ—Seabed Act of 1980

#### Doesn’t matter—US isn’t sponsoring domestic companies right now because we haven’t ratified UNCLOS. Timmons 12:

Jay Timmons, National Association of Manufacturers, [Given before the U.S. Committee on Foreign Relations, The Law of the Sea Convention: Perspectives from Business and Industry, 6-28-2012, https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/NAM%20Testimony1.pdf]//DW

**Lockheed Martin, for example, has two deep seabed claims that pre-date the Law of the Sea Convention**. It has continued to extend its licenses through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). **These claims will be instantly recognized by the International Seabed Authority (ISA) if the U.S. joins the Convention**. However, **without the U.S. becoming a party to the Convention, Lockheed Martin is unable to secure U.S. sponsorship of these claims at the ISA.**

#### Even if we concede this argument, you are still losing on the internal link debate. Even if the US can mine in the status quo, royalties do not go to the ISA without joining UNCLOS which is the internal link into our aid arguments.

#### The only difference between the US mining now and voting AFF is that aid will go to the ISA because UNCLOS mandates that which means you’ve basically still conceded this contention.

### AT: Mining Hurts Environment

#### Turn: Switching to deep-sea mining is comparatively better than mining on land. MIT 12:

No Author, No Publication, xx-xx-xxxx [Deep Sea Mining, http://web.mit.edu/12.000/www/m2016/finalwebsite/solutions/oceans.html, 9-7-2018]//DW

However, **this problem is not be nearly as troublesome as it may at first appear. Sea floor deposits are much more concentrated than those on land, meaning a significantly smaller volume of earth must be moved to extract the same amount of usable minerals. Less materials consequently have to be processed**, which is what causes most of the environmental problems in the first place. **Also, current technologies are able to minimize the actual sediment being thrown about**, mitigating enough of the initial concern to justify further usage of these techniques (Begley, 2010). The extremely rich deposits near these vents mean that mining in these areas is very economically viable, and **the environmental costs are minimal enough to warrant a further application of deep sea mining.**

### AT: Aid Shocks

#### Aid empirically reduces poverty and dependence. Andre 92:

Andre and Velasquez 92 [Claire Andre and Manuel Velasquez, “World Hunger: A Moral Response,” Issues in Ethics Volume 5, https://www.scu.edu/ethics/focus-areas/more/resources/world-hunger-a-moral-response/, 1992.]//DW

Those who support aid to poor nations also counter the argument that aid to poor nations rarely accomplishes what it was intended to accomplish. As a result of aid, they point out, many countries have significantly reduced poverty and moved from dependence to self reliance. **Aid has allowed Indonesia**, for example, **to reduce poverty from 58% to 17% in less than a generation**. There are, unfortunately, **instances in which the poor haven't benefitted from aid**, but such cases only **move us to find more effective ways to combat poverty** in these countries, be it **canceling debts, lowering trade restrictions, or improving distribution mechanisms for direct aid**. Furthermore, poor nations would benefit from aid if more aid was sent to them in the first place. In 1988, 41% of all aid was directed to high-income and middle-income countries, rather than to low income countries. According to the World Bank, only 8% of U.S. aid in 1986 could be identified as development assistance devoted to low income countries. Obviously poor countries can't benefit from aid if they're not receiving it. Finally, it is argued, all human beings have dignity deserving of respect and are entitled to what is necessary to live in dignity, including a right to life and a right to the goods necessary to satisfy one's basic needs. This **right to satisfy basic needs takes precedence over the rights of others to accumulate wealth and property.** When people are without the resources needed to survive, those with surplus resources are obligated to come to their aid. In the coming decade, the gap between rich nations and poor nations will grow and appeals for assistance will multiply. How peoples of rich nations respond to the plight of those in poor nations will depend, in part, on how they come to view their duty to poor nations--taking into account justice and fairness, the benefits and harms of aid, and moral rights, including the right to accumulate surplus and the right to resources to meet basic human needs.

### AT: Dependency

#### Aid empirically reduces poverty and dependence. Andre 92:

Andre and Velasquez 92 [Claire Andre and Manuel Velasquez, “World Hunger: A Moral Response,” Issues in Ethics Volume 5, https://www.scu.edu/ethics/focus-areas/more/resources/world-hunger-a-moral-response/, 1992.]//DW

Those who support aid to poor nations also counter the argument that aid to poor nations rarely accomplishes what it was intended to accomplish. As a result of aid, they point out, many countries have significantly reduced poverty and moved from dependence to self reliance. **Aid has allowed Indonesia**, for example, **to reduce poverty from 58% to 17% in less than a generation**. There are, unfortunately, **instances in which the poor haven't benefitted from aid**, but such cases only **move us to find more effective ways to combat poverty** in these countries, be it **canceling debts, lowering trade restrictions, or improving distribution mechanisms for direct aid**. Furthermore, poor nations would benefit from aid if more aid was sent to them in the first place. In 1988, 41% of all aid was directed to high-income and middle-income countries, rather than to low income countries. According to the World Bank, only 8% of U.S. aid in 1986 could be identified as development assistance devoted to low income countries. Obviously poor countries can't benefit from aid if they're not receiving it. Finally, it is argued, all human beings have dignity deserving of respect and are entitled to what is necessary to live in dignity, including a right to life and a right to the goods necessary to satisfy one's basic needs. This **right to satisfy basic needs takes precedence over the rights of others to accumulate wealth and property.** When people are without the resources needed to survive, those with surplus resources are obligated to come to their aid. In the coming decade, the gap between rich nations and poor nations will grow and appeals for assistance will multiply. How peoples of rich nations respond to the plight of those in poor nations will depend, in part, on how they come to view their duty to poor nations--taking into account justice and fairness, the benefits and harms of aid, and moral rights, including the right to accumulate surplus and the right to resources to meet basic human needs.

### AT: Corruption

#### Empirically denied – aid actually reduces corruption. Analysis of numerous factors proves. Charon 11:

Charron 11 (Nicholas, "EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF FOREIGN AID ON CORRUPTION: HAS THE “ANTI‐CORRUPTION MOVEMENT” BEEN EFFECTIVE?", 21 Feb 2011, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1746-1049.2010.00122.x/full)//DW

This study provides a more nuanced explanation and empirical examination of the complicated effects of foreign aid on domestic corruption levels. While the data on corruption and the use of multilateral ODA as a proxy for the ACM are of course imperfect indicators of the respective concepts they are intended to represent, it would seem that, given this caveat, there is relatively strong empirical support for the “anti-corruption” hypothesis—that, based on the strong correlation between multilateral ODA and the dependent variable, the ACM has in fact been relatively effective in curbing the level of corruption in recipient countries during the regime. This can be distinguished from bilateral aid, which was shown to be largely an insignificant (or slightly negative) determinant of corruption levels in recipient states. The results demonstrated that multilateral aid in the pre-ACM time period proved ineffective in combating corruption, yet it was revealed to be quite successful in the sample which examines only the time period after 1997 (the year by which all major IOs had signed agreements on fighting corruption). The effects of multilateral ODA dependence are strong and generally robust across both indicators of corruption, using multiple estimation methods and specifications, different start years, including and excluding East Asian states and when controlling for economic development, level of democracy, colonial heritage, and ethnic fractionalization. However, since it was not possible to measure the ACM directly, there is always the possibility that the results are somewhat spurious, and thus should be interpreted with a degree of caution. Further, while the alternative indicator, the CPI, corroborated the findings from the ICRG data, it is not available for the pre-ACM time period. However, a “pre-test,” so to speak, could not be conducted, and we are therefore not privy to whether or not the ACM altered any relation between the two types of ODA and corruption as measured by Transparency International.

### AT: Terrorism

#### Turn: Foreign Aid Decreases Terrorism. Wyant 15:

Office, Borgen Project, xx-xx-xxxx [Foreign Aid Decreases the Likelihood of Terror Attacks, https://borgenproject.org/foreign-aid-decreases-likelihood-terrorist-attacks/, 2-24-2018]//DW

Over the past decade and a half, the discussion of terrorism in relation to [foreign aid](http://borgenproject.org/foreign-aid/) has expanded around the world. Part of this discussion addresses how a lack of foreign direct investment (FDI) poses a serious threat to both developed and developing nations. **FDI allows developed nations to invest in developing nations in the form of foreign aid**. FDI is critical for the economies of the developing and developed nations, as **developing countries need support until they can economically sustain themselves**. If these developing nations fail due to a cause such as terrorist attacks, the developed nations that have invested in them experience a drop in stocks that, in turn, can negatively impact citizens. Economists Sandler Enders and Adolfo Sachsida found in a study that “terrorist attacks lowered U.S. FDI by 1 percent in nations that belong to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) but had no statistically significant effect in non-OECD nations.” Due to recent rapid globalization, no disease, repression or crime is isolated from the rest of the world. First world countries are not immune to terrorism. The 9/11 attacks, the Charlie Hebdo shooting and the Tunisia museum attack are proof of the international impact these terror groups can have (and seek to achieve). Limiting their abilities and presence in the countries from which they originate would then of course be sensible. Al-Qa’ida, Boko Haram and ISIS – all major terror groups in developing countries with which the world is familiar. These developing countries are more susceptible to terrorist groups arising because of rampant impoverishment. As Susan Rice, author of “The Threat of Global Poverty” attests, poverty “creates conditions conducive to transnational criminal enterprises and terrorist activity.” Insecurities in developing nations often leave individuals feeling desperate and hopeless. As individuals become more penurious, they are more inclined to join radical alternatives to sustain themselves and their families. These struggling nations are less established and unable to prevent terrorist groups from rising to power because of financial hindrances. In a recent study conducted by the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development, it was found that “**a country at $250 GDP per capita has on average a 15 percent risk of internal conflict over five years, while a country at $5,000 per capita has a risk of less than 1 percent**.” Multiple developed nations have set [foreign aid](http://borgenproject.org/foreign-aid/) funds; however, they are often minimal amounts that are only enough for a nation’s government to survive, rather than thrive. **By investing enough in developing countries, developed nations can reduce human suffering, curtail the chances of terrorist groups forming and support the domestic economy through the expansion of markets.**

#### Aid is key to reducing terrorism—creates jobs and teaches skills. Gaffey 17:

Conor Gaffey, Newsweek, 5-22-2017 [Donald Trump's foreign aid cuts could turn Africa into a “recruiting field for terrorists”, says African bank chief, http://www.newsweek.com/trump-budget-us-foreign-aid-africa-613413, 2-16-2018]//DW

**Cutting U.S. foreign aid to Africa could turn the continent into “a recruiting field for terrorists**,” the head of the African Development Bank (AfDB) tellsNewsweek . Akinwumi Adesina, the president of the 78-member AfDB — Africa’s version of the World Bank — says that **cash from Washington plays a vital role in creating jobs** in rural parts of Africa, **where young people may otherwise turn to extremism when faced with unemployment and poverty** due to environmental issues or conflict. U.S. President Donald Trump outlined his economic vision for America with a “skinny budget” [proposal](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/budget/fy2018/2018_blueprint.pdf) in March, which envisioned cutting resources for the Department of State and USAID—the U.S. government’s main disbursers of foreign aid—by 28 percent, partially to fund a $52 billion increase in military spending. The full budget is [due to be unveiled on Tuesday](http://www.newsweek.com/trump-medicaid-budget-613087). Africa is the biggest regional recipient of U.S. foreign aid, [drawing 32 percent](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40213.pdf) of the total spent in the 2015 fiscal year. USAID and the Department of State gave [more than $8 billion](https://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/organization/bureaus/bureau-africa) assistance to 47 countries in sub-Saharan Africa that year, which was spent on issues including security, fighting disease and nutrition. A total [$717 million](https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/working-crises-and-conflict/crisis-response/resources/annual-reports) was spent on response to [the Ebola epidemic](http://www.newsweek.com/democratic-republic-congo-ebola-609143), which claimed more than 11,000 lives across West Africa. “Everywhere you go where you have what I call a triangle of disaster—**anywhere [where] you have high levels of extreme poverty, rural poverty in particular; high levels of unemployment in rural areas**; and where you have environmental and climate degradation, **you always have terrorists operating**,” says Adesina, speaking to Newsweek from Ahmedabad, India, where the AfDB is holding meetings to improve cooperation between the host country and Africa. “**Where you cannot create economic opportunities, these rural areas** all across Africa where agriculture ought to be working **will simply become a recruiting field for terrorists**. I’m sure that’s not in the interests of the United States nor any other country.” **Several regions of Africa are blighted by Islamist terrorist groups:** [**Al-Shabab in Somalia**](http://www.newsweek.com/us-troops-somalia-donald-trump-al-shabab-586004) and [Boko Haram in Nigeria](http://www.newsweek.com/nigeria-islam-boko-haram-child-soldiers-613245) and the Lake Chad region are both waging insurgencies, while [multiple Al-Qaeda-linked groups](http://www.newsweek.com/isis-expands-its-brand-sahel-africas-migration-hub-524447) are active in and around Mali. In a recent address to Department of State employees, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson [said that](https://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2017/05/270620.htm) the administration’s main priority in Africa was national security and fighting militancy. “We cannot let Africa become the next breeding ground for a re-emergence of a caliphate for ISIS,” said Tillerson, referring to the Islamic State militant group (ISIS).

### AT: Income Inequality

 1. Even if Income Inequality goes up, poverty goes down

 1. Which is on net beneficial as being in a state of poverty leads to death

 2. I.E. Andre 40,000 kids die due to starvation because of poverty stemming from a lack of aid

 2. Evidence Comparison

### REM Cards

#### [2] Terrestrial Mining Bad

Deep sea mining to drive green growth and economy By Winston Tarere, 21 September 2012 Vanuatu Daily Post , Jeju, Korea https://earthjournalism.net/stories/6713

**{However Dr. Samantha Smith, {an} environmental expert** employed by the Canadian conglomerate Nautilus Minerals Inc. **is promoting deep sea mining** at the IUCN World Conservation Congress organized by the here in Jeju, South Korea, **as the solution to the ecological destruction of ecosystems by terrestrial mining operations on land**. “The world demand for minerals is on the rise and with the land resources stretched and the grades of minerals declining, deep sea mineral production offer sound environmental advantages.” She said the green growth can only be sustained by deep sea mining. Nautilus argues that deep sea mining is needed now more than ever to drive the growth towards developing clean technologies such as solar and wind energy. “To build just one wind turbine requires 500kg of nickel plus 1000kg of copper. This means that a single turbine requires 12 times more copper to create 1 kilowatt of power than fossil fuels,” Dr Smith said. To put things into perspective, land only represents 30% of the earth’s surface while 70% is submerged underwater. Today 100% of mining is done terrestrially on 30% of the earth’s surface while 70% remains untouched on the seabed.  **Becaue most of these metals especially nickel are found in the equatorial regions, it is argued that the further we delay mining  the seabed, more virgin forests have to be destroyed to make way for [terrestrial} mining, destroying biodiversity and tropical ecosystem as well as the earth’s capacity to absorb carbon emissions**. With declining quality in the average ore grade to 0.61% grade on ore extracted on land compared to a 7.2 % grade from samples obtained on the seabed in the Bismarck Sea in PNG, these large sulphide deposits on the seabed will become the world’s major source of gold, copper, zinc and silver. Nautilus Minerals **{She} argue{s} that building electric and hybrid cars with low carbon emissions and costs will require more minerals such as copper that terrestrial mining cannot offer without further destruction to the environment, loss of biodiversity and livelihoods from climate change**

**{This is critical because not pursuing deep sea mining initiatives through UNCLOS causes the US to mine for REMs on land. This causes extensive destruction to the environment}**

. The average car built in the US today has around 50-55 pounds or 22 to 24kg of copper. In a hybrid electric vehicle, this amount will double to 44 to 48kg of copper and triple to 66 to 72kg of copper in a pure electric vehicle. The vehicle’s inverter system alone which delivers power to the motors is connected to them by cables containing 8-18 kg of copper. The trade off in using more copper in vehicles in the US is 93% less smog-forming volatile and organic compounds and 31% less nitrogen oxide, compared to a car on fossil fuels. The Copper Development Association Inc translates this into a one-third reduction in use of oil if three-fourths of American vehicles were electric. Operating costs of plug-in cars are likely to be significantly lower than those on fossil fuel-powered cars because electricity costs three to five cents per mile with average electric rates, of the equivalent of 75 cents to $1.25 per gallon of gasoline. The rationale used is that the green economy will be driven by the use of renewable energy sources that has seen developed countries investing in new technology that seeks to make them become less dependent on fossil fuels for their energy supplies, building electricity based infrastructure for transportation. In-order to convert wind and solar energy directly into electric energy requires large amounts of metals whose terrestrial extraction have been cause of much destruction of nature’s biodiversity. According to a technical report prepared by SRK consulting (Australasia) Pty Ltd released May this year for Nautilus Minerals Inc, it has made applications for prospecting licenses and mining leases in PNG, Solomon Islands, Fiji, Vanuatu, Tonga and New Zealand. Applications were made through Nautilus Minerals Offshore, a company registered in Vanuatu and fully owned by Nautilus Minerals Inc. Nautilus has 41 granted Prospecting Licenses in Vanuatu covering an area of 3630km2 on the eastern side of the main islands while there are 14 further Prospecting License applications covering 1247km2. Deep Sea Mining has been hailed as the new frontier and the ‘Solwora 1’ site at the bottom of the Bismarck Sea is the experimental site and the new Wild West that needs to be conquered and subdued. **Dr. Smith, {further that} the deep sea mining is environmentally friendly because they will be using technology that will scrape the top of the ocean floor getting metals like a lawnmower cutting grass and transporting it in closed tubes back up to the to avoid spills and pollution to the surrounding environment**. In her presentation she said the mineral deposit under the seabed at the ‘Solwora 1’ site in the Bismarck Sea goes down to a depth of 30 to 50 meters, however, there was enough deposits on the surface to sustainably produce enough without having to dig. **When pressed about the drilling below the seabed to meet global demands she responded: “Even if we have to drill, 50 meters is not deep enough into the earth’s crust to trigger off a volcanic eruption, an earthquake or tsunami.”** The Solwara 1 deposit is a stratabound seafloor massive sulphide that occurs on the flank and crest of a sub-sea volcanic mound which extends about 150m to 200m above the surrounding seafloor. Despite the safety assurances, opposing groups argue that there is too much that is unknown about seafloor mining to guarantee a full proof protection against any form of destruction of the marine biodiversity and ecosystems. The irony of deep sea mining as a green solution to terrestrial mining is that after we have extracted all minerals, leveled mountains and dig deep holes towards the earth’s crust to milk every last bit of rock, we now want to shift into the sea which truly remains as the last frontier. Perhaps after we have depleted all mineral resources at the bottom of the ocean, the new frontier will become the moon and Mars.Capitalism, modern consumerism and our desire and wants to have more, bigger, better, faster, smaller and efficient has a funny way of justifying greed for profit in a green growth and green economy framework.

#### [3] Reason Why: Sea Mining Is Inherently Better.

**The Marin Executive in 2018 finds that**

**People will not be displaced by the proposed Solwara 1 {deep sea mining} project. There will be no impact to food production There will be no impact to surface or groundwater fresh water supplies There will be no significant risk of disaster (e.g. mine tailing slide into communities) There will be no impact to pollination, soil formation, erosion, historic and cultural. This is because deep sea mining technology avoids spills and reduces pollution to the surving environment.** values The monetary damages (measured in terms of USD/year) resulting from terrestrial mines is estimated to be significantly more than that of the proposed Solwara 1 project (4 to 13 times per ton of copper produced for the three mines used in the comparison). The long-term mining liabilities for freshwater contamination, tailings and overburden failures that threaten downstream communities do not exist in Solwara 1.

#### [4] Regulation on Deep Sea Mining

 **And the European Union Furthers this by stating that UNCLOS regulations are strict when it comes to sea mining and new and improved regulations are coming out every day.-**

 https://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/eip-raw-materials/en/content/environmentally-responsible-deep-sea-mining Environmentally Responsible Deep-sea Mining 23/7/2018

{**The European Union furthers that companies are using Environmentally Safe drill techniques to protect the Ocean while mining. These include the use of**}

Robots and tools prototypes allowing a remote and immersive tele-mining system concept. **Improved tools for the rapid assessment of biological population structure and connectivity, essential for efficiently assessing biodiversity {issues}** at genetic scale for mining sites and set-aside areas**,** delineating scale and direction of connectivity and identifying of source and sink populations. **A web-enabled decision support system employing innovative techniques and technologies to model environmental decision making taking uncertainty into account:** Holistic Governance Framework for Ocean Resources Sustainable Extraction. Autonomous deep-water environmental impact monitoring systems. Light-weight re-locatable monitoring network. Modular sensing systems for biogeochemical monitoring. **Prototype for an enhanced acoustic monitoring network system for the characterization of noise footprint of mining activities enabling the mitigation of noise** effects and alert service. WEB Portal and Information Observatory.

# Aid Good Turns

## Aid Good Turns

### Generic Impact Turns

#### **Aff is good – laundry list of impacts. Goldin 02:**

Goldin et al 02 [Ian Goldin, Halsey Rogers, and Nicholas Stern, “The Role and Effectiveness of Development Assistance,” Research Paper from the Development Economics Vice Presidency of the World Bank, 2002.]//DW

This progress on health, education, and income is not accidental. **Governments, with the support of the development community** and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), **have accelerated growth and poverty reduction** by improving their policies, institutions, and governance, and through well-designed projects and programs. iv • Programs like Progresa in Mexico and the Bolsa Escola in Brazil have used financial incentives and parental involvement in school management to induce families to keep their children in school, substantially raising school enrollments among the poorest children. **Progresa,** for example, **increased secondary enrollment rates by 8 percent for girls and 5 percent for boys in just four years**. • Targeted **action by** a **global** public-private **partnership has eliminated the disease of riverblindness from** much of **West Africa,** following the global community’s earlier success in eradicating smallpox from the planet. • **Bangladesh has cut infant mortality in half** (from 140 to 71 per 1,000 live births in the past 30 years), reduced fertility sharply (from 7 births per woman in 1970 to 3.2 births in 1999), and achieved near-universal primary enrollment for girls in an environment where they historically faced high barriers. The country’s innovative NGOs played an especially important role in this progress, but outside assistance was also strongly supportive. While the growth rate of per-capita incomes has not been high in Bangladesh, it has increased in each decade since independence. • Market-oriented reforms in Vietnam and China have helped catalyze domestic and foreign investment there, lifting tens of millions of people out of abject poverty in the former and hundreds of millions in the latter. These are just a few examples. More systematic evidence presented below and in greater detail in the full paper supports the case that good policies and external support have been the key to progress.

#### Aid empirically reduces poverty and dependence. Andre 92:

Andre and Velasquez 92 [Claire Andre and Manuel Velasquez, “World Hunger: A Moral Response,” Issues in Ethics Volume 5, https://www.scu.edu/ethics/focus-areas/more/resources/world-hunger-a-moral-response/, 1992.]//DW

Those who support aid to poor nations also counter the argument that aid to poor nations rarely accomplishes what it was intended to accomplish. As a result of aid, they point out, many countries have significantly reduced poverty and moved from dependence to self reliance. **Aid has allowed Indonesia**, for example, **to reduce poverty from 58% to 17% in less than a generation**. There are, unfortunately, **instances in which the poor haven't benefitted from aid**, but such cases only **move us to find more effective ways to combat poverty** in these countries, be it **canceling debts, lowering trade restrictions, or improving distribution mechanisms for direct aid**. Furthermore, poor nations would benefit from aid if more aid was sent to them in the first place. In 1988, 41% of all aid was directed to high-income and middle-income countries, rather than to low income countries. According to the World Bank, only 8% of U.S. aid in 1986 could be identified as development assistance devoted to low income countries. Obviously poor countries can't benefit from aid if they're not receiving it. Finally, it is argued, all human beings have dignity deserving of respect and are entitled to what is necessary to live in dignity, including a right to life and a right to the goods necessary to satisfy one's basic needs. This **right to satisfy basic needs takes precedence over the rights of others to accumulate wealth and property.** When people are without the resources needed to survive, those with surplus resources are obligated to come to their aid. In the coming decade, the gap between rich nations and poor nations will grow and appeals for assistance will multiply. How peoples of rich nations respond to the plight of those in poor nations will depend, in part, on how they come to view their duty to poor nations--taking into account justice and fairness, the benefits and harms of aid, and moral rights, including the right to accumulate surplus and the right to resources to meet basic human needs.

#### Over 4000 people starve to death every say and billions live in poverty – just the smallest amount of aid can slack these numbers significantly. Andre 15:

Andre and Velasquez 15 [Claire Andre and Manuel Velasquez, Nov 13, 2015, World Hunger: A Moral Response, Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, <https://www.scu.edu/ethics/focus-areas/more/resources/world-hunger-a-moral-response/>]//DW

Between now and tomorrow morning, 40,000 children will starve to death. The day after tomorrow, 40,000 more children will die, and so on throughout 1992. In a "world of plenty," the number of human beings dying or suffering from hunger, malnutrition, and hunger-related diseases is staggering. According to the World Bank, over 1 billion people—at least one quarter of the world's population—live in poverty. Over half of these people live in South Asia; most of the remainder in sub-Saharan Africa and East Asia. The contrast between these peoples and the populations of rich nations is a stark one. In the poor nations of South Asia, the mortality rate among children under the age of 5 is more than 170 deaths per thousand, while in Sweden it is fewer than 10. In sub-Saharan Africa, life expectancy is 50 years, while in Japan it is 80. These contrasts raise the question of whether people living in rich nations have a moral obligation to aid those in poor nations. Currently, less than 1/2 of 1% of the total world gross national product is devoted to aiding poverty-stricken nations. In 1988, the amount of aid from the U S. amounted to only 0.21% of its GNP. In 1990, the World Bank urged the international community to increase aid to poor countries to 0.7% of their GNP. If this goal is reached, poverty could be reduced by as much as 40% by the end of this decade. What is the extent of our duty to poor nations?

### Water Turns

#### Development assistance for water infrastructure declining now.

Biswas et al 17 Asit K. Biswas and Kris Hartley. “View: China has opportunity to become new leader in international development” Euronews, October 22, 2017.

Instead, the opposite is happening. The growing isolationism associated with the populist backlash around the world is having severe consequences for foreign assistance. According to the OECD, bilateral aid to the world’s least-developed countries fell by nearly 4% in 2016. This is an alarming drop for these countries, given that official development assistance (ODA) accounts for more than two thirds of the aid they receive. The US, which remains the world’s largest donor for nutrition programmes and for maternal and child health initiatives, is leading the funding retreat. President Donald Trump’s 2017 budget proposal includes a staggering 45% cut to funding by the US Agency for International Development for water and sanitation projects, a 26% cut to global health funding, and the elimination of funds for family planning. While it is not clear whether Congress will support Trump’s budget request, which would amount to billions of dollars in lost aid, even a minor reduction in US aid spending would hurt many of the world’s poorest. The US is not alone in its foreign aid retrenchment. The European Union’s 2018 draft budget proposes a €90 million cut to development spending, while Austria, Germany, and Italy have all diverted development assistance budgets towards migration crises viewed as imminent national security threats. These are troubling trends, because private philanthropy cannot replace aid withdrawn by government.

#### 2.4 million preventable deaths each year occur due to lack proper water infrastructure.

Bartram and Cairncross 10 Jamie Bartram, Water Institute, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, United States of America. Sandy Cairncross, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom. “Hygiene, Sanitation, and Water: Forgotten Foundations of Health” PLOS Medicine, Policy Forum. November 2010, Volume 7, Issue 11.

Globally, around 2.4 million deaths (4.2% of all deaths) [1] could be prevented annually if everyone practised appropriate hygiene and had good, reliable sanitation and drinking water. These deaths are mostly of children in developing countries from diarrhea and subsequent malnutrition, and from other diseases attributable to malnutrition. How is an opportunity to prevent so many deaths (and 6.6% of the global burden of disease in terms of disability adjusted life years or DALYs [1]) failing to attract the attention of the international public health community? In this introductory paper to the PLoS Medicine series on water and sanitation, we develop the idea that these basic needs are the forgotten foundations of health.

#### Comprehensive empirical analyses of the literature concludes that water development assistance increases sanitation.

Bartram et al 10 Jamie Bartram, Water Institute, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina. Sandy Cairncross, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London. “Hygiene, Sanitation, and Water: Forgotten Foundations of Health” PLOS Medicine, Policy Forum. November 2010, Volume 7, Issue 11.

Figure 2 shows the average reductions in diarrhea incidence found to be associated with HSW interventions in several literature reviews. The impact of ‘‘real world’’ interventions varies widely in response to local factors such as which pathogens are contributing to disease and the relative contribution of different transmission routes. A balanced interpretation of the available evidence suggests that a reasonably well-implemented intervention in one or more of hygiene, sanitation, water supply or water quality, where preexisting conditions are poor, is likely to reduce diarrheal disease prevalence by up to a third. Still greater reductions (up to 63%) are associated with water piped to one or more taps on a property [8]. Such a major impact merits far more attention from health professionals and health systems than has been common in recent decades.

#### Infrastructure is key – creates stability to combat upcoming drought risks.

Tortajada 16. Tortajada, Cecilia. “Policy dimensions of development and financing of water infrastructure: The cases of China and India”, *Institute of Water Policy*, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, Singapore. 2016 <https://thirdworldcentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Policy-dimensions-of-development.pdf>

Investments in numerous construction and modernization projects have been the results of increasing water, energy, and food-related needs as well as climate-related security (Tortajada, 2014; Kenny, 2015). **Water infrastructure** for domestic, agricultural, energy and environment-related uses (pipes, treatment plants, groundwater recharge and storage, rainwater harvesting, small, medium and large dams, etc.) **are essential for developing countries** located **in the tropical and subtropical regions** compared to countries in temperate zones. **This is the case in India and China, where** high rainfall inter- and intra-annual fluctuations **result in more** erratic rainfall patterns making reservoirs essential to store water whenever this is available **to use** it during the rest of the year (Biswas, 2012). Given that reservoirs are some of the most important buffers against droughts and that one of their most important roles is flood protection, the question arises as to whether construction of new reservoirs should be encouraged or whether small projects should be developed instead. Since new construction may not always be possible for economic, social, environmental or dogmatic reasons, a feasible alternative to new reservoirs is to look into their re-operation that can be more effective under the present, and perhaps also future, conditions. A limitation could be, however, that re-operation of reservoirs requires comprehensive policy, management, governance (formal and informal institutions and decision making processes) and financial considerations that are very complex to realize (Tortajada, 2016).

#### Development assistance is key to sustainable infrastructure development , which checks back water wars.

Dunn 13. Dunn, Gregory.“Water Wars: A Surprisingly Rare Source of Conflict.” *Harvard International Review*. November 2013. <http://hir.harvard.edu/article/?a=10414>

**Modern times are associated with** **increasing** rates of water depletion, but also with a rise of international institutions, diplomacy, and conflict mediation. History has shown that these forces are not always powerful enough to overcome wars fought for political or strategic reasons (notably, the Iraq war was launched to destroy the military threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction). However, **water scarcity is a problem related to** economic **development**. Thus, **wars associated with water scarcity are not based in** **the wishes of leaders, but rather a failure of environment or leadership.** International organizations are able to respond to a nation’s failures, and leaders are generally willing to receive aid to complete tasks they have been unable to accomplish. **Failures in water supply and distribution can be remedied with aid**, **which can install wells, aqueducts, and water purification** facilities **to improve access to clean water**. **Additionally,** educational aid can help develop better practices for water use and conservation in an area of water scarcity. **A large proportion of drinkable water is wasted or contaminated** before it is available to those who need it to survive, a problem **that can be solved through** proper **education and infrastructure development.**

#### China proves – development assistance empirically stabilizes infrastructural issues.

Tortajada 14. Tortajada, Cecilia. “Dams: An Essential Component of Development” *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering.* 2014.

Overall, it is **China** that **has been investing** more **heavily in the water sector** through its support for large infrastructure in theseveral countries, mostly in terms of dams. At present, the countryfar outweighs the support of all the development banks (includingthe World Bank) in aids to development of water infrastructure. In2008, Chinese companies were involved in 97 dam projects in 39countries. **By 2011, the country was supporting the development of 251 dams in 68 countries** (Tanaka 2011). Some **examples** include financial support of $448 million to help finalize the Neelum Jhelum project in Pakistan by China Exim Bank (Hydropower& Dams 2012b). In Nepal, the 750 MW West Seti hydro project in Nepal will be developed by CWE Investment Corporation, asubsidiary of Three Gorges Corporation. **In Nigeria**, there are **two hydropower stations with a total capacity of 3,750** MW with China’s Sino hydro corporation and Gezhouba Group Company, and the 3,050 MW Mambilla plant and the 700 MW Zungeru plant—85% financed by China’s Export-Import Bank with the balance being financed by Nigeria and private equity funds. In Cambodia, the first-scale hydropower project of the country, a194 MW Kamchay storage project with a 100-m high dam andtwo power plants built by Sinohydro Corporation, is a 400-MW storage hydropower project—a joint project by Cambodian, Chinese, and Vietnamese companies, and there are four more projects with a combined capacity of more than 900 MW by Chinese companies (Hydropower & Dams 2012a; [http://eng.sinohydro.com/)](http://eng.sinohydro.com/%29).

### Pandemics Turns

#### Empirical models prove solvency – development aid successfully combats disease spread.

Pearson 15 (Ben, “The Positive Effects of Aid on Health Development Outcomes”, Political Science Honors Thesis, April 6th 2015, <https://scholar.colorado.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2011&context=honr_theses>)

Both regressive models clearly show a relationship between foreign development aid and health outcomes within a country. Although at first glance the relationships seem to be somewhat small, it is important to observe the bigger picture and recognize the true impact of aid. By analyzing the greater impact of a single donated dollar per capita within a developing country it soon becomes clear that thousands of lives are saved every year already by foreign aid efforts in the health field. Additionally, by pinpointing the key differences between similar countries with sustained foreign aid efforts and those without, it has been shown that aid as a whole is more than capable of having a constructive impact on a recipient country. The **case studies** presented, for the most part, show a clear break between countries which have benefitted from considerable levels of aid, and those which have not. By using this data it has also been shown that despite a number of complaints and accusations of bias, the LDCs saw a substantial increase in foreign aid after the Millennium Aid Goals were declared and adopted. As the LDCs saw an increase of foreign aid they are also shown to have started development at an increased pace and rate, once again lending a degree of credence to the notion that foreign aid has a positive impact developing countries.

#### Nigeria proves – development assistance is the key internal link.

Yong 10/24Ed Yong (Science staff writer at The Atlantic) 10/24/2017, The Deadly Panic-Neglect Cycle in Pandemic Funding, The Atlantic.

But **Nigeria** was ready. In the previous years, it **has been using investments and support from the United States and other countries to boost its efforts to eradicate polio. When Ebola came, it swiftly redirected all of that infrastructure at the problem**, including an emergency operations center, a crack team of epidemiologists trained by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and GPS systems that could be used to track potential cases. In the end, **Nigeria brought Ebola to heel in just three months, with only 19 cases and eight deaths. The country’s spectacular success is a testament to the decisive actions of its government and health workers.** But it also shows how important it is for rich countries to bolster the capacities of poorer ones, where outbreaks are most likely to begin due to weaker health systems and dense populations. **No nation can tackle the problem of epidemics alone. In a world in which someone with a deadly virus can fly to any other continent in less than a day, the United States is connected to the entire planet’s diseases**. And so, **to protect itself, it must protect everyone else.** As Rebecca Katz from Georgetown University once said to me, “If your desire is to keep disease out of your country, the

#### And, things will only get worse – Trump is calling for cuts to health assistance.

Schneider et al 7/27 Jake Schneider (Research Assistant - The Brookings Insitution) and Darrell M. West (Vice President and Director - Governance Studies Founding Director - Center for Technology Innovation) How the Trump budget harms global health and weakens international stability, 7/27/2017, Brookings Institution.

The President Donald **Trump** budget **calls for a 24 percent reduction in spending on foreign assistance for global health. These** are the U.S. government funds that **support efforts abroad to improve disease prevention and treatment.** That draconian decrease could spell trouble for the fight against neglected diseases and, if enacted, would pose a serious threat to international stability. Foreign aid **support for global health addresses** a wide spectrum of **maladies that disproportionately affect the world’s poor, usually in developing nations**, and receive a dearth of funding for research & development (R&D) for new treatments.[1] Global health expenditures include spending on the “Big Three” neglected diseases of HIV/AIDs, Malaria, and Tuberculosis, but also lesser-known neglected tropical diseases such as schistosomiasis, chagas, African sleeping sickness, and lymphatic filariasis, among others. **Global health also seeks to improve outcomes for childhood and maternal health**, constrain the rise of non-communicable diseases and protect against infectious diseases (both known and unknown).

#### The United States is currently the largest contributor to the DAH – cuts would massively hamper global responses to pandemic outbreaks.

Schneider et al 7/27 Jake Schneider (Research Assistant - The Brookings Insitution) and Darrell M. West (Vice President and Director - Governance Studies Founding Director - Center for Technology Innovation) How the Trump budget harms global health and weakens international stability, 7/27/2017, Brookings Institution.

To put these numbers in global context, **the U.S. contributed nearly one-third of the global spending on Development Assistance for Health (DAH) in 2016**. [3] As the pie chart below shows, **the U.S. government is the largest single contributor towards DAH.** Although some may contend that the U.S. government’s contribution is too large, overall foreign aid only makes up less than 1 percent of our national budget. Indeed, the amount devoted to global health amounts to only 0.22 percent of the entire 2016 budget.

**he continues:**

What happens **if the U.S. significantly cuts its funding for programs such as the** President’s Emergency Fund for AIDs Relief (PEPFAR), the President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), **the Center for Disease Control** (CDC), or the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA)? To gauge the impact, we examined **the consequences of a 24 percent decrease in American foreign assistance on U.S. DAH** and global DAH. The results **are dramatic**. Using a statistical analysis, **we forecast that the global development assistance for health** would drop from $39.2 to $28.8 billion and the U.S. contribution would drop from $13.6 to $10 billion in real 2015 dollars. If enacted, this **would** represent the lowest American investment in the last decade, **and create** the possibility of **instability abroad.**

#### A pandemic could kill up to hundreds of millions.

Walsh 5/4Bryan Walsh (Contributor to Time), 5/4/2017, The World Is Not Ready for the Next Pandemic, Time Magazine

The consequences of a major pandemic would be world-changing. The 1918 flu pandemic killed 50 million to 100 million people–at the top end, more than the combined total casualties of World Wars I and II–and for a slew of reasons, **humans are** arguably **more vulnerable today than they were 100 years ago.** First of all, **there are simply more of us.** The number of people on the planet has doubled in the past 50 years, **which means more humans to get infected and to infect others, especially in densely populated cities**. **Because people no longer stay in one place**–**nearly 4 billion trips were taken by air last year**–neither do diseases. **An infection** in all but the most remote corner of the world **can make its way to a major city in a day or less.** Climate change also plays a role as **warmer temperatures expand the range of disease-carrying animals and insects we’re exposed to**, like the Aedes aegypti mosquitoes that transmit Zika. And if nature isn’t bloody-minded enough, **genetic-engineering tools have made it easier for terrorist groups or lone madmen to unleash custom-designed killer germs.**

# AC\_LaFlame Cards

## [C1] Marine Research

### Link

#### [1] Brown of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration writes,

CRS Issue Brief for Congress Received through the CRS Web Order Code IB95010 The Law of the Sea Convention and U.S. Policy Updated June 16, 2006 Marjorie Ann Browne Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

**The Convention grants the coastal State jurisdiction over marine scientific research conducted within its EEZ and on its continental shelf and requires coastal State consent for the conduct of such research**. As a result, some claimed that the prospects for U.S. marine scientists to gain increased access to other nations’ offshore areas — the location of some of the most useful marine scientific research — would be limited. **The Convention includes an “implied consent” rule to promote prompt coastal State responses to requests for consent. Under this rule, work on a marine scientific research project may proceed six months after detailed information on the project has been provided by the foreign State or international organization** unless, within four months of receipt of the information, the coastal State has informed the research project that, 1) it has withheld consent; 2) the information provided does not conform with the facts; 3) additional information is required; or 4) outstanding obligations exist from previous research projects.

#### [2] Allen of Washington University writes,

Arctic Region Policy, supra note 17, at 3-4. 35. Cabinet Report, Turning to the Sea: America’s Ocean Future, The Law of the Sea Convention, (1999), available at http://www.publicaffairs.noaa.gov/oceanreport/ lawofsea.html. 12 WASHINGTON J. OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAW & POLICY [Vol. 5:

 The third way in which the **U.S. national** Arctic **policy goals** would be enhanced by accession to the LOS Convention concerns the nation’s commitment to enhancing **{on} Scientific monitoring and research** into local, regional, and **{on} global environmental issues**, and measures that will ensure that natural resource management and economic development in the region are environmentally sustainable. Much of the research to accomplish those goals **must** necessarily **be conducted in waters beyond U.S. jurisdiction**. **Unfortunately**, U.S. **oceanographers are presently at a serious disadvantage in gaining access{ing} to the offshore waters of other states. As an earlier presidential cabinet report concluded, our status as a non-party to the Convention “often slows or complicates approval for U.S. ships and aircraft access to conduct marine scientific research in foreign waters**.” **Our non-party status that stands out is that U.S. researchers are unable to take advantage of the more favorable “implied consent” provisions for gaining access to conduct marine scientific research in other states’ exclusive economic zones or on their continental shelves.**

### Impact

#### [1] Bruckner from Issues on Science and Technology writes,

http://issues.org/18-3/p\_bruckner/ [Table of Contents](http://issues.org/toc/18-3/) Volume XVIII Issue 3, Spring 2002 « A Makeover for Engineering Education[A Sweeter Deal at Yucca Mountain](http://issues.org/18-3/p_carter-2/) » Life-Saving Products from Coral Reefs by [Andrew W. Bruckner](http://issues.org/byline/andrew-w-bruckner) Coral reefs are storehouses of genetic resources with vast medicinal potential, but they must be properly managed.

**The prospect of finding a new drug in the sea**, especially among coral reef species, may be **{are} 300 to 400 times more likely than isolating one from a terrestrial ecosystem**. Although terrestrial organisms exhibit great species diversity**, marine organisms have greater phylogenetic diversity**, including several phyla and thousands of species found nowhere else. Coral reefs are home to sessile plants and fungi similar to those found on land, but **coral reefs also contain a diverse assemblage of invertebrates** such as corals, tunicates, molluscs, bryozoans, sponges, and echinoderms that are absent from terrestrial ecosystems. **These animals spend most of their time firmly attached to the reef and cannot escape environmental perturbations, predators, or other stressors**. Many engage in a form of chemical warfare, using bioactive compounds to deter predation, fight disease, and prevent overgrowth by fouling and competing organisms. In some animals, toxins are also used to catch their prey. These compounds may be synthesized by the organism or by the endosymbiotic microorganisms that inhabit its tissues, or they are sequestered from food that they eat. **Because of their unique structures or properties, these compounds may yield life-saving medicines or other important industrial and agricultural products.**

## [C2] Royalties

### Link

#### [1] From his testimony to the US Senate, Jay Timmons writes

https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/NAM%20Testimony1.pdf

Rare Earth Minerals are Vital to Manufacturing Manufacturers in the United States require access to basic inputs for the production process in order to become and remain competitive in the global economy. As manufacturing grows more high tech, “rare earth” minerals are becoming increasingly important to manufacturers and their supply chains. **Rare earth minerals consist of 17 elements that are important for numerous manufacturing applications, including in the production of chemicals, defense products, consumer electronics, wind turbines, hybrid car batteries and other renewable energy products**. They are also used as catalysts for petroleum refining. Until a decade ago, the United States was 100 percent self-reliant for rare earth production, with domestic companies producing enough to supply U.S. manufacturers. Over time, however, U.S. production was halted as it became economically and environmentally cost prohibitive. Companies in various countries – including the United States – are looking at reopening closed mines and developing new deposits, but these efforts could take a number of years to fully come on line. **The deep seabed offers a new opportunity for the United States to gain steady access to these vital rare earth minerals**. Polymetallic nodules are located on the deep ocean floor. These nodules typically contain manganese, nickel, copper, cobalt and rare earth minerals. **However, U.S. companies cannot actively pursue claims in the areas where these nodules are dense and safe unless the U.S. ratifies the Law of the Sea Treaty**. 4 Deep Seabed Development There is no doubt the world is very different today. We are a global economy, and countries are working feverishly to take our mantle of economic leadership away from us. Deep seabed mining is an emerging global industry and, indeed, a key ingredient to economic growth and competitiveness. **We have companies in the United States with the means to explore and develop the resources and minerals on and in the seabeds of international waters, but they will only do so if there is a structure that contains internationally recognized agreements in place. This treaty will institute that legal framework upon which companies—and countries—can rely. U.S. multinational companies expect other countries to abide by international standards and rules in other areas, such as intellectual property, counterfeiting, dumping, and international financing. So do we. It, therefore, is logical that we would expect the same when determining our ability to access the resources of the seabed.** T**he Law of the Sea Convention provides the only internationally recognized legal regime for extracting mineral resources from the ocean floor in the deep seabed, an area over which no country has sovereign rights.** The International Seabed Authority (ISA) develops the rules, regulations and procedures relating to the deep seabed. The Convention guarantees the United States, and only the United States, a permanent seat on the decision-making Council of the ISA – with an effective veto over decisions impacting U.S. interests. The development of deep seabed claims is incredibly expensive. Companies in the U.S. are reluctant to invest heavily in deep seabed mining because of the risk that their activities would not withstand a legal challenge since the U.S. is not a party to the Conventi**on. Conversely, foreign companies, because their governments have joined the Convention, have access to the international bodies that grant the legal claims to operate in the deep seabed area. The U.S. cannot represent the interests of its companies in those bodies. Lockheed Martin, for example, has two deep seabed claims that pre-date the Law of the Sea Convention. It has continued to extend its licenses through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). These claims will be instantly recognized by the International Seabed Authority (ISA) if the U.S. joins the Convention. However, without the U.S. becoming a party to the Convention, Lockheed Martin is unable to secure U.S. sponsorship of these claims at the ISA.**

[2] Ives of Yale Global writes, {Spike: Feasability}
Published at the [Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies](http://environment.yale.edu/) Explore Search About E360 Drive to Mine the Deep Sea Raises Concerns Over Impacts Armed with new high-tech equipment, mining companies are targeting vast areas of the deep ocean for mineral extraction. But with few regulations in place, critics fear such development could threaten seabed ecosystems that scientists say are only now being fully understood. BY MIKE IVES • OCTOBER 20, 2014

For years, the idea of prospecting for potentially rich deposits of minerals on the ocean floor was little more than a pipe dream. Extractive equipment was not sophisticated or cost-effective enough for harsh environments thousands of feet beneath the ocean’s surface, and mining companies were busy exploring mineral deposits on land. But **the emergence of advanced technologies specifically designed to plumb the dead seabed— along with declining mineral quality at many existing terrestrial mines — is nudging the industry closer to a new frontier**.

#### [3] MIT writes, {Spike:Feasability}

http://web.mit.edu/12.000/www/m2016/finalwebsite/solutions/oceans.html

**Two technologies are** being **considered for commercial mining:** of the ocean floor are continuous **line bucket system (CLB) and hydraulic suction systems. CLB is the preferred method and transfers the mud up to the ship in a conveyor belt type system. Hydraulic suction has a pipe running the mud up from the ocean floor and another pipe that transfers the tailings back to the ocean floor** (Economist 2006). **Hydrothermal vents are the primary source for deep sea mines**. These magma below these vents heats the surrounding seawater, which causes metals within the sediment to leach into the water. The subsequent shock of the cold water causes the metals to precipitate and form as solids in the sediment surrounding the vents. Because of these high concentrations, most deep sea mining would occur in the chimneys above the vents. **Vents themselves would be preserved undamaged, but the chimneys would be destroyed. These chimneys, however, can be built back over time, and is the equivalent of "cutting grass" on the ocean** floor (Begley, 2010).

#### [4] MIT writes, {Spike:Feasability}

http://web.mit.edu/12.000/www/m2016/finalwebsite/solutions/oceans.html

**2012-2020: Exploratory mines are developed, as well as continual pursuit of new extraction technologies**
2020-2025: Strict restrictions are put in place by some countries (mostly coastal nations) to protect their environment and minimize ecological impact
2025-2035: New technologies are developed as research of the ocean floor's ecology sheds more light on the matter of stabilizing the ecosystem
**2035-2040: Implementation of those technologies occurs at a more rapid pace as the need for higher grade rare earth mines increases**2040+: Further expansion of deep sea mines across the oceans (focused on good sample areas).

#### [5] A press release from Nautilus Mineral writes, {Spike:Feasability}

NAUTILUS MINERALS INC. (TSX: NUS) (OTCQX: NUSMF), (OTC:NUSMF Nasdaq Intl Designation) Suite 1400 400 Burrard Street Vancouver, BC V6C 3A6 Press Release Number 2016 – 01 Nautilus to wet test Seafloor Production Equipment http://www.nautilusminerals.com/IRM/PDF/1717/NautilustowettestSeafloorProductionEquipment

**Nautilus to wet test Seafloor Production Equipment Toronto Ontario, January 18, 2016** - Nautilus Minerals Inc. (TSX:NUS, OTCQX:NUSMF, OTC:NUSMF Nasdaq Intl Designation) (the "Company" or "Nautilus") announces that it has signed agreements with United Engineering Services LLC (“UES”) to provide support services associated with wet testing the Company’s Seafloor Production Equipment and storing the equipment as it is delivered from various suppliers prior to integration onto the Company’s Production Support Vessel (“PSV”). **The first of the equipment to be tested will be the three Seafloor Production Tools (SPTs). The SPTs are due for delivery from the Soil Machine Dynamics facility in Newcastle upon Tyne early in 2016**. Each machine is undergoing rigorous commissioning and factory acceptance testing which has been conducted in dry conditions on land. Once delivered, the SPTs will undergo extensive wet testing at Duqm Port in Oman which is designed to provide a submerged demonstration of the fully assembled SPTs and will involve submerged testing of:

#### [6] The Marine Executive writes, {Spike:Feasability}

https://www.maritime-executive.com/article/anglo-american-exits-deep-sea-mining-project#gs.w8t9uFs

**The submerged testing of its robotic cutting tools was completed successfully in mid-February**. Nautilus' Solwara 1 site would be the first ever commercial seafloor copper-gold mine. The deposits at Solwara 1 are polymetallic sulfides that are rich in copper, gold and other valuable metals. Based on drilling results, Nautilus believes that there are about one million tons of ore containing seven percent copper, compared with the 0.5 percent copper found in everyday on-shore ore grades. The gold content comes in at 20 grams per ton, and zinc and silver are also present. Nautilus estimates production in the range of 20,000 tons of copper and 30,000 ounces of gold at steady-state production.

#### [7] The New York Times writes, {Spike:Feasability}

William J. Broad, 7-9-2012, "Vast Deposits of Gold and Other Ores Lure Seabed Miners," New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/10/science/vast-deposits-of-gold-and-other-ores-lure-seabed-miners.html

https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/10/science/vast-deposits-of-gold-and-other-ores-lure-seabed-miners.html

These finds are fueling a gold rush as nations, companies and entrepreneurs race to stake claims to the sulfide-rich areas, which dot the volcanic springs of the frigid seabed. The prospectors — motivated by dwindling resources on land as well as record prices for gold and other metals — are busy hauling up samples and assessing deposits valued at trillions of dollars.

“**We’ve had extreme success**,” Mr. Dettweiler said in a recent interview about the deepwater efforts of his company, Odyssey Marine Exploration of Tampa, Fla.

**Skeptics once likened mining the deep to looking for riches on the moon. No more. Progress in marine geology, predictions of metal shortages in the decades ahead and improving access to the abyss are combining to make it real**.

The technological advances center on new robots, sensors and other equipment, some of it derived from the offshore oil and gas industry. Ships lower exploratory gear on long tethers and send down sharp drills that gnaw into the rocky seabed. **All of this underwater machinery is making it more and more feasible to find, map and recover seabed riches.**

#### [8] Magnusson of the Ocean Development and International Law Journal writes,

**We have companies in the United States with the means to explore and develop the resources and minerals on and in the seabeds of international waters, but they will only do so if there is a structure that contains internationally recognized agreements in place. This treaty will institute that legal framework upon which companies—and countries—can rely. U.S. multinational companies expect other countries to abide by international standards and rules in other areas, such as intellectual property, counterfeiting, dumping, and international financing. So do we. It, therefore, is logical that we would expect the same when determining our ability to access the resources of the seabed.** T**he Law of the Sea Convention provides the only internationally recognized legal regime for extracting mineral resources from the ocean floor in the deep seabed, an area over which no country has sovereign rights.** The International Seabed Authority (ISA) develops the rules, regulations and procedures relating to the deep seabed. The Convention guarantees the United States, and only the United States, a permanent seat on the decision-making Council of the ISA – with an effective veto over decisions impacting U.S. interests. **Companies in the U.S. are reluctant to invest heavily in deep seabed mining because of the risk that their activities would not withstand a legal challenge{s} since the U.S. is not a party to the Convention. Conversely, foreign companies, because their governments have joined the Convention, have access to the international bodies that grant the legal claims to operate in the deep seabed area. The U.S. cannot represent the interests of its companies in those bodies. Lockheed Martin, for example, has two deep seabed claims that pre-date the Law of the Sea Convention. It has continued to extend its licenses through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). These claims will be instantly recognized by the International Seabed Authority (ISA) if the U.S. joins the Convention. However, without the U.S. becoming a party to the Convention, Lockheed Martin is unable to secure U.S. sponsorship of these claims at the ISA.**

#### [9] Conathan of Think Progress Writes

Think Progress, 6-13-2012, "Conservatives Disregard Traditional Allies to Oppose the Law of the Sea," No Publication, https://thinkprogress.org/conservatives-disregard-traditional-allies-to-oppose-the-law-of-the-sea-2a814f04a717/

**Until we ratify the treaty, no U.S. companies will operate on the extended continental shelf.** Aside from a [small pocket of territory](http://www.boemre.gov/ooc/press/2000/061300.htm) 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** [**Lockheed Martin**](http://ratifythetreatynow.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Lockheed%20Letter%20to%20SFRC.pdf)**, 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.

#### [10] Lockheed Martin writes.

Eric Martin, 5-16-2017, "Mining the Deep Seabed for Renewable Energy," JD Supra, https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/mining-the-deep-seabed-for-renewable-90911/

U.S. companies can obtain exploration licenses for polymetallic nodules from the [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration](http://www.gc.noaa.gov/gcil_seabed_management.html) (NOAA) under the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act of 1980 (DSHMRA), 30 U.S.C. §§ 1401-1473. NOAA is in the process of extending the two existing licenses, both held by Lockheed Martin, for another five years.  [82 Fed. Reg. 18,613](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/04/20/2017-07987/deep-seabed-mining-request-for-extension-of-exploration-licenses)(Apr. 20, 2017).  **However, according to Lockheed Martin, U.S. ratification of UNCLOS, as modified by the 1994 Implementing Agreement, must occur before at-sea exploration is feasible.**

#### [11] Rumsfeld of the State Department {Royalties to Landlocked}{Another Card at bottom}

https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Rumsfeld\_Testimony.pdf

The Treaty creates a United Nations-style body called the “International Seabed Authority.” “The Authority,” as UN bureaucrats call it in Orwellian shorthand, would be involved in all commercial activity such as mining and oil and gas production in international waters. It is to this entity that the United States, pursuant to the Treaty’s Article 82, would be required to transfer a significant share of all royalties generated by American companies—royalties that would otherwise go to the U.S. Treasury for the benefit of

**Over time, hundreds of billions of dollars could flow through the “Authority”. Under the Treaty, the Authority is empowered to redistribute these so-called “international royalties” to developing and landlocked nations with no role in exploring or extracting those resources**. It would constitute a massive form of global welfare.

It is true that the Treaty might produce some benefits, clarifying some principles and perhaps making it easier to resolve certain disputes.

In his farewell address to the nation in 1988, President Reagan, advised the country: "Don't be afraid to see what you see." If the members of the U.S. Senate fulfill their responsibilities, actually read the Law of the Sea Treaty and consider it carefully, I believe they will come to the conclusion, as I have, that the Treaty’s costs to our security and sovereignty would far exceed any benefits for the United States. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

### Impact

#### [1] USAID reduces poverty on a wide-spread scale—this is an independent reason to affirm--. Alvi 11:

Alvi, Eskander, and Aberra Senbeta. “Does Foreign Aid Reduce Poverty?” Journal of International Development, vol. 24, no. 8, 2011, pp. 955–976., doi:10.1002/jid.1790.//DW

For all measures of poverty, in both specifications, the variable of interest—**foreign aid**— enters negatively and significantly. This indicates that aid **plays a positive role in reducing poverty**. The finding that **aid has poverty‐reducing effects even after controlling for average income is noteworthy** and has important policy implications. It means that despite the controversy surrounding the aid–growth relation, **the direct effect of aid indeed helps reduce poverty** even though its effects on growth remain uncertain. When we use the headcount index, **a one‐percentage‐point increase in aid to a recipient country reduces the proportion of people living below the poverty  by 1.8 percent. This result is consistent with the findings of Mosley and Suleiman (2007) who find that aid reduces headcount poverty by a similar magnitude in a cross‐country analysis of 49 countries**. Interestingly, if this direct effect of aid on poverty is taken into account, poverty‐efficient allocation of aid calculated by Collier and Dollar (2002) would have an even stronger poverty‐reducing effect. 9The negative and significant estimates of the aid parameter in columns (3) through (6) suggest that aid helps even the poorest of the poor who survive on a dollar a day or less. The estimate in column (3) indicates that **a one‐percentage‐point increase in aid reduces the average income shortfall of the poor by 3 per cent**. Although the poverty mitigation effect of aid is significant in our study, we believe that our estimates understate the potential impact. This is because we are assessing the direct effect of aid but are using all types of aid flows, whether aimed at poverty reduction or not. The latter type, which has typically been a large part of foreign aid delivered to most countries during the period under study, may at best weakly reduce poverty, thereby diluting the impact on poverty mitigation. Ideally, aid that is specifically intended to address poverty should be used to appraise its effectiveness in poverty alleviation, but lack of such data at the national level requires us to do otherwise. Another interesting finding is the effect of finance on poverty. We find consistently negative and significant estimates for finance, suggesting a prominent role that financial sector development can play in poverty reduction. This finding is in line with that of Beck et al. (2007) who argued that financial development raises incomes of the poor more than proportionately. It is noteworthy that the strong poverty‐reducing effects of finance appear after controlling for average income, as in the case with aid. According to Beck et al. (2000), the exogenous components of financial development affect growth mainly through improvements in productivity and by easing credit constraints facing the poor (Beck et al., 2007). The economic significance of these results can be assessed by calculating how an increase in aid and improved financial sector development would translate to poverty reduction. For instance, in Kenya over the period 1981–2004, had the average aid‐to‐GNI ratio been doubled to 14.2 per cent, the average poverty rate would have fallen to 19.6 per cent instead of its actual value of 23.4. Such an increase would have freed close to one million people from poverty. The economic significance of financial development is even more substantial. Over the period under consideration, Colombia and Zambia had domestic credit to private sector as percentage of GDP ratio of 31 and 11.3 per cent, respectively. Had Zambia’s domestic credit to private sector GDP ratio been the same as Colombia’s, which is 178 per cent higher, the average poverty rate would have fallen from 57.7 to 12.1 per cent, freeing close to four million people from poverty. Financial development appears to have a more potent effect on poverty reduction than the direct effect of foreign aid, although it is useful to keep in mind that financial development is a complex process much like economic development. The estimates of income per capita and the Gini coefficient enter with the expected signs and are consistent with the findings of earlier studies by Ravallion and Chen (1997), Besley and Burgess (2003) and Oyolola (2007). But our growth elasticity of poverty estimates from system GMM, which take into account the persistent nature of poverty and other control variables, are lower compared with the estimates of Ravallion and Chen (1997) and Besley and Burgess (2003), who examined the relationship using a fixed‐effects model. In all specifications and for all three measures of poverty, the lagged dependent variable enters positively and significantly, suggesting a persistence effect of poverty. Trade, age dependency ratio and democracy do not enter significantly, indicating a lack of direct impact on poverty.13 The lack of significant poverty‐reducing effects of growth‐enhancing policies and institutions such as trade and democracy confirms the findings of Dollar and Kraay (2002, 2004).



#### [2] Aid empirically reduces poverty and dependence. Andre 92:

Andre and Velasquez 92 [Claire Andre and Manuel Velasquez, “World Hunger: A Moral Response,” Issues in Ethics Volume 5, https://www.scu.edu/ethics/focus-areas/more/resources/world-hunger-a-moral-response/, 1992.]//DW

Those who support aid to poor nations also counter the argument that aid to poor nations rarely accomplishes what it was intended to accomplish. As a result of aid, they point out, many countries have significantly reduced poverty and moved from dependence to self reliance. **Aid has allowed Indonesia**, for example, **to reduce poverty from 58% to 17% in less than a generation**. There are, unfortunately, **instances in which the poor haven't benefitted from aid**, but such cases only **move us to find more effective ways to combat poverty** in these countries, be it **canceling debts, lowering trade restrictions, or improving distribution mechanisms for direct aid**. Furthermore, poor nations would benefit from aid if more aid was sent to them in the first place. In 1988, 41% of all aid was directed to high-income and middle-income countries, rather than to low income countries. According to the World Bank, only 8% of U.S. aid in 1986 could be identified as development assistance devoted to low income countries. Obviously poor countries can't benefit from aid if they're not receiving it. Finally, it is argued, all human beings have dignity deserving of respect and are entitled to what is necessary to live in dignity, including a right to life and a right to the goods necessary to satisfy one's basic needs. This **right to satisfy basic needs takes precedence over the rights of others to accumulate wealth and property.** When people are without the resources needed to survive, those with surplus resources are obligated to come to their aid. In the coming decade, the gap between rich nations and poor nations will grow and appeals for assistance will multiply. How peoples of rich nations respond to the plight of those in poor nations will depend, in part, on how they come to view their duty to poor nations--taking into account justice and fairness, the benefits and harms of aid, and moral rights, including the right to accumulate surplus and the right to resources to meet basic human needs.

#### [3] Over 4000 people starve to death every say and billions live in poverty – just the smallest amount of aid can slack these numbers significantly. Andre 15:

Andre and Velasquez 15 [Claire Andre and Manuel Velasquez, Nov 13, 2015, World Hunger: A Moral Response, Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, <https://www.scu.edu/ethics/focus-areas/more/resources/world-hunger-a-moral-response/>]//DW

Between now and tomorrow morning, 40,000 children will starve to death. The day after tomorrow, 40,000 more children will die, and so on throughout 1992. In a "world of plenty," the number of human beings dying or suffering from hunger, malnutrition, and hunger-related diseases is staggering. According to the World Bank, over 1 billion people—at least one quarter of the world's population—live in poverty. Over half of these people live in South Asia; most of the remainder in sub-Saharan Africa and East Asia. The contrast between these peoples and the populations of rich nations is a stark one. In the poor nations of South Asia, the mortality rate among children under the age of 5 is more than 170 deaths per thousand, while in Sweden it is fewer than 10. In sub-Saharan Africa, life expectancy is 50 years, while in Japan it is 80. These contrasts raise the question of whether people living in rich nations have a moral obligation to aid those in poor nations. Currently, less than 1/2 of 1% of the total world gross national product is devoted to aiding poverty-stricken nations. In 1988, the amount of aid from the U S. amounted to only 0.21% of its GNP. In 1990, the World Bank urged the international community to increase aid to poor countries to 0.7% of their GNP. If this goal is reached, poverty could be reduced by as much as 40% by the end of this decade. What is the extent of our duty to poor nations?

## [C3] Lawsuits

### Link

#### [1] Countries Can Sue

**Steven Groves of the Heritage Foundation in 2012 writes**

https://www.heritage.org/testimony/the-law-the-sea-costs-us-accession-unclos

**U.S. accession** to the convention **would provide an opportunity** and legal forum **for** other **UNCLOS members to initiate lawsuits against the U.S. challenging** the adequacy of **its efforts to protect the** marine **environment.** Although current U.S. law may satisfy some of the general environmental obligations set forth in the convention, the U.S. might nevertheless be forced to defend itself in a costly and politically embarrassing lawsuit challenging the sufficiency and enforcement of U.S. domestic environmental laws and regulations. One such lawsuit—**the MOX Plant Case (Ireland v. United Kingdom)—has already been litigated in UNCLOS tribunals. Acceding to UNCLOS would commit the U.S. to controlling its pollutants, including** alleged “harmful substances” such as **carbon emissions** and other greenhouse gases (GHG), in such a way that they do not negatively impact the marine environment. **The U.S. would** also **be obligated to adopt** laws and **regulations to prevent** the **pollution** of the marine environment from the atmosphere and could be liable under international law for failing to enact legislation necessary to prevent atmospheric pollution. Moreover, such domestic laws and regulations “shall” take into account “internationally agreed rules, standards and recommended practices and procedures.” The “internationally agreed rules, standards and recommended practices” that could be invoked by **UNCLOS litigants may include instruments such as the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its Kyoto Protocol.**

#### [2] US is a target

**Justin Gillis of the New York Times in 2017 details**

https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/06/01/climate/us-biggest-carbon-polluter-in-history-will-it-walk-away-from-the-paris-climate-deal.html

**The U**nited **S**tates, with its love of big cars, big houses and blasting air-conditioners, **has contributed more than any other country to the atmospheric carbon dioxide that is scorching the planet.**

### Impact

#### [1] Policies Empirically Reduce GW

**Union of Concerned Scientists states**

 https://www.ucsusa.org/our-work/global-warming/solutions/global-warming-solutions-reduce-emissions

In order **to effectively address global warming, we must** significantly **reduce the amount of** heat-trapping **emissions** we are putting **in**to **the atmosphere.** The good news is that we have the technology and practical solutions at hand to accomplish it. As individuals, we can help by taking action to reduce our personal carbon emissions. **But to fully address** the threat of **global warming, we must demand action from our** elected **leaders to** support and **implement a** comprehensive **set of climate solutions.**

#### [2] Reducing Emissions Save Lives

**Tim Lucas of Duke in 2018 concludes**

https://nicholas.duke.edu/about/news/cutting-carbon-emissions-sooner-could-save-153-million-lives

As many as **153 million premature deaths** linked to air pollution **could be avoided** worldwide **this century if governments speed up their timetable for reducing** fossil fuel **emissions and switches to cleaner technology.**, a new Duke University-led study finds. The study is the first to project the number of lives that could be saved, city by city, **in 154 of the world’s largest urban areas if nations agree to reduce carbon emissions and limit global temperature rise to 1.5°C in the near future** rather than postponing the biggest emissions cuts until later, as some governments have proposed.

# Other Frontlines

#### Lockheed Martin Interest

If these security benefits were not enough,**the U.S. business community is unified in its support for the treaty for two reasons. First, UNCLOS would protect U.S. rights to sole commercial exploitation to all resources on and under its extended continental shelf** (that is, beyond two hundred miles). This area--**estimated to be twice the size of California**--is rich in oil, gas, and other exploitable resources.**Second, accession to the treaty would allow the United States to sponsor its own national companies to engage in deep sea-bed mining. Last week, the chairman of Lockheed Martin sent a strongly worded letter to the Senate saying his company wanted to join the race for undersea riches, but could not assume investment risks until it was clear that it would have a clear legal title to its findings.** This coming week, Senator Kerry will hold a second round of hearings on UNCLOS, featuring an array of military commanders, treaty champions like John Bellinger-former legal counselor to the State Department and National Security Council under the George W. Bush administration-and critics, like Steven Groves of the Heritage Foundation. The hearings offer a golden opportunity to put to rest the canards of treaty opponents.

#### Resources in EEZ

**The Atlantic margin ECS** includes a series of basins (Georges Bank Basin, Baltimore Canyon Trough, Carolina Trough, Southeast Georgia Embayment, and the Blake Plateau Basin) which are filled with enormous thicknesses of sediments, sometimes reaching 43,000 feet thick. In addition, the Continental Slope and Rise are underlain by a great wedge of sediments. Because of the depth of water over the Rise, this area **is just beginning to be evaluated for its resource potential.** The deep basins, buried reefs, and the Continental Rise are all targets for petroleum exploration, but some of them are in such deep water that exploration must wait for more favorable economic conditions. In addition to the petroleum potential of the Atlantic margin, the ECS has a significant potential for mineral resources. **Recent surveys have identified very large tonnages of heavy minerals, of economic interest for titanium and rare-earth elements, that are concentrated by sea-floor currents in relatively shallow water on the Continental Shelf. Other surveys have shown that phosphates and pavement-like deposits of manganese cover the Blake Plateau off the Carolina coast.**