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# \*\*\*General Turns\*\*\*

## General Renewables Turn

#### It’ll actually be harder to create renewable technology in their world. Brenda of the Union of Concerned Scientists outlines two reasons why:

#### Renewable tech faces a lot of competition from the already major fossil fuel players in the energy sector such as oil and natural gas. When we increase drilling in the pro world this competition only grows and it is harder to create renewable technology in their world.

#### Political influence benefits the fossil fuel industry as the US government spends 37.5 billion dollars on subsidies every year to increase domestic production diverting capital away from renewable energy. Voting pro is only going to increase these subsidies because production increases which will move us away from energy efficiency through clean technology.

Brenda Ekwurzel12-20-2017, Barriers to Renewable Energy Technologies, Union of Concerned Scientists, https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/renewable-energy/barriers-to-renewable-energy, 10-5-2018

Market entry. A pie chart of energy sources in 2016. US electricity sources, 2016. Renewables face stiff competition from more established, higher-carbon sectors. For most of the last century US electricity was dominated by certain major players, including coal, nuclear, and, most recently, natural gas. Utilities across the country have invested heavily in these technologies, which are very mature and well understood, and which hold enormous market power. This situation—the well-established nature of existing technologies—presents a formidable barrier for renewable energy. Solar, wind, and other renewable resources need to compete with wealthier industries that benefit from existing infrastructure, expertise, and policy. It’s a difficult market to enter. New energy technologies—startups—face even larger barriers. They compete with major market players like coal and gas, and with proven, low-cost solar and wind technologies. To prove their worth, they must demonstrate scale: most investors want large quantities of energy, ideally at times when wind and solar aren’t available. That’s difficult to accomplish, and a major reason why new technologies suffer high rates of failure. Increased government investment in clean energy—in the form of subsidies, loan assistance, and research and development—would help. Unequal playing fiel Scott Pruit Climate action opponents like former EPA administrator Scott Pruitt have long been propped up by industry money You don’t tend to see multi-billion dollar industries without also seeing outsized political influence—and the fossil fuel industry is no exception. Oil Change International estimates that the United States spends $37.5 billion on subsidies for fossil fuels every year. Through direct subsidies, tax breaks, and other incentives and loopholes, US taxpayers help fund the industry’s research and development, mining, drilling, and electricity generation. While subsidies have likely increased domestic production, they’ve also diverted capital from more productive activities (such as energy efficiency) and constrained the growth of renewable energy (solar and wind enjoy fewer subsidies and, generally, receive much less preferential political treatment). For decades, the fossil fuel industry has used its influence to spread false or misleading information about climate change—a strong motivation for choosing low-carbon energy sources like wind or solar (in addition to the economic reasons). Industry leaders knew about the risks of global warming as early as the 1970s, but recognized that dealing with global warming meant using fewer fossil fuels. They went on to finance—and continue to fund—climate disinformation campaigns, aimed at sewing doubt about climate change and renewable energy. Their efforts were successful. Despite widespread scientific consensus, climate action is now a partisan issue in the US congress, complicating efforts to move from fossil fuels to clean energy. The disconnect between science and policy means that the price we pay for coal and gas isn’t representative of the true cost of fossil fuels (ie, it doesn’t reflect the enormous costs of global warming and other externalities). This in turn means that renewables aren’t entering an equal playing field: they’re competing with industries that we subsidize both directly (via government incentives) and indirectly (by not punishing polluters). Emission fees or caps on total pollution, potentially with tradable emission permits, are examples of ways we could use to help remove this barrier.

# \*\*\*Economy\*\*\*

# A2: Arctic Drilling

#### [NON-UNIQUE]: We’re already going to be oil independent. Flynn of the Price Futures Group explains in 2018 the U.S. is “on path to being the biggest oil producer [and] exporter.” We gain nothing from drilling the Arctic.

Kelly Burke. Fox News. 1 June 2018. “US becoming more energy independent, on path to being 'biggest oil producer in the world'.” http://www.foxnews.com/us/2018/06/01/us-becoming-more-energy-independent-on-path-to-being-biggest-oil-producer-in-world.html

But analysts say it's true. "We're still on a path to being the biggest oil producer in the world, the biggest oil exporter, and one of the biggest consumers," explains Phil Flynn, senior market analyst with Price Futures Group and author of The Energy Report. That's an astonishing statement for those old enough to remember the long lines at the gas pump during the 1973 oil embargo by The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. OPEC largely controlled the price of oil for decades – but that is changing.

#### [NON-UNIQUE]: CNBC reports in August that the US will become energy independent by 2019 and oil independent by 2021.

Tom Dichristopher, 08-09-2018, America’s rapid march to energy independence has slowed under Trump, CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/09/americas-rapid-march-to-energy-independence-has-slowed-under-trump.html, 9-17-2018

According to Courvalin, the rapid progress toward energy independence is mostly due to surging U.S. natural gas shipments and a boom in oil sales after Congress and President Barack Obama lifted a 40-year ban on exporting crude. OPEC’s deal with Russia and other producers to boost oil prices by cutting output has also helped to shrink the U.S. trade deficit in energy products. But oil prices hit 3½-year highs above $80 a barrel this year after Trump sanctioned Iran and as OPEC members cut output more deeply than intended. That rise in crude prices is the primary reason the U.S. energy trade deficit is no longer shrinking, Courvalin says. Goldman expects the United States to start closing the deficit again in the second half of next year as oil and natural gas exports pick up and crude prices stabilize around $65 a barrel. It forecasts the United States will be energy independent by 2019 and oil independent in 2021. That does not mean the United States will no longer buy foreign oil or energy commodities. It means the United States well sell more oil and energy products overseas than it imports.

#### [TURN]: The U.S. should just drill without acceding because it’s more profitable. Groves of the Davis Institute for Foreign Policy explains in 2012 that:

#### a) under international law and longstanding U.S. foreign policy, we do not need to accede to UNCLOS to be able to drill our continental shelf (including the Arctic one). This is proven by the U.S. leasing out its continental shelf to oil companies in the Gulf of Mexico without ratifying UNCLOS.

#### And b) if we DID wait to sign UNCLOS to drill, we would be on the hook for paying trillions in royalties to developing and landlocked countries and we would be exposed to costly lawsuits shouldered by taxpayers regarding maritime activity.

Steven Groves, The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy. The Heritage Foundation. 14 July 2012. “The Law of the Sea: Costs of U.S. Accession to UNCLOS.” https://www.heritage.org/testimony/the-law-the-sea-costs-us-accession-unclos

In summary: If the U.S. accedes to UNCLOS, it will be required by Article 82 to transfer royalties generated from hydrocarbon production of the U.S. “extended continental shelf” (ECS) to the International Seabed Authority for redistribution to developing and landlocked countries. Since the value of the hydrocarbon resources lying beneath the U.S. ECS may be worth trillions of dollars, the amount of royalties that the U.S. Treasury would be required to transfer to the Authority would be substantial. In any event, U.S. accession would amount to an open-ended commitment to forgo an incalculable amount of royalty revenue for no appreciable benefit. U.S. accession to UNCLOS is not necessary to develop or secure title to the hydrocarbon resources of the ECS. Under international law and long-standing U.S. policy and practice, the U.S. has established full jurisdiction and control over its ECS and is in the process of delimiting its ECS boundaries on a worldwide basis. The successful delimitation of areas of U.S. ECS and subsequent leasing of those areas in the Gulf of Mexico to U.S. and foreign oil exploration companies demonstrate that the United States does not need to achieve universal international recognition of its ECS to provide “certainty” to oil exploration companies. Proponents of U.S. accession to UNCLOS contend that by failing to join the convention the United States is forbidden from mining the deep seabed—the ocean floor lying beyond the ECS and designated as “the Area.” However, no legal barriers prevent U.S. access, exploration, and exploitation of the resources of the deep seabed. The United States has long held that U.S. corporations and citizens have the right to develop the resources of the deep seabed and may do so whether or not the United States accedes to UNCLOS. U.S. accession to UNCLOS would expose the U.S. to lawsuits regarding virtually any maritime activity, such as alleged pollution of the marine environment from a land-based source or through the atmosphere. Regardless of the lack of merits of such a case, the U.S. would be forced to defend itself against every such lawsuit at great expense to U.S. taxpayers. Any adverse judgment rendered by an UNCLOS tribunal would be final, could not be appealed, and would be enforceable in U.S. territory. Finally, it is not essential or even necessary for the United States to accede to UNCLOS to protect and preserve its navigational rights and freedoms. The navigational and maritime boundary provisions of the convention either codify customary international law that existed well before the convention was adopted in 1982 or “refine and elaborate” navigational rights and regimes that are now widely accepted as binding international law.

#### [TURN]: Arctic drilling is apocalyptic for the environment.

#### The Shankman evidence from case indicates that the heavy fuel oil that would be used in the Arctic releases black carbon soot when burned.

#### There are three reasons it causes warming from the Shankman evidence:

#### 1. Black soot is more potent than other GHGs because of its chemical composition.

#### 2. Black soot darkens the tundra, making it absorb UV radiation instead of reflecting it, making it 2,000 times worse for climate change.

#### 3. Black soot accelerates melting of the permafrost. The Walsh evidence says this could release 1.7 trillion cubic feet of methane, which is 20 times worse for warming.

#### This means warming happens fast than humans can adapt, creating two impacts:

#### First, it increases the chance of conflict by 14% according to the Hsiang evidence.

#### Second, the U of Cambridge evidence indicates that drilling the Arctic could increase the cost of climate change by 60 trillion dollars.

#### Third, the World Bank evidence says that 44% of people who became impoverished over a 25-year period cited weather events as a cause.

Sabrina Shankman. Inside Climate News. 7 April 2018. “Shipping’s Heavy Fuel Oil Puts the Arctic at Risk. Could It Be Banned.” https://insideclimatenews.org/news/06042018/arctic-ocean-ships-heavy-fuel-oil-spills-climate-change-emissions-marine-shipping-imo-ban

Heavy fuel oil—the molasses-like sludge left after the oil refining process—is among the dirtiest fuels on the planet, and yet its use by ships is widespread in the Arctic, a pristine environment where it could do significant harm. Burning the fuel contributes to climate change, and a spill in Arctic waters would be a nightmare for emergency response coordinators. But it's cheap, and attractive for ships making long hauls, the kind of traffic on the rise as climate change makes Arctic shipping easier. Concerns about the safety and use of the fuel in a delicate and remote environment led to it being banned in the Antarctic in 2011, but efforts to include the Arctic in that ban fell short. When oil is refined, once the light and middle distillates (like liquid petroleum gas, kerosene and the gas used in vehicles) are removed, what's left behind are the heavy distillates—wax, lubricating oils, asphalt and heavy fuel oil. For ships operating across long distances, or in cash-strapped communities across the Arctic, heavy fuel oil is a relatively cheap option. But it also has a lot of impurities. When it's burned, that results in emissions like carbon dioxide, as well as short-lived climate pollutants like nitrogen oxide (a precursor to tropospheric ozone), sulfur oxide and black carbon. These short-lived climate pollutants don't linger in the atmosphere for as long as carbon dioxide, but they are significantly more potent—meaning that it in their short lifetimes, they can do a lot to accelerate climate change. In 2015, heavy fuel oil was the most consumed marine fuel in the Arctic, according to the nonprofit International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT), which provides research and technical and scientific analysis to environmental regulators. This was almost 57 percent of the half-million tons of fuel used by ships in the region. The Black Carbon Factor The black carbon, or soot, emitted by burning heavy fuel oil is a two-pronged threat. There's climate-warming, when black carbon enters the atmosphere, and then additional warming when the soot falls back to Earth, blanketing the ice or snow below. One gram of black carbon contributes 100 to 2,000 times more to global warming than one gram of CO2 on a 100-year timescale. A 2015 study found it is responsible for about a half a degree Celsius of warming in the Arctic. Ice or snow that is white reflects much of the sun's radiation. But when it is darkened by black carbon as it falls from the atmosphere, the black carbon absorbs that radiation instead, leading to further warming. That's why black carbon that is emitted locally in the Arctic is so important. "Black carbon emissions from in-Arctic sources have about a fivefold warming effect over black carbon emitted elsewhere," said James. In 2015, more than 2,000 ships operated in the Arctic region, as defined by the IMO, emitting more 193 tons of black carbon, according to a report by the ICCT. In total, 68 percent of that black carbon came from the burning of heavy fuel oil.

Bryan Walsh. Time. 20 July 2012. “It’s Not Just Spills—the Climate Risks of Arctic Drilling.” http://science.time.com/2012/07/20/its-not-just-spills-the-climate-risks-of-arctic-drilling/

But a new report by the NGO Clean Air Task Force (CATF) shows that an oil spill isn’t the only risk that Arctic drilling poses to the environment. Methane and black carbon, two potent greenhouses gases, will likely be emitted in significant amounts if drilling in the Arctic proves as lucrative as many oil companies are hoping for. Exactly how much additional greenhouse gas will be released by the production of Arctic oil isn’t clear—and depends on whether drillers and regulators take steps to reduce the warming side effects of drilling. “It’s ironic that climate change has led to the opening of the Arctic for drilling, but we aren’t paying much attention to the climate change that drilling will help cause,” says Jonathan Banks, senior climate policy advisor for CATF and the author of the report. The main problem isn’t the oil itself—although, of course, if the 90 billion barrels of oil believed to be obtainable in the Arctic are burned in cars or trucks, the carbon released will help undoubtedly help intensify climate change. It’s chiefly the natural gas that will be produced along with that oil. Natural gas is essentially methane—and methane is a powerful, albeit short-lived greenhouse gas, with more than 20 times the warming potential of plain old carbon dioxide. By some estimates, there’s as much as 1.7 trillion cubic ft. of natural gas to be found in the Arctic. But companies like Shell aren’t braving the elements in the Arctic to bring back natural gas. They’re there for the oil, which is worth far more—and not incidentally, is a lot easier to store and transport than gas. Natural gas either needs a pipeline network that can allow it to be shipped from the well to a consumer, or it needs to be cooled to super-low temperatures, after which it can be shipped on an LNG tanker. (Oil, by contrast, can be loaded without any intermediary steps onto a tanker.) There are neither many pipelines nor many LNG facilities in the far North, which means it’s not easy nor cheap for oil companies to actually do anything with the natural gas they’ll be producing alongside all that lovely oil. “The race in the Arctic is about the oil,” says Banks. “But the gas that goes along with it can be a huge source of carbon.”

Robinson Meyer. The Atlantic. 12 February 2018. “Does Climate Change Cause More War?” https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/02/does-climate-change-cause-more-war/553040/

In the past half-decade, a growing body of research—spanning economics, political science, and ancient and modern history—has argued that it can and will. Historians have found temperature or rainfall change implicated in the fall of Rome and the many wars of the 17th century. A team of economists at UC Berkeley and Stanford University have gone further, arguing that an empirical connection between violence and climate change persists across 12,000 years of human history. Meanwhile, high-profile scientists and powerful politicians have endorsed the idea that global warming helped push Syria into civil war. “Climate change did not cause the conflicts we see around the world,” Barack Obama said in 2015, but “drought and crop failures and high food prices helped fuel the early unrest in Syria.” The next year, Bernie Sanders declared that “climate change is directly related to the growth of terrorism.” If you live on a planet expecting changes to temperature or rainfall in the coming decades—which will come faster and stronger than the many natural climate changes of the past—it’s all a bit worrying. So a paper published Monday in Nature Climate Change might seem like a nice respite. After undertaking a large-scale analysis of more than 100 papers published on the topic, the article argues that the connections between climate change and war aren’t as strong as they seem—that the entire literature “overstates the links between both phenomena.” Dalby takes something of a middle ground on the dispute. Going back to the 1990s, he says, a body of literature has “made it clear that environmental change might—in some complicated series of circumstances—lead to conflict, but it was the intervening circumstances that really mattered.” Another researcher who has harped on the focus on Africa is Solomon Hsiang, an economist and professor of public policy at UC Berkeley. In 2013, he and his colleagues noted the preponderance of Africa-focused research in a now-famous study that argued there was an empirical link between conflict and climate change. For every change of a standard deviation in temperature or rainfall, he and his colleagues found that the chance of violent conflict between groups rose by 14 percent. “There is nothing really surprising or new in this study,” he said in an email. “Studying conflict-prone regions isn’t a problem, it’s what you would expect. Nobody is studying Ebola outbreaks by studying why Ebola is not breaking out in cafés in Sydney today, we study what happened in West Africa when there was an actual event.”

Nina Chestney. Scientific American, Reuters. “Arctic Methane Release Could Cost Economy $60 Trillion.” https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/arctic-methane-release-could-cost-60t/

They also looked at lower and slower releases, yet all produced "steep" economic costs stemming from physical changes to the Arctic. "The global impact of a warming Arctic is an economic time-bomb," said Gail Whiteman, an author of the report and professor of sustainability, management and climate change at the Rotterdam School of Management, part of Erasmus University. "In the absence of climate-change mitigation measures, the model calculates that it would increase mean global climate impacts by $60 trillion," said Chris Hope, a reader in policy modeling at the Cambridge Judge Business School, part of the University of Cambridge. That approaches the value of the global economy, which was around $70 trillion last year. The costs could be even greater if other factors such as ocean acidification were included, the study said, or reduced to some $37 trillion if action is taken to lower emissions.

The World Bank. 6 February 2015. “Climate Change Complicates Efforts to End Poverty.” http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2015/02/06/climate-change-complicates-efforts-end-poverty

The poor – both those living in poverty and those just barely above the poverty line – are already the most at risk from climate change. They have the fewest resources to adapt or recovery quickly from shocks, and they often live on the most vulnerable land because it tends to be the most affordable, such as homes along creeks that flood or on hillsides prone to landslides, or farmland with limited water access. The damage extreme weather can to do their homes and businesses can prevent the poor from escaping poverty, and it is often the trigger that tips the vulnerable into poverty. A 25-year survey of households in India’s Andhra Pradesh found that 14 percent of households were able to escape poverty while 12 percent of households became impoverished; of those who slid into poverty, 44 percent cited weather events as a cause. 2) Climate policies benefit the poor over the long-term and can benefit the poor in the short-term when accompanied by appropriate social policies.

#### THEY’RE IN A DOUBLE BIND HERE. EITHER

#### A. DRILLING CAN HAPPEN IN BOTH WORLDS LIKE THE GROVES EVIDENCE SAYS. IF THIS IS TRUE, CLIMATE CHANGE HAPPENS IN BOTH WORLDS, BUT YOU SHOULD VOTE CON TO SAVE TRILLIONS IN ROYALITIES AND LAWSUIT EXPENSES.

#### OR B. UNCLOS *IS* NECESSARY TO DRILL THE ARCTIC. AT THAT POINT, WE OWE TRILLIONS IN ROYALTIES AND LAWSUITS IN THE PRO WORLD ONLY AND THE TERRIBLE HARMS OF CLIMATE CHANGE HAPPEN IN THE PRO WORLD *ONLY*.

#### THAT MEANS YOU’RE VOTING CON EITHER WAY.

#### [HERE’S SOME ANALYSIS ON WHY THE IMAPCTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE OUTWEIGH THE BENEFITS OF DRILLING].

## A2: Drilling is Safe

#### 1. Weigh Arctic Oil Spills over other types. Husseini of Offshore Technology gives three reasons why they are harder to clean up:

#### a. oil eating microbes are slowed down in cold temperatures making it harder to break down oil

#### b. longer sunlight hours in the Arctic makes oil compounds more toxic

#### c. there is no sufficient transportation infrastructure in the Arctic for an oil spill response.

#### 2. The Scientific American quantifies that methane warms the planet at 86x the magnitude that CO2 does.

#### The Shankman evidence from case indicates that the heavy fuel oil that would be used in the Arctic releases black carbon soot when burned.

#### There are three reasons it causes warming from the Shankman evidence:

#### 1. Black soot is more potent than other GHGs because of its chemical composition.

#### 2. Black soot darkens the tundra, making it absorb UV radiation instead of reflecting it, making it 2,000 times worse for climate change.

#### 3. Black soot accelerates melting of the permafrost. The Walsh evidence says this could release 1.7 trillion cubic feet of methane, which is 20 times worse for warming.

#### This means warming happens fast than humans can adapt, creating two impacts:

#### First, it increases the chance of conflict by 14% according to the Hsiang evidence.

#### Second, the U of Cambridge evidence indicates that drilling the Arctic could increase the cost of climate change by 60 trillion dollars.

#### Third, the World Bank evidence says that 44% of people who became impoverished over a 25-year period cited weather events as a cause.

Sabrina Shankman. Inside Climate News. 7 April 2018. “Shipping’s Heavy Fuel Oil Puts the Arctic at Risk. Could It Be Banned.” https://insideclimatenews.org/news/06042018/arctic-ocean-ships-heavy-fuel-oil-spills-climate-change-emissions-marine-shipping-imo-ban

Heavy fuel oil—the molasses-like sludge left after the oil refining process—is among the dirtiest fuels on the planet, and yet its use by ships is widespread in the Arctic, a pristine environment where it could do significant harm. Burning the fuel contributes to climate change, and a spill in Arctic waters would be a nightmare for emergency response coordinators. But it's cheap, and attractive for ships making long hauls, the kind of traffic on the rise as climate change makes Arctic shipping easier. Concerns about the safety and use of the fuel in a delicate and remote environment led to it being banned in the Antarctic in 2011, but efforts to include the Arctic in that ban fell short. When oil is refined, once the light and middle distillates (like liquid petroleum gas, kerosene and the gas used in vehicles) are removed, what's left behind are the heavy distillates—wax, lubricating oils, asphalt and heavy fuel oil. For ships operating across long distances, or in cash-strapped communities across the Arctic, heavy fuel oil is a relatively cheap option. But it also has a lot of impurities. When it's burned, that results in emissions like carbon dioxide, as well as short-lived climate pollutants like nitrogen oxide (a precursor to tropospheric ozone), sulfur oxide and black carbon. These short-lived climate pollutants don't linger in the atmosphere for as long as carbon dioxide, but they are significantly more potent—meaning that it in their short lifetimes, they can do a lot to accelerate climate change. In 2015, heavy fuel oil was the most consumed marine fuel in the Arctic, according to the nonprofit International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT), which provides research and technical and scientific analysis to environmental regulators. This was almost 57 percent of the half-million tons of fuel used by ships in the region. The Black Carbon Factor The black carbon, or soot, emitted by burning heavy fuel oil is a two-pronged threat. There's climate-warming, when black carbon enters the atmosphere, and then additional warming when the soot falls back to Earth, blanketing the ice or snow below. One gram of black carbon contributes 100 to 2,000 times more to global warming than one gram of CO2 on a 100-year timescale. A 2015 study found it is responsible for about a half a degree Celsius of warming in the Arctic. Ice or snow that is white reflects much of the sun's radiation. But when it is darkened by black carbon as it falls from the atmosphere, the black carbon absorbs that radiation instead, leading to further warming. That's why black carbon that is emitted locally in the Arctic is so important. "Black carbon emissions from in-Arctic sources have about a fivefold warming effect over black carbon emitted elsewhere," said James. In 2015, more than 2,000 ships operated in the Arctic region, as defined by the IMO, emitting more 193 tons of black carbon, according to a report by the ICCT. In total, 68 percent of that black carbon came from the burning of heavy fuel oil.

Bryan Walsh. Time. 20 July 2012. “It’s Not Just Spills—the Climate Risks of Arctic Drilling.” http://science.time.com/2012/07/20/its-not-just-spills-the-climate-risks-of-arctic-drilling/

But a new report by the NGO Clean Air Task Force (CATF) shows that an oil spill isn’t the only risk that Arctic drilling poses to the environment. Methane and black carbon, two potent greenhouses gases, will likely be emitted in significant amounts if drilling in the Arctic proves as lucrative as many oil companies are hoping for. Exactly how much additional greenhouse gas will be released by the production of Arctic oil isn’t clear—and depends on whether drillers and regulators take steps to reduce the warming side effects of drilling. “It’s ironic that climate change has led to the opening of the Arctic for drilling, but we aren’t paying much attention to the climate change that drilling will help cause,” says Jonathan Banks, senior climate policy advisor for CATF and the author of the report. The main problem isn’t the oil itself—although, of course, if the 90 billion barrels of oil believed to be obtainable in the Arctic are burned in cars or trucks, the carbon released will help undoubtedly help intensify climate change. It’s chiefly the natural gas that will be produced along with that oil. Natural gas is essentially methane—and methane is a powerful, albeit short-lived greenhouse gas, with more than 20 times the warming potential of plain old carbon dioxide. By some estimates, there’s as much as 1.7 trillion cubic ft. of natural gas to be found in the Arctic. But companies like Shell aren’t braving the elements in the Arctic to bring back natural gas. They’re there for the oil, which is worth far more—and not incidentally, is a lot easier to store and transport than gas. Natural gas either needs a pipeline network that can allow it to be shipped from the well to a consumer, or it needs to be cooled to super-low temperatures, after which it can be shipped on an LNG tanker. (Oil, by contrast, can be loaded without any intermediary steps onto a tanker.) There are neither many pipelines nor many LNG facilities in the far North, which means it’s not easy nor cheap for oil companies to actually do anything with the natural gas they’ll be producing alongside all that lovely oil. “The race in the Arctic is about the oil,” says Banks. “But the gas that goes along with it can be a huge source of carbon.”

Robinson Meyer. The Atlantic. 12 February 2018. “Does Climate Change Cause More War?” https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/02/does-climate-change-cause-more-war/553040/

In the past half-decade, a growing body of research—spanning economics, political science, and ancient and modern history—has argued that it can and will. Historians have found temperature or rainfall change implicated in the fall of Rome and the many wars of the 17th century. A team of economists at UC Berkeley and Stanford University have gone further, arguing that an empirical connection between violence and climate change persists across 12,000 years of human history. Meanwhile, high-profile scientists and powerful politicians have endorsed the idea that global warming helped push Syria into civil war. “Climate change did not cause the conflicts we see around the world,” Barack Obama said in 2015, but “drought and crop failures and high food prices helped fuel the early unrest in Syria.” The next year, Bernie Sanders declared that “climate change is directly related to the growth of terrorism.” If you live on a planet expecting changes to temperature or rainfall in the coming decades—which will come faster and stronger than the many natural climate changes of the past—it’s all a bit worrying. So a paper published Monday in Nature Climate Change might seem like a nice respite. After undertaking a large-scale analysis of more than 100 papers published on the topic, the article argues that the connections between climate change and war aren’t as strong as they seem—that the entire literature “overstates the links between both phenomena.” Dalby takes something of a middle ground on the dispute. Going back to the 1990s, he says, a body of literature has “made it clear that environmental change might—in some complicated series of circumstances—lead to conflict, but it was the intervening circumstances that really mattered.” Another researcher who has harped on the focus on Africa is Solomon Hsiang, an economist and professor of public policy at UC Berkeley. In 2013, he and his colleagues noted the preponderance of Africa-focused research in a now-famous study that argued there was an empirical link between conflict and climate change. For every change of a standard deviation in temperature or rainfall, he and his colleagues found that the chance of violent conflict between groups rose by 14 percent. “There is nothing really surprising or new in this study,” he said in an email. “Studying conflict-prone regions isn’t a problem, it’s what you would expect. Nobody is studying Ebola outbreaks by studying why Ebola is not breaking out in cafés in Sydney today, we study what happened in West Africa when there was an actual event.”

Nina Chestney. Scientific American, Reuters. “Arctic Methane Release Could Cost Economy $60 Trillion.” https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/arctic-methane-release-could-cost-60t/

They also looked at lower and slower releases, yet all produced "steep" economic costs stemming from physical changes to the Arctic. "The global impact of a warming Arctic is an economic time-bomb," said Gail Whiteman, an author of the report and professor of sustainability, management and climate change at the Rotterdam School of Management, part of Erasmus University. "In the absence of climate-change mitigation measures, the model calculates that it would increase mean global climate impacts by $60 trillion," said Chris Hope, a reader in policy modeling at the Cambridge Judge Business School, part of the University of Cambridge. That approaches the value of the global economy, which was around $70 trillion last year. The costs could be even greater if other factors such as ocean acidification were included, the study said, or reduced to some $37 trillion if action is taken to lower emissions.

The World Bank. 6 February 2015. “Climate Change Complicates Efforts to End Poverty.” http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2015/02/06/climate-change-complicates-efforts-end-poverty

The poor – both those living in poverty and those just barely above the poverty line – are already the most at risk from climate change. They have the fewest resources to adapt or recovery quickly from shocks, and they often live on the most vulnerable land because it tends to be the most affordable, such as homes along creeks that flood or on hillsides prone to landslides, or farmland with limited water access. The damage extreme weather can to do their homes and businesses can prevent the poor from escaping poverty, and it is often the trigger that tips the vulnerable into poverty. A 25-year survey of households in India’s Andhra Pradesh found that 14 percent of households were able to escape poverty while 12 percent of households became impoverished; of those who slid into poverty, 44 percent cited weather events as a cause. 2) Climate policies benefit the poor over the long-term and can benefit the poor in the short-term when accompanied by appropriate social policies.

Talal Husseini, 08-14-2018, Oil spills in the ocean: why the Arctic is particularly vulnerable, Offshore Technology, https://www.offshore-technology.com/features/oil-spills-in-the-ocean-arctic/, 9-17-2018

While there has been little research into the effects that oil spills have on the Arctic environment, some studies have shown that the unique climate poses its own challenges, and nature is slower to respond to oil spills than it is in more temperate or tropical conditions. Oil spills in the ocean: the limitations of oil-eating microbe During the clean-up operations of the Exxon Valdez spill in Alaska and Deepwater Horizon in the Gulf of Mexico, only 15% to 25% of oil was successfully removed through mechanical methods, such as mechanical recovery and burning of the spilled oil. The bulk of the clean-up was carried out by oil-eating bacteria in the water. Of particular interest to scientists is the way in which oil-eating microbes are slowed down in ice-cold temperatures. The Arctic Research Centre at Aarhus University in Denmark has found that low temperatures change the chemical properties of the spilled oil and slow down biodegradation. Cold oil is said to be more viscous, making it harder for oil-eating microbes to break it down. The lack of waves in the Arctic Ocean poses another challenge. Where there is sea ice and therefore fewer waves, the oil does not disperse into small droplets. There is also a lower level of nutrients, such as nitrogen and phosphorus, which feed algae and bacteria in the water. Without these nutrients, the bacteria cannot develop at an optimum rate. Another interesting feature is the long (often 24-hour) periods of sunlight in the Arctic summer, which can both help and hinder clean-up operations. On the one hand, long hours of sunlight help the microbes to break up oil molecules, but conversely this could make the oil compounds more toxic for aquatic organisms. Oil spills in the ocean: a collective respons US National Research Council (NRC) committee chair Martha Grabowski noted in a report the lack of a ‘presence’ in the Arctic that can respond to oil spills in the ocean as another challenge. Grabowski says: “A ‘presence’ is bodies, but it is also vessels or platforms, and aerial capability for airlift in the event of an oil spill response. The transportation infrastructure that the rest of us would presuppose to be existing as it is in the lower 48 [region of the US mainland] simply doesn’t exist up north [i.e. in the Arctic].”

Gayathri Vaidyanathan,Climatewire, 12-22-2015, How Bad of a Greenhouse Gas Is Methane?, Scientific American, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-bad-of-a-greenhouse-gas-is-methane/, 9-17-2018

At issue is the global warming potential (GWP), a number that allows experts to compare methane with its better-known cousin, carbon dioxide. While CO2 persists in the atmosphere for centuries, or even millennia, methane warms the planet on steroids for a decade or two before decaying to CO2. In those short decades, methane warms the planet by 86 times as much as CO2, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. But policymakers typically ignore methane's warming potential over 20 years (GWP20) when assembling a nation's emissions inventory. Instead, they stretch out methane's warming impacts over a century, which makes the gas appear more benign than it is, experts said. The 100-year warming potential (GWP100) of methane is 34, according to the IPCC. There is no scientific reason to prefer a 100-year time horizon over a 20-year time horizon; the choice of GWP100 is simply a matter of convention. The 100-year GWP value underestimates the gas's negative impacts by almost five times, said Ilissa Ocko, a climate scientist at the nonprofit Environmental Defense Fund. The quick warming in the short run catalyzed by methane can affect environmental processes, such as the flowering of plants, she said at the American Geophysical Union meeting last week. "The short-lived climate pollutants [like methane] that we emit from human activities are basically controlling how fast the warming occurs," she said. "This is because they are very powerful at absorbing radiation." EDF and some scientists are calling on the United Nations and policymakers to stop relying on GWP100. They would instead like experts to use GWP20 and GWP100 as a slashed pair.

## Weighing

#### Weigh Arctic Oil Spills over other types. Husseini of Offshore Technology gives three reasons why they are harder to clean up:

#### a. oil eating microbes are slowed down in cold temperatures making it harder to break down oil

#### b. longer sunlight hours in the Arctic makes oil compounds more toxic

#### c. there is no sufficient transportation infrastructure in the Arctic for an oil spill response.

Weigh methane and black carbon

#### 2. Walsh of Time Magazine quantifies drilling the arctic could release 1.7 trillion cubic feet of methane, which The Scientific American quantifies warms the planet at 86x the magnitude that CO2 does.

#### The release of black carbon from the permafrost and ships is bad as Shankman of Inside Climate News gives three reasons why the release of black carbon accelerates global warming.

#### 1. Black soot is more potent than other GHGs because of its chemical composition.

#### 2. Black soot darkens the tundra, making it absorb UV radiation instead of reflecting it, making it 2,000 times worse for climate change.

#### 3. Black soot accelerates melting of the permafrost.

# A2: Securing Access to Deep Sea Mining

#### [TURN]: The U.S. should just mine without acceding because it’s more profitable. Groves of the Davis Institute for Foreign Policy explains in 2012 that:

#### a) “no legal barriers prevent U.S. access, exploration, and exploitation of the resources of the deep seabed.”

#### And b) if we DID wait to sign UNCLOS to mine, we would be exposed to costly lawsuits shouldered by taxpayers regarding maritime activity.

#### This means the U.S. should mine without acceding because it is less expensive and still legal.

Steven Groves, The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy. The Heritage Foundation. 14 July 2012. “The Law of the Sea: Costs of U.S. Accession to UNCLOS.” https://www.heritage.org/testimony/the-law-the-sea-costs-us-accession-unclos

U.S. accession to UNCLOS is not necessary to develop or secure title to the hydrocarbon resources of the ECS. Under international law and long-standing U.S. policy and practice, the U.S. has established full jurisdiction and control over its ECS and is in the process of delimiting its ECS boundaries on a worldwide basis. The successful delimitation of areas of U.S. ECS and subsequent leasing of those areas in the Gulf of Mexico to U.S. and foreign oil exploration companies demonstrate that the United States does not need to achieve universal international recognition of its ECS to provide “certainty” to oil exploration companies. Proponents of U.S. accession to UNCLOS contend that by failing to join the convention the United States is forbidden from mining the deep seabed—the ocean floor lying beyond the ECS and designated as “the Area.” However, no legal barriers prevent U.S. access, exploration, and exploitation of the resources of the deep seabed. The United States has long held that U.S. corporations and citizens have the right to develop the resources of the deep seabed and may do so whether or not the United States accedes to UNCLOS. U.S. accession to UNCLOS would expose the U.S. to lawsuits regarding virtually any maritime activity, such as alleged pollution of the marine environment from a land-based source or through the atmosphere. Regardless of the lack of merits of such a case, the U.S. would be forced to defend itself against every such lawsuit at great expense to U.S. taxpayers. Any adverse judgment rendered by an UNCLOS tribunal would be final, could not be appealed, and would be enforceable in U.S. territory. Finally, it is not essential or even necessary for the United States to accede to UNCLOS to protect and preserve its navigational rights and freedoms. The navigational and maritime boundary provisions of the convention either codify customary international law that existed well before the convention was adopted in 1982 or “refine and elaborate” navigational rights and regimes that are now widely accepted as binding international law.

## A2: Energy Resources

#### [TURN]: If the U.S. did accede to UNCLOS for the purposes of energy resources, we’d probably turn to the Arctic because it has the most energy. Indeed, Gardener of the American Security Project writes in 2012 that the U.S. continental shelf of the Arctic holds 72 billion barrels of natural gas. Turning to the Arctic would be detrimental because [pull Shankman paragraph lol)

Robert Gardener. American Security Project. 13 June 2012. “US Must Ratify Law of Sea Convention.” https://www.americansecurityproject.org/us-must-ratify-law-of-sea-convention/

The US is literally on the outside looking in as nations divide valuable resources it could be legally claiming. The US continental shelf is estimated to extend at least 600 miles into the Arctic Sea off the coast of Alaska. This region, called the Arctic Alaska Province, is an incredibly recourse richest area, estimated by the USGS to hold 29.96 billion barrels of oil and 72 billion barrels of natural gas (about 33% of technically recoverable oil and 18% of technically recoverable gas in the Arctic). Supporters of the treaty assert that through acquiring resource rights, the US could substantially increase its domestic oil and natural gas production in the long term. Such production would lead to greater US energy security and greater investment and employment in the energy sector.

## A2: Rare Earth Minerals

### A2: Chinese Monopoly

#### [DELINK]: This isn’t going to be a problem. Daly of Reuters reports on September 18 that the US removed rare earth metals from the initial list of tariffs placed on Chinese imports.

Tom Daly, 9-18-2018, U.S. gives rare earths reprieve in revised $200 billion China..., U.S., https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trade-china-minerals/u-s-gives-rare-earths-reprieve-in-revised-200-billion-china-tariff-list-idUSKCN1LY0QK, 9-18-2018

China is the world’s largest producer of rare earths and the biggest supplier to the United States, according the U.S. Geological Survey.Rare earth elements and minor metals have broad applications in U.S. industry, ranging from jet engines to mobile phones to oil and gas drilling. Most of the minerals the U.S. had originally targeted for tariffs were on a list of 35 minerals published by the U.S. Department of the Interior in May that were deemed critical to the country’s security and economic prosperity. Rare earth metals and their compounds, as well as mixtures of rare earth oxides or chlorides, were all included on a provisional list of tariffs on Chinese goods unveiled by the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) in July. However, the final list released on Monday does not mention rare earths, a group of 15 lanthanide metallic elements plus the metals scandium and yttrium. The latest tariffs will go into effect on Sept. 24 at a rate of 10 percent. Permanent metal magnets and articles intended to become permanent magnets, which could include rare earth oxides neodymium and praseodymium, also dropped off the list. That category accounted for $191.2 million of imports in 2017, according to the USTR. The United States is aware of the strategic importance of rare earth metals as illustrated by a U.S. law passed last month that bans the purchase of rare earth magnets from China for the military in the 2019 fiscal year, said Dylan Kelly, a resources analyst at brokerage CLSA in Sydney. The law “clearly highlighted how exposed the nation was to any kind of disruption to the Chinese supply chain,” said Kelly. U.S. politicians “should be very aware of the corner they have pinned themselves into.” Whether the Chinese will retaliate and use rare earths as a bargaining chip or “strategic lever” in future talks with the United States remains to be seen, Kelly said. “But obviously that’s where a lot of investors have focused their attention.” Some minor metals used in high-tech industries, such as bismuth, titanium and cobalt, are still on the tariff list. However, barite and antimony are not included in the new tariffs. Antimony, along with antimony oxide, made up $108.5 million of imports from China last year, according to USTR data. Natural graphite, which is used in steelmaking and lithium-ion batteries, also won a reprieve. Tungsten, used to harden steel, now only features in 11 categories on the final tariff list, half the original number.

#### [DELINK]: The Chinese monopoly is fake news. Berke of Business Insider reports in April that Japan has found a semi-infinite, 16-million-ton deposit of rare earth minerals that experts say could fulfill the worldwide demand for centuries. Japan is a close U.S. ally–it would be easy for us to import from them.

Jeremy Berke. Business Insider. 13 April 2018. “Japan just found a 'semi-infinite' deposit of rare-earth minerals — and it could be a 'game-changer' in competition with China.” https://www.businessinsider.com/rare-earth-minerals-found-in-japan-2018-4

Researchers have found a deposit of rare-earth minerals off the coast of Japan that could supply the world for centuries, according to a new study. The study, published in the journal Nature on Tuesday, says the deposit contains 16 million tons of the valuable metals. Rare-earth minerals are used in everything from smartphone batteries to electric vehicles. By definition, these minerals contain one or more of 17 metallic rare-earth elements (for those familiar with the periodic table, those are on the second row from the bottom).

####  [TURN]: China didn’t monopolize the rare earth market. The rest of the world willingly let them have it. Vincent continues that purifying rare earth metals from soil is “expensive, difficult, and dangerous.” Indeed, Kaiman of the Guardian finds in 2014 that people routinely die of cancer in China due to the chemicals associated with REM mining. For this reason, Vincent concludes “the West has been happy to cede production of rare earths to China.”

James Vincent. The Verge. 17 April 2018. “China can’t control the market in rare earth elements because they aren’t all that rare.” https://www.theverge.com/2018/4/17/17246444/rare-earth-metals-discovery-japan-china-monopoly

Rare earth ore goes through these steps hundreds and hundreds of times, and for each new mining location, the concentration of the acids used has to be recalculated in order to target the specific impurities in the soil. To top it off, the whole process produces any number of nasty chemical byproducts and is radioactive. The whole process is “expensive, difficult, and dangerous,” says former rare earth trader and freelance journalist Tim Worstall. He tells The Verge that, because of this, the West has been more or less happy to cede production of rare earths to China. From the 1960s to the ‘80s, the US did actually supply the world with these elements; all extracted from a single mine in California named Mountain Pass. But in the ‘90s, China entered the market and drove down prices, making Mountain Pass unprofitable and leading to its closure in 2002. Worstall says there are many reasons production moved overseas. Some of these are familiar: cheap labor costs and a willingness to overlook environmental damage, for example. But there’s also the fact that rare earth production in China is often a byproduct of other mining operations. “The biggest plant there is actually an iron ore mine which extracts rare earths on the side,” says Worstall. This means that, unlike the Mountain Pass mine, producers aren’t reliant on a single product. “If you are trying to only produce rare earths, then you’re subject to the swings and roundabouts of the market.”

Jonathan Kaiman. The Guardian. 20 March 2014. “Rare earth mining in China: the bleak social and environmental costs.” https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/rare-earth-mining-china-social-environmental-costs

A short walk from the 43-year-old former farmer's dilapidated brick home in Xinguang Number One Village, is the world's largest rare earths mine tailings pond – an endless expanse of viscous grey sludge built in the 1950s under Mao Zedong. The pond, owned by the Inner Mongolia Baotou Steel Rare-Earth Hi-Tech Company, or Baotou Steel, lacks a proper lining and for the past 20 years its toxic contents have been seeping into groundwater, according to villagers and state media reports. It is trickling towards the nearby Yellow River, a major drinking water source for much of northern China, at a rate of 20 to 30 metres a year, a local expert told the influential Chinese magazine Caixin. "In the beginning, there was no tap water here, so we all drank from wells," Wang said. "The water looked fine, but it smelled really bad." In the 1990s, when China's rare earths production kicked into full gear, his sheep died and his cabbage crops withered. Most of his neighbours have moved away. Seven have died of cancer. His teeth have grown yellow and crooked; they jut out at strange angles from blackened gums. Rare earths are a group of 17 elements: "iron grey to silvery lustrous metals" that are "typically soft, malleable, and ductile; and usually reactive", according to the US Geological Survey. They're crucial in manufacturing a broad array of high-tech products, such as smartphones, wind turbines, camera lenses, magnets and missile defence systems. China produces more than 85% of the world's supply, about half of which comes from Baotou, a city of 2.5 million in China's Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, 650km northwest of Beijing.

#### [DELINK]: China has never been able to use their “monopoly” for market power or political leverage. Vincent of the Verge explains in 2018 that China tried to limit rare earth exports following a 2010 dispute with Japan, but the rest of the world easily picked up slack and the problem faded.

James Vincent. The Verge. 17 April 2018. “China can’t control the market in rare earth elements because they aren’t all that rare.” https://www.theverge.com/2018/4/17/17246444/rare-earth-metals-discovery-japan-china-monopoly

This news was positioned as having great geopolitical significance. China currently produces more than 90 percent of the world’s supply of rare earth materials (the exact figure tends to fluctuate year-by-year), and in the event of a conflict, said reports, it could jack up prices for the West and its allies, or even shut them out altogether. In this eventuality, the Minamitori hoard would be a lifeline. “It is important to secure our own source of resources, given how China controls the prices,” Professor Yutaro Takaya Waseda, who led the Japanese research team, told The Wall Street Journal. But experts say the narrative here is wrong. Despite appearances, the Minamitori find is not as significant as headlines have implied. And although China seems to wield great power over this critical global supply chain, the truth is that the country can’t just bring the West to its knees by limiting the export of rare earth elements. We know this pretty conclusively because it tried this in 2010, and it didn’t work out. In both cases, the overlooked factor is just how difficult it is to produce rare earth elements, compared to how easy it is to find them. The name “rare earth” is a historical misnomer, stemming from that when they first discovered, they were difficult to extract from surrounding matter. The USGS (United States Geological Survey) describes rare earth elements as “moderately abundant,” meaning that although they’re not as common as elements like oxygen, silicon, aluminum, and iron (which together make up 90 percent of the Earth’s crust), they’re still well dispersed around the planet. Worstall says there are many reasons production moved overseas. Some of these are familiar: cheap labor costs and a willingness to overlook environmental damage, for example. But there’s also the fact that rare earth production in China is often a byproduct of other mining operations. “The biggest plant there is actually an iron ore mine which extracts rare earths on the side,” says Worstall. This means that, unlike the Mountain Pass mine, producers aren’t reliant on a single product. “If you are trying to only produce rare earths, then you’re subject to the swings and roundabouts of the market.” All this looks like it gives China immense power over the market, but the truth is the world is benefiting at China’s expense. Proof of this came in 2010 when China did actually start limiting rare earth exports because of a dispute with Japan. This threat to the supply chain caused prices to rise, and so investment flowed into new and old rare earth mining projects. Meanwhile, consumers of rare earths like Hitachi and Mitsubishi altered their products to use less of each substance. In other words, when China tried to take advantage of its monopoly and limit supply, the rest of the world picked up the slack. As a think tank report on the fallout from the 2010 incident put it: “Even with such apparently favorable circumstances, market power and political leverage proved fleeting and difficult [for China] to exploit.” Markets responded and “the problem rapidly faded.” (Money even flowed back into Mountain Pass for a while, although the company in charge, Molycorp, collapsed in 2015 when rare earth prices fell back to 2010 levels.) So what does all this mean for last week’s news? Well, mostly that it’s not as important as it might first appear. There are plenty of other sources for these elements, and ways to circumvent China’s control of the global supply. Worstall, writing for The Continental Telegraph, points out that last week’s find is nearly identical to one announced by some of the same Japanese scientists in 2011, and he tells The Verge that although the sea bed is most likely home to many rare earth elements, there’s still the challenge of processing the stuff and actually getting it out of the sea and into a usable form.

### A2: Used in Renewables

#### [TURN]: Tim Hefferman of HCN explains in 2015 that the majority of rare earth minerals aren’t used for green tech, but rather to further oil and fossil fuel production. We’d say a better way to transition to renewables would be to keep the supply of oil and minerals low so that prices increase. Professor Ross of the University of Houston writes in April that high oil prices would spur investment in renewables.

Tim Hefferman. High Country News. June 16, 2015. “Why rare-earth mining in the West is a bust.” https://www.hcn.org/issues/47.11/why-rare-earth-mining-in-the-west-is-a-bust

The segment was good television. It was good politics — Alaska Republican Sen. Lisa Murkowski cited it the next morning in a call for more federal support of mining. But it was not good journalism. Modern life, or at least its smooth functioning, does depend on rare-earth elements. But it’s absurd to single them out as uniquely vital to the U.S. economy, let alone as a unique vulnerability. American manufacturers in 2014 imported just $210 million worth of rare earths, or about 12,000 tons, just 8 percent of global production. (China’s share of those imports was 75 percent, not 90-plus.) No American manufacturer or defense contractor — not even the Pentagon itself — has ever indicated supply problems. Moreover, more than half of rare earths are simply used as catalysts in petroleum refining; most of the rest go into cars, digital devices and lighting. And the rest of the world is happy to sell America as much oil, autos and gadgetry as it wants. More broadly, modern life depends on the energy-critical elements, or ECEs. Taken together, they underpin many of the technologies that fall under the “green” or digital umbrellas. In addition to the rare earths, they include the familiar metal lithium, used in the batteries that power phones, laptops and hybrid cars; the obscure metal rhenium, which strengthens the turbine blades of latest-generation, super-efficient jet engines; and vanadium, employed in megawatt-capacity batteries that help rationalize the variable output of wind farms and other zero-emission electricity sources.

Chris Ross. University of Houston. 5 April 2018. “Prices Are Up, But Challenges Remain For Oil And Gas Companies.” https://www.forbes.com/sites/uhenergy/2018/04/05/prices-are-up-but-challenges-remain-for-oil-and-gas-companies/#10a15233213d

Geopolitics seem unusually fragile today, and wars are raging close to major oil and gas resources. Though some oil companies are hoping for stronger prices, there is a genuine risk that another oil crisis might initiate a “three strikes and you’re out” cycle, as high oil prices spur increased investment and innovation in batteries and renewables. Negative perceptions lead to legal challenges. States, cities and investor groups are suing large oil companies for marketing products that, when burned, release greenhouse gases with potential adverse consequences to their citizens. Environmental non-governmental organizations have expanded their missions from “beyond coal” to “beyond fossil fuels,” and are organizing to impede infrastructure projects with the intent to limit oil and gas producers’ access to markets. Politicians curry favor by withholding required permits.

#### [DELINK]: REMs aren’t key to solar. The American Chemical Society finds in 2012 that new tech in solar panels means earth-abundant materials can be used and achieve the same efficiency.

ACS 12 (American Chemical Society, “New solar panels made with more common metals could be cheaper and more sustainable”, 8/21/12, http://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/pressroom/newsreleases/2012/august/new-solar-panels-made-with-more-common-metals-could-be-cheaper-and-more-sustainable.html)

With enough sunlight falling on home roofs to supply at least half of America’s electricity, scientists today described advances toward the less-expensive solar energy technology needed to roof many of those homes with shingles that generate electricity. Shingles that generate electricity from the sun, and can be installed like traditional roofing, already are a commercial reality. But the advance ― a new world performance record for solar cells made with “earth-abundant” materials ― could make them more affordable and ease the integration of photovoltaics into other parts of buildings, the scientists said. Their report was part of a symposium on sustainability at the 244th National Meeting & Exposition of the American Chemical Society, the world’s largest scientific society, being held here this week. Abstracts of other presentations appear below. “Sustainability involves developing technology that can be productive over the long-term, using resources in ways that meet today’s needs without jeopardizing the ability of future generations to meet their needs,” said Harry A. Atwater, Ph.D., one of the speakers. “That’s exactly what we are doing with these new solar-energy conversion devices.” The new photovoltaic technology uses abundant, less-expensive materials like copper and zinc ― “earth-abundant materials” ― instead of indium, gallium and other so-called “rare earth” elements. These substances not only are scarce, but are supplied largely by foreign countries, with China mining more than 90 percent of the rare earths needed for batteries in hybrid cars, magnets, electronics and other high-tech products. Atwater and James C. Stevens, Ph.D., described successful efforts to replace rare earth and other costly metals in photovoltaic devices with materials that are less-expensive and more sustainable. Atwater, a physicist at the California Institute of Technology, and Stevens, a chemist with The Dow Chemical Company, lead a partnership between their institutions to develop new electronic materials suitable for use in solar-energy-conversion devices. Atwater and Stevens described development and testing of new devices made with zinc phosphide and copper oxide that broke records for both electrical current and voltage achieved by existing so-called thin-film solar energy conversion devices made with zinc and copper. The advance adds to evidence that materials like zinc phosphide and copper oxide should be capable of achieving very high efficiencies, producing electricity at a cost approaching that of coal-fired power plants. That milestone could come within 20 years, Atwater said. Stevens helped develop Dow’s PowerHouse Solar Shingle, introduced in October 2011, which generates electricity and nevertheless can be installed like traditional roofing. The shingles use copper indium gallium diselenide photovoltaic technology. His team now is eyeing incorporation of sustainable earth-abundant materials into PowerHouse shingles, making them more widely available. “The United States alone has about 69 billion square feet of appropriate residential rooftops that could be generating electricity from the sun,” Stevens said. “The sunlight falling on those roofs could generate at least 50 percent of the nation’s electricity, and some estimates put that number closer to 100 percent. With earth-abundant technology, that energy could be harvested, at an enormous benefit to consumers and the environment.”

# A2: Oil Shocks

#### [DELINK] Oil prices don’t dictate inflation rates anymore. Lioudis of Investopedia finds in June of 2018 that after the 1979 oil crisis the correlation between oil prices and inflation has weakened significantly.

#### [DELINK] Cook finds in April of 2018 that increases in oil prices alone do not cause a recession but an increase in the federal interest rate AND increase in energy price that causes a recession.

Nick K. Lioudis, 6-4-2018, What is the relationship between oil prices and inflation?, Investopedia, https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/06/oilpricesinflation.asp, 9-17-2018

The direct relationship between oil and inflation was evident in the 1970s, when the cost of oil rose from a nominal price of $3 before the 1973 oil crisis to around $40 during the 1979 oil crisis. This helped cause the [consumer price index](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/consumerpriceindex.asp) (CPI), a key measure of inflation, to more than double to 86.30 by the end of 1980 from 41.20 in early 1972. To put this into greater perspective, while it had previously taken 24 years (1947-1971) for the CPI to double, it took about eight years during the 1970s However, this relationship between oil and inflation started to deteriorate after the 1980s. During the 1990's Gulf War oil crisis, crude oil prices doubled in six months to around $40 from $20, but CPI remained relatively stable, growing to 137.9 in December 1991 from 134.6 in January 1991. This detachment in the relationship was even more apparent during the [oil price run-up](https://www.investopedia.com/articles/economics/08/determining-oil-prices.asp) from 1999 to 2005, when the annual average nominal price of oil rose to $50.04 from $16.56. During this same period, the CPI rose to 196.80 in December 2005 from 164.30 in January 1999. Using this data, it appears that the strong [correlation](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/correlation.asp) between oil prices and inflation that was seen in the 1970s has weakened significantly.

Peter Cook, 4-27-2018, Does Surging Oil Prices Cause Recession? Depends On The Fed, No Publication, https://realinvestmentadvice.com/does-ring-oil-prices-cause-recession-depends-on-the-fed/, 9-18-2018

Enter the price of crude oil.  During the 1960s, the price of crude oil was essentially fixed, so the recession of the late 1960s cannot be attributed to a change in the price of oil, as shown below.  However, a spike in oil prices (defined as a doubling or more) preceded all the other recessions since the late 1960s.   Interestingly, during the Fed rate hikes of 1983-84 and 1994-95, oil prices were either falling or relatively stable, which may explain why the economy avoided recession.  Similar to Fed rate hikes, a doubling of oil alone does not cause a recession.   For example, in the period 2010-14, and again 2016-2018, oil prices rose two to three times, yet a recession did not occur. By putting the two charts in proximity, it becomes clear that a recession only occurs when the Fed Funds rate rose by at least 2.00-2.50% AND the price of crude oil doubled (or more)\*.  When only one of the variables is rising sharply, a false alarm is triggered. For example, there was no recession during the Fed Funds hikes of 1983-84 and 1994-95, because the price of oil was falling or stable.  From 2010-14, the price of oil more than doubled, but the Fed wasn’t raising rates, so there was no recession.  The charts above are annotated with a red X to show instances when only one variable rose significantly. The important takeaway and economic rationale for this logic are that when the price of money AND the price of energy are rising sharply, it causes a retrenchment in consumer and commercial behavior that leads to a recession.

# \*\*\*Asia-Pacific\*\*\*

# A2: Countering Chinese Expansion in SCS

## A2: Tribunal/UNCLOS solves SCS

#### [BIG DELINK – BE CAREFUL ROSHNI]: China won’t listen to UNCLOS. Phillips of the Guardian reports in 2016 that there was already an international tribunal ruling that opposed Chinese claims in the SCS in 2016 but Beijing rejected it and did not accept the ruling.

Tom Phillips, 7-12-2016, Beijing rejects tribunal's ruling in South China Sea case, Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jul/12/philippines-wins-south-china-sea-case-against-china, 9-21-2018

China has said it will not accept a ruling against it in a key international legal case over strategic reefs and atolls that Beijing claims would give it control over disputed waters of the South China Sea. The judgment by an international tribunal in The Hague came down overwhelmingly in favour of claims by the Philippines and is likely to increase global diplomatic pressure on Beijing to scale back military expansion in the area. By depriving certain outcrops of territorial-generating status, the ruling from the permanent court of arbitration effectively punches holes in China’s all-encompassing “nine-dash” line that stretches deep into the South China Sea. The Chinese president, Xi Jinping, said China’s “territorial sovereignty and marine rights” in the seas would not be affected by the ruling, which declared large areas of the sea to be neutral international waters or the exclusive economic zones of other countries. He insisted China was still “committed to resolving disputes” with its neighbours. Chinese state media reacted angrily to the verdict. Xinhua, the country’s official news agency, hit out at what it described as an “ill-founded” ruling that was “naturally null and void”. The Communist party mouthpiece newspaper the People’s Daily said in an editorial that the tribunal had ignored “basic truths” and “trampled” on international laws and norms. “The Chinese government and the Chinese people firmly oppose [the ruling] and will neither acknowledge it nor accept it,” it added. The Philippine foreign affairs secretary, Perfecto Yasay Jr, said the country welcomed the ruling and called for “restraint and sobriety”. The US State Department called on both parties to comply with their obligations, according to a statement from spokesman John Kirby. The ruling makes grim reading for Beijing and contains a series of criticisms of China’s actions and claims. The tribunal declared that “although Chinese navigators and fishermen, as well as those of other states, had historically made use of the islands in the South China Sea, there was no evidence that China had historically exercised exclusive control over the waters or their resources. “The tribunal concluded that there was no legal basis for China to claim historic rights to resources within the sea areas falling within the ‘nine-dash line’.”

## A2: Reassuring Allies

#### [TURN]: FONOPs create the potential for conflict in the South China Sea. This is empirically proven. Pham of the Diplomat explains in May that “following [a U.S.] FONOP, China carried out combat naval exercises and deployed additional troops the Spratly archipelago.” The chance for miscalculation is higher than ever according to the Kulacki evidence from case. These FONOPs are a sure fire way to initiate conflict in the South China Sea.

Tuan Pham. The Diplomat. 2 May 2018. “Now is Not the Time to Back Down in the South China Sea.” https://thediplomat.com/2018/05/now-is-not-the-time-to-back-down-in-the-south-china-sea/

On April 22, Chinese maritime researchers proposed a new boundary in the South China Sea (SCS) that they say will help the study of natural science, while adding weight to Beijing’s claims over the disputed waters and preparing for possible future changes in its SCS policy. A week prior, People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) vessels reportedly challenged Australian naval ships as they transited the strategic waterway toward Vietnam. On March 23, a U.S. Navy vessel purportedly conducted a freedom of navigation operation (FONOP) in the contested waters. Following the FONOP, China coincidentally carried out combat naval exercises and claimed to have deploy additional troops to and set up territorial defense equipment in the Spratly archipelago. Altogether, the forceful moves underscore a calculated campaign by Beijing to determinedly reassert and preserve respectively its perceived sovereignty and territorial integrity in the SCS through words and deeds. If so, the testimony of Admiral Phil Davidson – the newly confirmed U.S. Pacific Commander – to the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee may be more noteworthy in terms of its alarming content, context, and tone. He asserted that Beijing has built up enough military infrastructure in the SCS to completely control the disputed waterway.

Kulacki 16 [Gregory Kulacki (China Project Manager in the UCS Global Security Program) May 2016 [“The Risk of Nuclear War with China: A Troubling Lack of Urgency” online @ <http://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/05/Nuclear-War-with-China.pdf>]

**Twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year, the governments of the United States and the People’s Republic of China are a few poor decisions away from starting a war that could escalate rapidly and end in a nuclear exchange. Mismatched perceptions increase both the possibility of war and the likelihood it will result in the use of nuclear weapons. Miscommunication or misunderstanding could spark a conflict that both governments may find difficult to stop**. War between the United States and the People’s Republic of China is not inevitable, but failing to acknowledge the risks is certain to make it more likely. Introduction The possibility that the United States of America and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) could become involved in a nuclear war is increasing. Both governments must acknowledge the danger if they hope to avoid it. Several factors contribute to the risk of a nuclear war between the United States and the People’s Republic of China: • The United States and China have a contentious history. Mutual mistrust sustains an entrenched and deepening antagonism despite sincere and occasionally successful efforts to cooperate on shared concerns such as climate change and nuclear terrorism. • Both governments are preparing for war, including improving their nuclear arsenals. U.S. and PRC decision makers believe they need a demonstrable readiness to use military force— including nuclear weapons—to ensure the other nation will yield in a military confrontation. • U.S. and PRC leaders try to avoid conflict, but their discussions of contentious issues are inadequate. The extensive military exchanges the governments have conducted have produced memoranda of understanding on the conduct of naval vessels and aircraft, but strategic dialogues on their nuclear forces, missile defenses, and anti-satellite weapons are perfunctory. • U.S. and PRC officials see the risk differently. U.S. officials are concerned that if a military conflict starts, they may need to use nuclear weapons to stop it. PRC officials assume that no nation would ever invite nuclear retaliation by using nuclear weapons first. Their concern is to assure the PRC maintains a credible ability to retaliate after a U.S. nuclear attack.

### A2: South Korea Military Drills

#### [MITIGATE]: The U.S.-North Korea Singapore summit is the reason why we stopped military drills. Tara Copp of the Military Times writes on August 29 that Trump stopped conducting US-South Korea military drills as a good faith measure coming out of the summit. He also said that the drills can be instantly started whenever he chooses to do so.

Tara Copp, 8-29-2018, Trump makes it clear: No military exercises with South Korea, Military Times, https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2018/08/29/trump-makes-it-clear-no-military-exercises-with-south-korea/, 9-17-2018

A day after Defense Secretary Jim Mattis said there were no plans to cancel future joint U.S.-South Korea military exercises, President Donald Trump made it clear: they’re not happening. In a bizarre “Statement from the White House” that Trump tweeted from his personal account, but then referred to himself in the third person, Trump said, “the President believes that his relationship with Kim Jong Un is a very good and warm one, and there is no reason at this time to be spending large amounts of money on joint U.S.-South Korea war games." The statement seemed to be in response to initial confusion from Tuesday’s Pentagon press briefing with Mattis, who in response to a reporter’s question on the exercises, said, “we took the step to suspend several of the largest exercises as a good-faith measure coming out of the Singapore summit. We have no plans at this time to suspend any more exercises.” Earlier this year, the Pentagon suspended Ulchi Freeedom Guardian, which involves 17,500 U.S. forces and last year included almost two weeks of exercises with their South Korean counterparts. The exercises were suspended at Trump’s request because he viewed them as too expensive and counterproductive to his denuclearization talks with North Korean leader Kim Jong Un. Those talks are diplomat-led, and on Tuesday Mattis deferred to his counterpart, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, saying that whatever Pompeo needed in order to make progress with North Korea on the denuclearization talks, “we will certainly do to reinforce his effort,” Mattis said. “But at this time, there is no discussion about further suspensions.” The next major exercises to take place are traditionally scheduled for the spring — Foal Eagle and Max Thunder are major ground and joint air exercises that help improve South Korean and U.S. interoperability. Kim was reportedly so incensed about Max Thunder this year that he threatened to walk away from the historic summit talks with South Korea and the U.S. The exercises are a necessary part of maintaining the readiness of U.S. forces on the Korean Peninsula. After some media outlets reported that Mattis' remarks at the Tuesday briefing meant exercises were about to resume, he issued a clarifying statement Wednesday afternoon. “The Department of Defense suspended three individual military exercises in order to provide space for our diplomats to negotiate the verifiable, irreversible and complete de-nuclearization of the Korean Peninsula,” he said in the Pentagon-released statement. “Our military posture has not changed since the conclusion of the Singapore summit and no decisions have been made about suspending any future exercises.” In his Wednesday tweet, Trump said the decision to exercise military forces serving in Korea would be made by the White House, not the Pentagon. “The President can instantly start the joint exercises again with South Korea, and Japan, if he so chooses. If he does, they will be far bigger than ever before," Trump tweeted,

### A2: Japan

#### [DELINK]: It’s too late. Japan is already militarizing. Reuters reports in March that Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has “stressed his intention to revise Japan’s pacifist post-war constitution. Under Abe, Japan has been investing heavily in its military,” including purchasing F-35 fighters.

Reuters. 25 March 2018. “As Japan Continues to Militarize, PM Vows to Revise Japan's Pacifist Constitution.” https://www.haaretz.com/world-news/asia-and-australia/japan-s-pm-vows-to-revise-japan-s-pacifist-constitution-1.5938673

Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, his ratings in a slump amid a suspected cronyism scandal and cover-up, apologised again on Sunday for causing anxiety and loss of confidence in his government. Protesters urged Abe to resign, as riot police kept tight security outside the venue of his ruling party's annual convention, at which the premier stressed his intention to revise Japan's pacifist post-war, U.S.-drafted constitution. Abe faces his biggest political crisis since taking office in December 2012 as suspicions swirl about a sale of state-owned land at a huge discount to a nationalist school operator with ties to his wife. "We're protesting to defeat Abe's government through our voices and the anger of the people," said Fumiko Katsuragi, 69, who was among hundreds of protesters gathered in a Tokyo park where cherry blossoms were in full bloom. Some held banners that read "Go to jail Abe" and "No constitutional revision or war," while right-wingers gathered nearby amid police security. Under Abe, Japan has been investing heavily in its military, including purchasing some twenty stealth F-35A fighters this past February. In December 2017 reports surfaced that Japan is considering refitting the Izumo helicopter carrier so that it can land U.S. Marines F-35B stealth fighters as Tokyo faces China’s maritime expansion and North Korea’s missile and nuclear development. Also at the party convention, the LDP adopted a proposal to revise the pacifist constitution in line with a plan floated by Abe last year to explicitly refer to the Self-Defense Forces, as Japan's military is known.

#### [DELINK]: UNCLOS does nothing to solve the North Korean threat, which is the true reason Japan is militarizing. Sengupta of the Independent explains in February that the North Korean threat has moved Japan to form more marine units and acquire aircraft carries and ballistic missiles.

Kim Sengupta. The Independent. 16 February 2018. “Wary over North Korea threat, Japan flexes military muscle despite Olympic reconciliation.” https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/winter-olympics-north-korea-south-japan-war-conflict-nuclear-missile-a8214766.html

The Pentagon was caught by surprise when the US President tweeted last August that a military mission was “locked and loaded”. He had previously declared that the aircraft carrier USS Carl Vinson was heading for North Korea when, in fact, it was thousands of miles away in the Indian Ocean at the time. In Japan, Mr Abe’s government is seeking to reform the country’s post-Second World War constitution with a mandate claimed by the ruling LDP’s recent election victory. The supposed threat posed by North Korea and China is being used for a range of possible measures, from forming more marine units and turning the country’s two helicopter carriers to full aircraft carriers, to acquiring ballistic missiles. The latest planned acquisition is of the Aegis Ashore system with Cruise missiles – a move which has drawn objections from China and Russia who both have territorial disputes with Japan. “The adoption of a decision to purchase and deploy these systems should be viewed as disproportionate to the real missile threats in the region,” declared foreign ministry spokeswoman Maria Zakharova in Moscow. “This may undermine strategic stability in this part of the Pacific.”

### A2: South Korea

#### [DELINK] South Korea will never nuclearize. Three warrants:

#### a. Hibbs of the Carnegie Endowment reports in 2017 that the current President of South Korea, Moon Jae-in, has vowed to wind down South Korea’s nuclear program. He is strongly against nuclear power so will not be proliferating anywhere in the near future.

#### b. BBC News writes on September 18 that South Korea and North Korea are meeting in Pyonyang right now to discuss the resolution to bring peace to the Korean war and denuclearize the Korean peninsula. There is no chance that SoKo nuclearizes.

#### c. Gupta writes in 2013 that even if nuclear proliferation has support in South Korea, they do not have the development capabilities. South Korea does not have uranium refining resources, a reprocessing plant, enrichment capabilities, or the technology for mining, milling of uranium or isotope separation. Proliferation necessitates all of these parts.

Hibbs 17; Mark Hibbs [Hibbs is a Germany-based senior fellow in Carnegie’s Nuclear Policy Program. His areas of expertise are nuclear verification and safeguards, multilateral nuclear trade policy, international nuclear cooperation, and nonproliferation arrangements.] July 22, 2017. DA: September 21, 2017

Moon Jae-in, the newly-elected President of the Republic of Korea, has vowed to wind down Korea’s nuclear power program. Because Korea steadily built up its nuclear industry for four decades, has 25 power reactors generating nearly a third of its electricity, and is now exporting modern nuclear power plants, Moon’s statements about nuclear energy have taken some people by surprise. Let’s look at what they imply. Moon was elected for a five-year term; he cannot be re-elected. If he wants to launch a nuclear phase-out he has two basic options: He can arrest future development by halting a half-dozen new power plant construction projects and not re-licensing older units for extended lifetimes. He could also scale back Korea’s nuclear program by ordering operating nuclear power plants closed, cancelling previously initiated projects, and defunding ongoing research programs.

BBC News, 9-18-2018, Moon and Kim meet for nuclear talks, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-45544474, 9-17-2018

Since the beginning of the year North Korea has embarked on an unprecedented path of meetings with both the South and the US. Yet talks with Washington have reached deadlock, with both sides so far agreeing only to very general goals. South Korea has taken on a key mediating role. South Korean President Moon Jae-in and his wife Kim Jung-sook arrived in Pyongyang on Tuesday morning for the three-day visit. They were warmly welcomed from the plane by Mr Kim and his wife, Ri Sol-ju. It's the first trip to the North Korean capital by a leader from the South in a decade. It is Mr Moon's third meeting with the North's Kim Jong-un since their historic summit at the border in April this year. [The Korean War ended in 1953 with an armistice](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10165796) - but no formal peace treaty was signed. What's on the agenda? The two leaders are expected to talk about "practical measures to denuclearise" the Korean peninsula, but the specifics are not known. For South Korea, there are two main goals: to further inter-Korean co-operation and rapprochement to act as a negotiator between Pyongyang and Washington on the issue of denuclearisation. When the two Korean leaders met for the first time back in April, the simple fact that they were meeting was itself a major step. This time, Mr Moon has to make real progress in persuading the North Koreans to make concrete steps to denuclearise, says BBC Seoul correspondent Laura Bicker. Otherwise, the flurry of inter-Korean summits and the much-hyped Singapore meeting between Mr Kim and President Trump this year will be seen as glossy photo ops, and the US leader may begin to lose patience, she adds. The April meeting resulted in a joint declaration to improve ties and scale down the nuclear threat. Since then, North and South Korea have [held a reunion of families separated by Korea's division](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-45243108), and last week [set up a liaison office](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-45521134) at the border to allow direct communication 24/7.

Gupta 13, Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses, and Balachandran, Consulting Fellow at the IDSA, 2013 G. Balachandran, PhD in Economics and Computer Science from the University of Wisconsin, and Rukmani, doctoral candidate at the Centre for East Asian Studies at the Jawaharlal Nehru University, “Examining the Prospects of South Korea “Going Nuclear”” 5/1/2013 http://www.idsa.in/issuebrief/ProspectsofSouthKoreaGoingNuclear\_gbalachandran\_01052013.html; DA: September 24, 2017

Currently, South Korea is poorly placed to consider any serious proposal for going nuclear for a variety of reasons enumerated below. 1. South Korea does not have any of the facilities required for five of eight exercises needed to undertake a programme for the acquisition of nuclear weapons. It does not have (i) mining, milling, and refining of uranium; (ii) isotope separation of uranium, lithium, boron and heavy water; (iii) chemical separations of plutonium, uranium, and tritium from irradiated fuel and target elements;(iv) weapon operations, including assembly, maintenance, modification, and dismantlement of nuclear weapons; and (v) research, development, and testing. It does have some (i) fuel fabrication facilities for reactors; (ii) Reactor operations to irradiate fuel and targets to produce nuclear materials; and (iii) component fabrication of non-nuclear components. Of these, all such facilities under the first two categories are under IAEA safeguards. In addition some of the reactors in S. Korea of are of indigenous design and manufacture. 2. South Korea has international obligations under various bilateral and multilateral agreements that restrict its ability to acquire a nuclear weapon. It has a Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement with IAEA (INFCIRC/236) in force since November 1975 and also has in force the Additional Protocol since 19 February 2004 (INFCIRC/256/Add.1). Since 2007 the IAEA on the basis of its safeguards implementation procedures has declared that the Secretariat found no indication of the diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities and no indication of undeclared nuclear material or activities in South Korea. On this basis, the Secretariat concluded that all nuclear material in South Korea remained in peaceful activities although on a number of occasions, starting in 1982 and continuing until 2000, the ROK conducted experiments and activities involving uranium conversion, uranium enrichment and plutonium separation, which it failed to report to the Agency in accordance with its obligations under its Safeguards Agreement. The IAEA conducted special inspections in South Korea subsequent to its declaration in October 2004 about these unreported activities. The ROK provided active cooperation to the Agency in providing timely information, and access to personnel and locations, and also permitted the collection of environmental and other samples for Agency analysis and assessment. Based on the information provided by the ROK and the verification activities carried out by the Agency to date, the IAEA secretariat concluded in late 2004 that there is no indication that the undeclared experiments had continued, and since 2007 has been giving the ROK a clean chit. Therefore, South Korea asset position to embark on a nuclear weapon program is very weak now. It Has not mined any natural uranium within its territory; hence has no stock of indigenous natural uranium; Has no enrichment facility; No reprocessing plant; and All fissile material stock in South Korea is under IAEA safeguards as a consequence of (1) lack of any domestic uranium; (2) its NPT commitments and bilateral agreements with foreign suppliers of fissile material.

#### PROBABLY DON’T READ THIS.

#### [DELINK]: It’s too late. South Korea is already militarizing. Hun of the New York Times reports in 2017 that South Korean President Moon Jae-in has vowed to “push for the South to move more quickly to retake wartime operational control of its military from America” He’s also accelerated missile build up.

#### [DELINK]: UNCLOS does nothing to solve the North Korean threat, which is the true reason South Korea is militarizing. Hun continues that the North Korean threat has moved South Korea to gain pre-emptive strike, missile defense, and retaliatory capabilities.

Choe Sang-Hun. The New York Times. 28 September 2017. “South Korea Says It’s Speeding Up Arms Buildup to Counter the North.” https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/28/world/asia/south-korea-military-north.html

SEOUL, South Korea — The president of South Korea vowed on Thursday to accelerate efforts to strengthen its pre-emptive strike, missile defense and retaliatory capabilities against North Korea, and he renewed his call for the armed forces to become more independent from the United States. In a speech to mark South Korea’s Armed Forces Day, the president, Moon Jae-in, said he would push for the South to move more quickly to retake wartime operational control of its military from its American ally. Since the Korean War in the early 1950s, the terms of the countries’ alliance have called for an American general to command the South’s 650,000-member military should war break out. Mr. Moon and other liberals have campaigned for South Korea to play a greater role in the alliance, and they have long called for the country to resume responsibility for wartime command as soon as it can feasibly do so. But the idea has gotten more public support as remarks by President Trump have led many South Koreans to doubt his commitment to defend their country.

## A2: Protecting FONOPs

#### [DELINK]: FONOPs don’t need protection from UNCLOS. Storey of the Yusof Ishak Insitute reports in March that the U.S. “regularly conducts FONOPs around the world” and has conducted six in the South China Sea since January of 2017. In so far as none of these have been legally or militarily challenged, there no need for extra legal protection.

Ian Storey. Yusof Ishak Institute. 27 March 2018. “"US Conducts 6th South China Sea FONOP under Trump" by Ian Storey.” https://iseas.edu.sg/medias/commentaries/item/7200-us-conducts-6th-south-china-sea-fonop-under-trump-by-ian-storey

On 23 March 2018, the US Navy destroyer USS Mustin conducted a “freedom of navigation operation” (FONOP) in the South China Sea by sailing within 12 nautical miles of Chinese-controlled Mischief Reef in the contested Spratly Islands. Over the past few years, China has constructed extensive military facilities on Mischief Reef. This was the sixth publicized US FONOP in the South China Sea since President Trump took office in January 2017. All three FONOPs in the Spratlys have taken place at Mischief Reef (two others have occurred in the Paracel Islands and another at Scarborough Shoal which is not considered part of the Spratlys). The shortest duration between FONOPs was 39 days and the longest 99 days; the average was 60.6 days or approximately two months. The Mustin FONOP followed a similar pattern to previous missions. The US Defense Department refused to confirm or deny that it had taken place, stating only that the US regularly conducts FONOPs around the world. China’s defence ministry said the mission was “illegal and provocative” and that it had “seriously harmed” China’s sovereignty and security. It added that such missions would only strengthen China’s determination to bolster its military capabilities in the South China Sea. Two Chinese warships were dispatched to warn off the Mustin though no confrontation was reported. The Trump administration has been highly critical of Beijing’s activities in the South China Sea and has stepped up the frequency of FONOPs to challenge what Washington considers to be China’s excessive maritime claims. This latest FONOP comes at a time of growing tensions between America and China. The Trump administration has threatened to impose tariffs on US$60 billion worth of Chinese imports and signed legislation that permits US officials to travel to Taiwan and meet with their Taiwanese counterparts.

#### [DELINK]: FONOPs are ineffective. Cole of the National Interest explains in July that “FONOPs are too little, too late.” This is obvious as China continues to expand and flex in the South China Sea.

Michael Cole. The National Interest. 21 July 2018. “It's Time to Stop China's Seaward Expansion.” https://nationalinterest.org/feature/its-time-stop-chinas-seaward-expansion-26346

There was a time, when President Barack Obama was still in the White House, when the U.S.-led coalition in the Asia-Pacific could have responded to, and perhaps countered, the creeping occupation and militarization of the South China Sea. According to many security experts, the window for such action has now closed, and Beijing has successfully created irreversible facts on the ground. If that is indeed the case, then freedom of navigation operations (FONOPS) and other measures are too little, too late. China has engineered a new status quo in the South China Sea, and efforts to counter its larger ambitions should henceforth focus elsewhere. What is perhaps most surprising about what has occurred in the South China Sea in the past decade isn’t so much that China has succeeded in building a series of artificial islands and militarizing what it regards as its “lake,” but rather that the international community would be caught unawares by the current state of affairs. From the outset, Beijing telegraphed its intentions in the South China Sea, and if it has become a no-go zone for others in the region, and for the United States, it is largely the result of our inattention and our failure to read the tea leaves.

#### [TURN]: FONOPs create the potential for conflict in the South China Sea. This is empirically proven. Pham of the Diplomat explains in May that “following [a U.S.] FONOP, China carried out combat naval exercises and deployed additional troops the Spratly archipelago.” The chance for miscalculation is higher than ever according to the Kulacki evidence from case. These FONOPs are a sure fire way to initiate conflict in the South China Sea.

Tuan Pham. The Diplomat. 2 May 2018. “Now is Not the Time to Back Down in the South China Sea.” https://thediplomat.com/2018/05/now-is-not-the-time-to-back-down-in-the-south-china-sea/

On April 22, Chinese maritime researchers proposed a new boundary in the South China Sea (SCS) that they say will help the study of natural science, while adding weight to Beijing’s claims over the disputed waters and preparing for possible future changes in its SCS policy. A week prior, People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) vessels reportedly challenged Australian naval ships as they transited the strategic waterway toward Vietnam. On March 23, a U.S. Navy vessel purportedly conducted a freedom of navigation operation (FONOP) in the contested waters. Following the FONOP, China coincidentally carried out combat naval exercises and claimed to have deploy additional troops to and set up territorial defense equipment in the Spratly archipelago. Altogether, the forceful moves underscore a calculated campaign by Beijing to determinedly reassert and preserve respectively its perceived sovereignty and territorial integrity in the SCS through words and deeds. If so, the testimony of Admiral Phil Davidson – the newly confirmed U.S. Pacific Commander – to the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee may be more noteworthy in terms of its alarming content, context, and tone. He asserted that Beijing has built up enough military infrastructure in the SCS to completely control the disputed waterway.

Kulacki 16 [Gregory Kulacki (China Project Manager in the UCS Global Security Program) May 2016 [“The Risk of Nuclear War with China: A Troubling Lack of Urgency” online @ <http://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/05/Nuclear-War-with-China.pdf>]

**Twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year, the governments of the United States and the People’s Republic of China are a few poor decisions away from starting a war that could escalate rapidly and end in a nuclear exchange. Mismatched perceptions increase both the possibility of war and the likelihood it will result in the use of nuclear weapons. Miscommunication or misunderstanding could spark a conflict that both governments may find difficult to stop**. War between the United States and the People’s Republic of China is not inevitable, but failing to acknowledge the risks is certain to make it more likely. Introduction The possibility that the United States of America and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) could become involved in a nuclear war is increasing. Both governments must acknowledge the danger if they hope to avoid it. Several factors contribute to the risk of a nuclear war between the United States and the People’s Republic of China: • The United States and China have a contentious history. Mutual mistrust sustains an entrenched and deepening antagonism despite sincere and occasionally successful efforts to cooperate on shared concerns such as climate change and nuclear terrorism. • Both governments are preparing for war, including improving their nuclear arsenals. U.S. and PRC decision makers believe they need a demonstrable readiness to use military force— including nuclear weapons—to ensure the other nation will yield in a military confrontation. • U.S. and PRC leaders try to avoid conflict, but their discussions of contentious issues are inadequate. The extensive military exchanges the governments have conducted have produced memoranda of understanding on the conduct of naval vessels and aircraft, but strategic dialogues on their nuclear forces, missile defenses, and anti-satellite weapons are perfunctory. • U.S. and PRC officials see the risk differently. U.S. officials are concerned that if a military conflict starts, they may need to use nuclear weapons to stop it. PRC officials assume that no nation would ever invite nuclear retaliation by using nuclear weapons first. Their concern is to assure the PRC maintains a credible ability to retaliate after a U.S. nuclear attack.

## A2: Arms Race

#### [DELINK]: Hanham of Foreign Policy​ in 2017 explains that China doesn’t want to be involved in an arms race, maintaining a policy of keeping a small nuclear force since 1964. They have always officially advocated the complete prohibition and disarmament of nuclear weapons, saying that China would never be the first to use nuclear weapons, no matter the circumstances.

Hanham 17; Melissa Hanham, Foreign Policy, 1-30-2017, China’s Happy to Sit Out the Nuclear Arms Race, http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/30/chinas-happy-to-sit-out-the-nuclear-arms-race/, 7-4-2017; DA: September 17, 2017

So why hasn’t Chinese leader Xi Jinping stripped off his shirt and flexed his strategic forces? Why not take to Twitter — or Weibo, at least — to brag about how long he can last in an arms race? Well, he doesn’t need to and he knows it. Decades of Chinese leaders have known it. The Chinese think about nuclear weapons in a fundamentally different way than their Western counterparts — one that could give China an edge in the contest to become the defining power of the 21st century. As Jeffrey Lewis noted in his book ​Paper Tigers​, China has always maintained a small nuclear force. Fro​m their first announcement of a successful nuclear test on Oct. 19, 1964, China officially advocated the complete prohibition and disarmament of nuclear weapons, and even went so far as to declare that Beijing would never be the first to use nuclear weapons, no matter the circumstances — a policy maintained to this day. ​Former Chinese leader Mao Zedong thought of nuclear weapons as appearing powerful, but nothing to be afraid of in reality — the eponymous paper tigers of Lewis’s title.

#### [MITIGATE]: Rider​ of ​Texas Tech University ​quantifies in 2011 that the probability of an arms race occurring in any given year is ​0.01%. That’s not an impact you should weigh, or even consider in this round.

Rider 11; Toby Rider, Texas Tech University, 2011 ​“JUST PART O F THE GAME?ARMS RACES, RIVALRY, AND WAR1”, ​https://politicalscience.byu.edu/mfindley/assets/RFD\_JPR\_FinalDraft.pdf​; November 22, 2016

 The baseline probability of two states experiencing an arms race in any given year is 0.0102​; thus, such increases are relatively rare events. For states that have never experienced a militarized dispute (with each other), the probability of an arms race is 21% lower than for the general population. Among states with only isolated conflict, there is a 16% increase over the probability in the general population. The last two populations capture dyads during rivalry and non-rivalry years. The probability of arms races for rival states during non-rivalry years is 0.0115, or 12% higher than the general population. This populations, but the difference is not statistically significant (p=0.266). Most illuminating are those same states during periods of rivalry. There is a dramatic increase in the probability of an arms race while two states are rivals: 93% greater than the general population and 81% greater than when the same pair of states was not in a rivalry.

# \*\*\*Power Dynamics\*\*\*

# A2: Countering Russian Hegemony

#### [DELINK]: U.S. sanctions counter Russian hegemony. Lambert of Reuters reports in August that the U.S. has recently announce new sanctions against Russia, adding to the long list of ones we have had in place since 2014. This has likely aided in Russia having negative or slow GDP growth in recent years, according to Wang of NBF in 2018.

Lisa Lambert. Reuters. 24 August 2018. “U.S. sanctions on Russia tied to UK attack to take effect Monday.” https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-russia-novichok/u-s-sanctions-on-russia-tied-to-uk-attack-to-take-effect-monday-idUSKCN1L91CY

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - U.S. sanctions against Russia tied to a nerve agent attack in Britain, which were announced earlier this month, will come into effect on Monday, the U.S. government said on Friday, adding to the array of economic penalties it has imposed on Moscow in recent years. The new measures, detailed in a notice posted at the Federal Register, will terminate foreign assistance and some arms sales and financing to Russia, as well as deny the country credit and prohibit the export of security-sensitive goods and technology.

Brian Wang. Next Big Future. 6 August 2018. “Russia is weak and has a rapidly aging and shrinking population.” https://www.nextbigfuture.com/2018/08/russia-is-weak-and-has-a-rapidly-aging-and-shrinking-population.html

Russia cut back its military buildup and has flat military procurement budgets for the next ten years. Russia has had slow GDP growth or negative GDP growth since 2008. If the US economy grows at 4% per year then the US adds more than entire Russian economy ($1.7 trillion) in less than 2 years.

#### [DELINK]: The U.S. can use FONOPs to deter Russia. Storey of the Yusof Ishak Institute reports in March that “the U.S. regularly conducts FONOPs around the world,” usually for the purpose of deterring enemies.

Ian Storey. Yusof Ishak Institute. 27 March 2018. “"US Conducts 6th South China Sea FONOP under Trump" by Ian Storey.” https://iseas.edu.sg/medias/commentaries/item/7200-us-conducts-6th-south-china-sea-fonop-under-trump-by-ian-storey

This was the sixth publicized US FONOP in the South China Sea since President Trump took office in January 2017. All three FONOPs in the Spratlys have taken place at Mischief Reef (two others have occurred in the Paracel Islands and another at Scarborough Shoal which is not considered part of the Spratlys). The shortest duration between FONOPs was 39 days and the longest 99 days; the average was 60.6 days or approximately two months. The Mustin FONOP followed a similar pattern to previous missions. The US Defense Department refused to confirm or deny that it had taken place, stating only that the US regularly conducts FONOPs around the world. China’s defence ministry said the mission was “illegal and provocative” and that it had “seriously harmed” China’s sovereignty and security. It added that such missions would only strengthen China’s determination to bolster its military capabilities in the South China Sea. Two Chinese warships were dispatched to warn off the Mustin though no confrontation was reported. The Trump administration has been highly critical of Beijing’s activities in the South China Sea and has stepped up the frequency of FONOPs to challenge what Washington considers to be China’s excessive maritime claims. This latest FONOP comes at a time of growing tensions between America and China. The Trump administration has threatened to impose tariffs on US$60 billion worth of Chinese imports and signed legislation that permits US officials to travel to Taiwan and meet with their Taiwanese counterparts.

## A2: In Arctic

#### [DELINK]: The U.S. doesn’t need UNCLOS to assert itself. Groves of the Davis Institute for Foreign Policy explains in 2012 that the U.S. has full jurisdictional control over its economic shelf in the Arctic, meaning it can assert itself there as it pleases.

Steven Groves. The Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy. The Heritage Foundation. 14 July 2012. “The Law of the Sea: Costs of U.S. Accession to UNCLOS.” https://www.heritage.org/testimony/the-law-the-sea-costs-us-accession-unclos

If the U.S. accedes to UNCLOS, it will be required by Article 82 to transfer royalties generated from hydrocarbon production of the U.S. “extended continental shelf” (ECS) to the International Seabed Authority for redistribution to developing and landlocked countries. Since the value of the hydrocarbon resources lying beneath the U.S. ECS may be worth trillions of dollars, the amount of royalties that the U.S. Treasury would be required to transfer to the Authority would be substantial. In any event, U.S. accession would amount to an open-ended commitment to forgo an incalculable amount of royalty revenue for no appreciable benefit. U.S. accession to UNCLOS is not necessary to develop or secure title to the hydrocarbon resources of the ECS. Under international law and long-standing U.S. policy and practice, the U.S. has established full jurisdiction and control over its ECS and is in the process of delimiting its ECS boundaries on a worldwide basis. The successful delimitation of areas of U.S. ECS and subsequent leasing of those areas in the Gulf of Mexico to U.S. and foreign oil exploration companies demonstrate that the United States does not need to achieve universal international recognition of its ECS to provide “certainty” to oil exploration companies. Proponents of U.S. accession to UNCLOS contend that by failing to join the convention the United States is forbidden from mining the deep seabed—the ocean floor lying beyond the ECS and designated as “the Area.” However, no legal barriers prevent U.S. access, exploration, and exploitation of the resources of the deep seabed. The United States has long held that U.S. corporations and citizens have the right to develop the resources of the deep seabed and may do so whether or not the United States accedes to UNCLOS.

# A2: Increases American Credibility

## A2: Increases U.S. Soft Power

#### [DELINK]: Simpson of LL2 Research finds in 2012 writes that because the US has been a superpower throughout all of UNCLOS’s existence, whether or not the US joins UNCLOS will make little difference on its soft power.

#### [NONUNIQUE]: Groves of the Heritage Foundation writes in 2011 that:

#### a. US is already part of multilateralism worldwide organizations, like the Arctic Council, IMO proceedings, Major Maritime Powers, and many more. At the point that the US plays a leading role in so many different prominent organizations, ratifying just one more treaty is insufficient to increase or decrease any power.

#### b. Moreover, the US is already an observer nation in UNCLOS meetings, multilat doesn’t change.

LL2, “Sovereignty, Soft Power, and the U.S.’s Refusal to Ratify the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea” June 2012, <https://viewfromll2.com/2012/06/02/sovereignty-soft-power-and-the-u-s-s-refusal-to-ratify-the-un-convention-on-the-law-of-the-sea/>

But this lack of substantive debate likely persists due to the fact that the practical effects for the United States for ratifying UNCLOS, whether negative or positive, have been relatively minor. To date, the U.S. has done a decent job of splitting the baby when it comes to UNCLOS, consistently abiding by most of UNCLOS’s provisions while simultaneously claiming to only be following customary law. As a result, the question of whether or not the U.S. should formally ratify the convention has been largely academic. Because the U.S. has been a superpower throughout all relevant points of UNCLOS’ existence, whether the U.S. joins or doesn’t join UNCLOS has made so little difference that the U.S. could afford to ignore the debate altogether, or at least make it into a question of lofty principles rather than concrete policy. Which is why the U.S. has succeeded in being the only major power that has avoided ratifying UNCLOS — the stakes just haven’t been that high. But UNCLOS has been in force for eighteen years now. U.S.’s strategy of refusing to commit one way or another will not come without a price for much longer. Starting with 60 member nations when it came into effect in 1994, UNCLOS now has 162 members, including every Western nation other than the United States. During that time period, UNCLOS has been steadily solidifying, from its initial existence as a recital of customary international law, into the widely-adopted international institution it is today.

Steven Groves, The Heritage Foundation, August 2011, “Accession to the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea Is Unnecessary to Secure U.S. Navigational Rights and Freedoms” https://www.heritage.org/defense/report/accession-the-un-convention-the-law-the-sea-unnecessary-secure-us-navigational

The United States plays an essential, if not indispensable, role in the development of the law of the sea. The U.S. Navy’s Commander’s Handbook on the Law of Naval Operations is the preeminent operational manual on the convention’s navigational provisions and is considered the gold standard by maritime nations worldwide, many of which have adopted it for use by their own navies.[144] The United States is an active participant in many multilateral organizations and forums that deal with law of the sea issues, such as the annual meetings of the Major Maritime Powers, IMO proceedings, and meetings of the states parties to UNCLOS, which the U.S. attends as an observer nation. Despite repeated claims to the contrary, the United States effectively protects its Arctic interests, navigational and otherwise, regardless of its nonmembership in UNCLOS. It was a founding member of the Arctic Council, an eight-member intergovernmental body established to foster coordination among Arctic nations that recently adopted an agreement on search and rescue cooperation in the Arctic Ocean.[145] The United States is party to a number of multilateral treaties regarding the law of the sea and maritime navigation, including the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, the Convention on the Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, and the Convention on International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea.[146] The U.S. is also a global leader in maritime enterprises that are not treaty-based, such as the Proliferation Security Initiative (a multilateral effort to prevent trafficking of weapons of mass destruction) and Combined Task Force 151 (a multinational counterpiracy effort operating off the coast of Somalia).[147] In short, the United States has played and continues to play a dominant worldwide role in matters concerning the law of the sea. However, the United States needs to take the necessary steps to ensure that U.S. dominance persists well past 2011 and through the 21st century.

# A2: Multilateralism Good

#### [TURN]: Multilateralism limits action. Brooks of the Seattle Times in 2011 outlines three key reasons multilateralism fails:

**a. Multilateral efforts are marked by opaque decision-making and strategic vagueness. It is hard to get leaders from different nations with different values to agree on a common course of action.**

**b. Multilateral efforts are immobilized by dispersed authority and complicated decision-making processes, usually slow to get off the ground.**

**c. Multilateral forces lose the war of morale and motivation.**

David Brooks, Seattle Times, March 22, 2011, “The problem with multilateralism” <https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/the-problem-with-multilateralism/>

First, multilateral efforts are marked by opaque decision-making and strategic vagueness. It is hard to get leaders from different nations with different values to agree on a common course of action. When diplomats do achieve this, it is usually because they have arrived at artful fudges that allow leaders from different countries to read the same words in a U.N. resolution and understand them in different ways. The negotiation process to arrive at these fudges involves a long chain of secret discussions and it necessarily involves eliding issues that might blow everything up. Sure enough, the decision-making process that led to the Libyan intervention was remarkably opaque. (It is still not clear why the Obama administration flipped from skepticism to resolve.) More important, the nations have not really defined what they hope to achieve. Is the coalition trying to depose Moammar Gadhafi? Are coalition forces trying to halt Gadhafi’s advances or weaken his government? Would the coalition allow Gadhafi to win so long as he didn’t massacre more civilians? Is it trying to create a partitioned Libya? Are we there to help the democratic tide across the region? The members of the coalition could not agree on answers to any of these questions, so the purpose of the enterprise was left vague. Second, leaders in multilateral efforts often obsess about the diplomatic process and ignore the realities on the ground. The reports describing how the Libyan intervention came about are filled with palace intrigue. They describe the different factions within the Obama administration, the jostling by France and Britain, the efforts to win over the Arab League. It’s not clear who was thinking about the realities in Libya. Who are the rebels we are supporting? How weak is the Gadhafi government? How will Libyans react to a Western bombing campaign? Why should we think a no-fly zone will protect civilians when they never have in the past? In this, as in so many previous multilateral efforts, the process blots out the substance. Diplomats become more interested in serving the global architecture than in engaging the actual facts on the ground. Third, multilateral efforts are retarded and often immobilized by dispersed authority and a complicated decision-making process. They are slow to get off the ground because they have to get their most reluctant members on board. Once under way, they are slow to adapt to changing circumstances. Sure enough, the world fiddled for weeks while Gadhafi mounted his successful counterinsurgency campaign. The coalition attacks are only days old, but already fissures are appearing. The Arab League is criticizing the early results. The French are not coordinating well with their allies. NATO leaders are even now embroiled in a debate about the operational command structure. Fourth, multilateral forces often lose the war of morale and motivation. Most wars are fought by nations — by people aroused not only by common interests but by common passions, moralities and group loyalties. Multilateral campaigns rarely, on the other hand, arouse people. They are organized by elites, and propelled by calculation, not patriotism. No one wants to die for the Arab League, the United Nations or some temporary coalition of the willing. In the Libyan campaign, Gadhafi’s defenders will be fighting for land, home, God and country. The multinational force will be organized by an acronym and motivated by a calibrated calculus to achieve a humanitarian end. Finally, multilateral efforts are built around a fiction. The people who organize coalitions pretend that all the parties are sharing the burdens. In reality, only the U.S. can do many of the tasks. If the other nations falter, the U.S. will have to leap in and assume the entire burden. America’s partners go in knowing they do not bear ultimate responsibility for success or failure. Americans do. All of this is not to say the world should do nothing while Gadhafi unleashes his demonic fury. Nor is this a defense of unilateralism. But we should not pretend we have found a superior way to fight a war. Multilateralism works best as a garment clothing American leadership. Besides, the legitimacy of a war is not established by how it is organized but by what it achieves.

# \*\*\*Miscellaneous\*\*\*

# A2: Codifying Environmental Standards

## A2: Reduces Overfishing

#### 1. [NONUNIQUE]: According to the NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), the United States has become a leader in fisheries management who finds that annual catch limits help reduce the chance of overfishing and ensures long-term biological and economic sustainability. Therefore, acceding to UNCLOS is not necessary to solving this issue.

#### 2. [DELINK]: The WWF finds that a lot of the overfishing crisis is illegal and unregulated as 50% of the catch from fisheries is acquired illegally. That means, acceding to UNCLOS is not even solving the real issue.

#### 3. [DELIINK]: Trump has no incentive to solve for Overfishing. King of USA Today finds that top Trump administration officials knew extending the recreational fishing season in the Gulf of Mexico from three to 42 days this summer would lead to significant overfishing. But they did it anyway, meaning that having a seat at the table won’t mean much if the US wants to mitigate overfishing.

#### 4. [NONUNIQUE]: According to Ayres of CFR in 2013, countries will not listen to UNCLOS regulations because they are ineffective and not properly enforced.

Magnuson-Stevens, 2017 Report to Congress on the Status of U.S. Fisheries, No Publication, https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/2017-report-congress-status-us-fisheries, 9-20-2018

Under the MSA, the United States has become an international leader in  fisheries management. NOAA Fisheries is committed to continuing our successful efforts to prevent overfishing and rebuild overfished stocks. The MSA has been reauthorized twice since its enactment—once in 1996 and again in 2006. The 2006 reauthorization included a new requirement to use annual catch limits (ACLs) to end and prevent overfishing. In 2017, ACLs were not exceeded for 91 percent of all stocks or complexes. Councils are implementing management measures to address any ACL overages that did occur. Monitoring catch levels and keeping them in check on an annual basis—as occurs with ACLs—helps reduce the chance of overfishing and ensures long-term biological and economic sustainability. ACLs are effective in preventing overfishing, but some challenges remain. For data-poor and rarely sampled stocks, for example, fisheries managers are still learning how to accurately account for catch and determine effective mechanisms to address overfishing. NOAA’s regional fisheries science centers and the councils’ scientific and statistical committees (SSCs) have employed a number of methods for setting catch advice in these data-poor situations. For example, species with similar habitat and life histories can be grouped together to increase data availability, with catch advice for the complex established from an indicator species.

World Wildlife Fund, Overfishing, https://www.worldwildlife.org/threats/overfishing, 9-20-2018

A lack of management oversight, government regulations, and traceability of fishing activities has long been a problem in the fishing industry. Current rules and regulations are not strong enough to limit fishing capacity to a sustainable level. This is particularly the case for the high seas, where there are few international fishing regulations, and those that exist are not always implemented or enforced. Many fisheries management bodies are not able to adequately incorporate scientific advice on fish quotas, and customs agencies and retailers cannot always ensure that the fish entering their country is caught legally and in a sustainable way. One key dimension of the overfishing crisis is illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing. It occurs across all types of fisheries, within national and international waters, and small scale to large industrialized operations. Illegal fishing accounts for an estimated 20% of the world’s catch and as much as 50% in some fisheries. The costs of illegal fishing are significant, with the value of pirate fish products estimated at between $10-23.5 billion annually. SUBSIDIES. Many governments still continue to subsidize their fleets, allowing unprofitable operations to subsist, and overfishing to occur. Today’s worldwide fishing fleet is estimated to be up to two and a half times the capacity needed to catch what we actually need.

Ledyard King, 10-6-2017, Commerce extended red snapper season knowing it would lead to overfishing, memos reveal, USA TODAY, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/10/06/trump-officials-extended-red-snapper-season-despite-knowing-would-lead-overfishing/739401001/, 9-20-2018

Internal memos show **top Trump administration officials knew extending the recreational fishing season in the Gulf of Mexico from three to 42 days this summer would lead to significant overfishing. But they did it anyway.** In memos released in response to a lawsuit, Commerce Department officials defended the move by saying that keeping the three-day season would be “devastating” to the recreational marine industry and the communities whose economies are tied to it. And extending the time would also help solve a long-running dispute with states who have much longer seasons and want to wrest control of red snapper management from federal managers, they argued.

Alyssa Ayres, 6-19-2013, The Global Oceans Regime, Council on Foreign Relations, https://www.cfr.org/report/global-oceans-regime, 9-20-2018

 Even when regional bodies make a binding decision on a high-seas case, implementation hinges on state will and capacity. In 2003, the UN General Assembly established a fund to assist developing countries with their obligations to implement the FSA through RFBs. The overall value of the fund remains small, however, and countries' compliance is often constrained by resource scarcity. This results in spotty enforcement, which allows vessels to violate international standards with impunity, particularly off the coasts of weak states. Migratory species like blue fin tuna are especially vulnerable because they are not confined by jurisdictional boundaries and have high commercial value.

# A2: Protecting Sea Cables

#### [MITIGATE]: Wired Magazine finds in 2018 that even if Russia cut off every single cable connecting to the US which is highly unlikely that would not cut us off from the internet. We would still be able to communicate with people in the US. The most likely scenario of Russia damaging a few cables won’t affect us either because damages happen every day and get repaired but our data is just rerouted to another cable.

No Author, 5-25-2018, WIRED, https://www.wired.com/story/russia-undersea-internet-cables/, 8-28-2018

You don’t notice when a cable faults, especially if you live somewhere like the United States, because your Instagram message or Google Voice call is instantly re-routed. If you’re Skyping with a friend in Romania for instance, and a fishing boat or anchor ruptures a cable—as causes two-thirds of faults—your conversation simply goes over another line. Many regions, like Europe, the United States, and East Asia have numerous cables running over the same path. You can check out a map of them all here. That means Russia snipping a handful of cables in the Atlantic, where its submarines have been spotted, would disturb the global internet very little. In fact, even if it ruptured every single cable in the Atlantic Ocean, traffic could still be re-routed the other way, across the Pacific. “It wouldn’t work very well or be the highest quality, but it’s not like there wouldn’t be any communication happening,” says Alan Mauldin, research director at TeleGeography, a market research firm that specializes in telecommunications, including undersea cables. Even in a hypothetical, Black Mirror-esque world in which Russia somehow chops every cable that connects to the United States from every side, the internet would not go out like a light. Americans would still be able to utilize land networks that connect the continent; it would just be impossible to communicate overseas. “You can still email people in the US if all submarine cables were gone,” says Mauldin. “But people in Europe wouldn’t see your silly cat video you posted on your Facebook profile.”

#### [MITIGATE]: There’s no impact. Deep sea cables are routinely disturbed. Schreck of RFERL explains in June that there are 200 incidents of cable damage regularly, caused by anchors and fishing gear getting tangled with the cables. There has been a net zero impact of these problems.

Carl Schreck. Radio Free Europe; Radio Liberty. 12 June 2018. “Explainer: How Vulnerable Are Undersea Cables That U.S. Says Russia Is Tracking?” https://www.rferl.org/a/explainer-undersea-cables-u-s-says-russia-vulnerable-internet/29287432.html

"If somebody knew how these systems worked and if they staged an attack in the right way, then they could disrupt the entire system. But the likelihood of that happening is very small. Most of the concerns and fears are not nearly a threat at all," she said. Undersea cables are, in fact, damaged regularly, with experts estimating between 100 and 200 such incidents each year. Two of the main causes are less exotic than state sabotage; namely, anchors dragging across the seabed and fishing gear that gets tangled up with the cables, experts say. There have been incidents of sharks biting deep-sea fiber-optic cables, though the Britain-based International Cable Protection Committee (ICPC) recorded no such incident between 2007 and 2014.

# A2: Foreign Aid

#### Professor of Economics Easterly at NYU reports in 2017 that 76% of U.S. royalties go to corrupt countries.

Gryting, Carina Bentata. The Aid-Corruption Paradox: How Should the US allocate Foreign Aid? The Global Anticorruption Blog. 2017 https://globalanticorruptionblog.com/2017/01/13/the-aid-corruption-paradox-how-should-the-u-s-allocate-foreign-aid/ (William Russell Easterly is an American economist, specializing in economic development. He is a Professor of Economics at New York University)

Unfortunately, it seems that in practice, the U.S. does not balance necessity with efficacy, and instead prioritizes a third consideration: self-interest. Studies have found that less corrupt governments do not end up receiving more foreign aid. Even worse, a study by Easterly shows that the high percentage of corrupt countries that receive aid from the U.S. is not actually explained by the fact that these are the poorest countries. Easterly showed that 76% of the U.S.’s aid went to corrupt countries while only 29% of its aid went to the least developed countries. Perhaps some citizens may believe that the U.S.’s focus on self-interest is justified, preferring their tax dollars to have at least tangential benefits to Americans.

# A2: Offshore Wind Farming

#### [DELINK]: We don’t need UNCLOS to build offshore wind farms. Even without UNCLOS, the U.S. has access to 200 miles off its shore under international law. This is plenty to build offshore windfarms because the Sierra Club reports in 2017 that offshore wind farms are typically located only five to fifteen miles offshore.

Sierra Club. “OFFSHORE FAQ.” 2017. https://content.sierraclub.org/coal/wind/offshore-wind-faq

How far offshore will the wind turbines be? Will I be able to see them from shore? Offshore wind farms are typically located between five and 15 miles from shore. At that distance, they are about as wide as a toothpick and create minimal impact to shoreline views. What are offshore wind developers doing to make sure that seabirds and marine mammals are protected?

#### [DELINK]: Building offshore farms as far out in the ocean as they want to is literally impossible. Cheung of BBC News reports in 2018 that offshore wind farms cannot be installed in water deeper than 40 meters, but National Geographic writes in 2018 that the continental shelf, where they want to build wind turbines, is 60 meters deep.

Alexandra Franklin-Cheung. BBC News. 2018. “How far offshore can we build wind farms?.” https://www.sciencefocus.com/planet-earth/how-far-offshore-can-we-build-wind-farms/

Sea depth is often the limiting factor when it comes to constructing offshore wind farms. Conventional turbines rest on the seabed and can’t be installed in water deeper than about 40 metres. In most regions this means they cannot be built more than 30km from shore. Floating wind turbines could, however, be a game changer. The floating turbines currently being installed at the Hywind wind farm near Peterhead in north-east Scotland can operate in water up to 1km deep. Such technologies could make it possible to build wind farms much further out to sea, where winds are typically stronger.

National Geographic. 2018. “Continental Shelf.” https://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/continental-shelf/

Even though they are underwater, continental shelves are part of the continent. The actual boundary of a continent is not its coastline, but the edge of the continental shelf. The widths of the continental shelves vary. Along parts of the U.S. state of California, for example, the continental shelf extends less than a kilometer (.62 miles). But along the northern coast of Siberia, the shelf extends about 1,290 kilometers (800 miles). The average width of a continental shelf is 65 kilometers (40 miles). Most continental shelves are broad, gently sloping plains covered by relatively shallow water. Water depth over the continental shelves averages about 60 meters (200 feet). Sunlight penetrates the shallow waters, and many kinds of organisms flourish—from microscopic shrimp to giant seaweed called kelp. Ocean currents and runoff from rivers bring nutrients to organisms that live on continental shelves. Plants and algae make continental shelves rich feeding grounds for sea creatures. The shelves make up less than 10 percent of the total area of the oceans. Yet all of the ocean’s plants and many types of algae live in the sunny waters.

# A2: Human Trafficking

#### [NONUNIQYE]: The Muse in 2018 lists seven key organizations working to end human trafficking on an international level. The article continues that they are making major strides in ending human trafficking.

Natalie Jesionka, The Muse, 2018, “The Fight for Freedom: 7 Organizations Combatting Human Trafficking” https://www.themuse.com/advice/the-fight-for-freedom-7-organizations-combatting-human-trafficking

In the dialogue on human trafficking, it’s easy to feel overwhelmed by the statistics, the issues, and the politics. The problem is complex and pervasive, and there are more modern-day slaves in our world than at any other point in history. But, there are also more people working to end human trafficking and modern-day slavery than ever before. Few of these organizations are large or well-known—rather, they work from the grassroots level, promoting awareness and advocating for change in the communities they’re needed most. These groups confront traffickers, criminal gangs, and broken systems in order to make a difference. They use their resources to take a stand and serve as a voice for those who are exploited and held against their will. Each organization has a different strategy, but all of them, little by little, are making major strides in ending human trafficking. Read on to learn about seven organizations that are fighting to ensure freedom for all. Trafficking Policy and Advocacy: Polaris Project One of the most influential groups working on the issue in the United States, the Polaris Project takes a comprehensive approach to ending modern-day slavery. The organization advocates for stronger federal and state laws, operates the National Human Trafficking Resource Center hotline, provides services and support for trafficking victims, and works with survivors to develop long-term strategies to ending human trafficking. Second-Generation Trafficking: Prajwala In India, children who grow up in brothels with their parents often meet the same fate. In order to counteract this dangerous legacy, social activist Dr. Sunitha Krishnan co-founded Prajwala (which means "eternal flame”). Based in Hyderbad, India, the organization rescues women from brothels and then provides them with education, mental health care, and job programs. (Check out Dr. Krishnan’s powerful talk at the 2009 TedIndia Conference.) Statelessness and Child Trafficking: COSA Most Hill tribes in Thailand are “stateless,” or not governed by the laws of the country—which makes their women and girls particularly vulnerable to trafficking. After recognizing this, photojournalist Mickey Choothesa and social worker Anna Choothesa created the Children’s Organization of Southeast Asia to provide education, intervention, and support in Hill tribe communities. COSA works directly within trafficking communities to provide trafficked girls with healthcare, social services, and housing in the Baan Yuu Suk Shelter—as well as to bring awareness and education to the traffickers themselves. Trafficking of Men and Young Boys: Urban Light A number of organizations help girls in the sex industry, but very few work to aid young men. After a service trip during which she observed the industry in Thailand firsthand, Alezandra Russel realized that boys are often excluded from the human trafficking conversation. So she created Urban Light, an organization that works to help young men break free from child prostitution and sexual exploitation. By providing food, shelter, healthcare, and support services, the group helps restore and rebuild the lives of male victims. International Sporting Events: Student World Assembly’s Red Card Project When a large sporting event, such as the World Cup, takes place, fears often arise that trafficking will increase to meet demand from the influx of tourists. Student World Assembly’s Red Card Project mobilizes students from around the world to stage powerful and striking condemnations of human trafficking at these events, bringing large-scale and needed public awareness to the practice. Child Labor: GoodWeave The handmade rug industry has one of the highest child labor rates in the world. When GoodWeave began its work in 1994, there were nearly one million children—many kidnapped or trafficked—working on the looms in South Asia, often for up to 18 hours a day. Through its efforts, the organization has not only helped bring child labor in the rug industry down 75%, it has built affiliations with retail outlets all over the U.S. to ensure that all carpets sold are free from child labor. The Issue of Choice: The Empower Foundation Not all who work in the sex industry do so against their will—some do so by choice. While the resources of most organizations aim to assist those exploited and hidden in the shadows, The Empower Foundation grew from a movement of sex workers and entertainers who fight for fair and sustainable standards and equal rights in the professions they have chosen. The group runs the Can Do Bar, which offers just, safe, and fair conditions for its workers. Standing up against human trafficking takes courage, but anyone can get involved by working for an anti-trafficking group or taking a stand on an individual level. Stay tuned for our next installment to learn how you can get involved in the fight to end modern-day slavery.