

Affirmative Redemption

Ridge RW Affirms (**Resolved the US should accede to the Law of The Sea Treaty**)

Our Sole Contention is That The Time is Now.

[Nankivell of Emory University](#) writes that by enshrining freedom of navigation, providing a forum for dispute resolution through the tribunal system, and creating clear guidelines to maintain order, the law of the sea is the bedrock for international stability. However, [Holmes 14 of The Diplomat](#) writes that **even a powerful treaty like the law of the sea will always need defenders to ensure its true meanings do not get subverted.**

The time to defend the law of the sea is now.

Iglesias 18 of Palermo University contextualizes that the law is under siege by 2 opposing forces: a territorializing pressure emerging from the coastal states and an internationalizing pressure that vows for freedom of navigation and global governance. Territorialization is winning as [Stewart 12 of The Atlantic](#) finds that the Law of the Sea is being pushed into new, antithetical directions by countries like Brazil, Malaysia, Peru, China and India who have started restricting freedom of navigation.

Furthermore, [Gates 17 of The Diplomat](#) writes that the dispute resolution tribunal framework of the treaty is also under siege, as great powers such as China and Russia have begun to ignore its ruling without consequence, setting global precedent that international law no longer works. [Kardon 18 from The University of Pennsylvania](#) writes that all of these factors have lead to the fragmentation of the treaty, destroying its dispute resolution power. Smith 17 from URhode Island concludes, **the law of the sea is dangerously close to deterioration.**

Accession allows for America to defend the treaty in 3 ways.

First --- Countering Interpretations.

[Almond 17 of The Diplomat](#) contextualizes that while the US currently has no voice within the law of the sea - accession gives us that voice allowing us to defend the treaty from a position of primacy as the most powerful country in the world. Anderson 14 of Washington University finds that this voice will allow us to counter the influence of other great powers and change the current dynamic favoring coastal state control.

Second --- Global Power.

[Borgerson 09 from The Council of Foreign Relations](#) writes that joining the Law of the Sea would provide America with the opportunity to take a leadership role in the first truly global maritime partnership—a coalition of 160 nations committed to freedom of navigation, which Vanecko 11 of The NWC reports would allow commanders to more aggressively assert navigational rights. Critically, [Sherwin 17 of The Air War college](#) explains that Wen pressure is exerted on a nation from an international level, it becomes unbearable and forces compliance, which is why [Smith](#) finalizes that US accession to the law of the sea will force our enemies to restrain themselves as they would now be faced with the power of a global community.

Third --- Symbolic Leadership.

DeRenzi 12 of The NWC writes that our lack of participation in the law of the sea allows for foreign powers to create a narrative that America does not care about international law and order. He implicates that faced with the perception that there is no global leader defending the treaty, smaller countries have no choice but to give into pressure and turn away from the law of the sea. However, Hudzick 10 of Washington University finds that US accession would be a powerful and meaningful gesture, symbolizing a recommitment to international law and moral backing of our allies - giving them the confidence to defend and enforce the treaty.

The Impacts are twofold.

First --- New Conflicts.

[Hensel of UT Austin](#) writes that the destruction of the law of the sea would mean a decrease in clear guidelines and greater incentive for nations to expand territory, increasing the chance of worldwide maritime conflicts by 400%. Indeed, [Strating 18 of La Trobe University](#) finds that the deterioration of the treaty has already driven up the amount of maritime conflicts across Asia. The scope and magnitude of these disputes will only get bigger the more the law degrades.

Second --- Worse Conflicts.

The delegitimization of the tribunal dispute settlement system under the treaty would be devastating as [Nguyen 16 from The University of Cambridge](#) writes that tribunals have historically been incredibly effective at de-escalating conflict. [Nemeth of Ulowa](#) corroborates that international 3rd party interventions increase the chance of peaceful settlement in conflicts by 100%. We need the tribunals to stay legitimate as [Mancini 13 of the IPI](#) finds that globally there are 71 unresolved maritime disputes that could lead to armed conflict.

Thus we strongly urge an affirmative ballot.

Mid Bronx Affirmative

Ridge RW Affirms (**Resolved the US should accede to the Law of The Sea Treaty**)

Contention 1: Preventing Conflict

[Stewart 12 of The Atlantic](#) finds that the Law of the Sea is being pushed into new, antithetical directions by countries like Brazil, Malaysia, Peru, China and India who have started restricting freedom of navigation and pushing for more coastal state territorial control - however the US can't fight back against this because we have no position within UNCLOS' international framework.

Luckily, [Borgerson 09 from The Council of Foreign Relations](#) writes that joining the Law of the Sea would provide America with the opportunity to take a leadership role in a global maritime partnership of 156 nations committed to freedom of navigation, allowing us to enforce the law with the power of the world at our side.

Smith finalizes that US accession to the law of the sea will force our enemies to restrain themselves as they would now be faced with the power of a global community.

Protecting freedom of navigation is important as [Hensel of UT Austin](#) writes that a shift away from freedom of navigation and **towards territorialization** would mean a decrease in clear guidelines and greater incentive for nations to expand, increasing conflict by 400%.

Indeed, [Strating 18 of La Trobe University](#) finds that the shift towards territorialization has already driven up the amount of maritime conflicts across the world. The scope and magnitude of these disputes will only get bigger the more the law degrades.

Contention 2: Dodging Conflict

[Jaipragas of the SCMP](#) reports 7 days ago that the situation in the South China Sea is dramatically escalating as US and Chinese Naval ships increasingly confront each other and come close to conflict. [The Economic Times 18](#) finds that the latest US naval action only last week in the region has crossed China's red line, and that China is willing to risk a possible collision to oppose the US making the risk of miscalculation really high. Indeed, [Holmes 18 of The National Interest](#) finds that a US clash with a Chinese warship or even something as small as a fishing boat, can quickly escalate into fully fledged warfare as China would not be willing to back down and deescalate the situation, setting us on the path to inevitable conflict. [Jaipragas](#) finds that since 2015 there have already been 12 close calls between American and Chinese warships, and as tensions escalate these confrontations will only become more frequent.

Affirming solves this in 2 ways.

First --- Intelligence.

[Anderson 14 of Washington University](#) writes that China is currently pushing an interpretation that the law of the sea does not allow intelligence operations in economic zones, which regional nations are acquiescing to. Luckily, [Gallagher 14 of Westlaw](#) writes that upon accession to the law of the sea the US would gain a voice in its institutional framework, allowing us to counter

China's interpretation. This is really important as [Colonel Torelli](#) of the APDC writes that intelligence is critical in monitoring tensions, ensuring that we avoid actions that may spark miscalculation.

Second --- Diplomacy

[Yamei 15 of the CIS](#) writes that accession to the law of the sea would enable the US to counter China's view of the treaty over a negotiating table, rather than through a series of maritime confrontation, because we would now have an institution through which both sides could communicate.

The Impact is Warfare.

[Ashley Tellis of The Carnegie Endowment Center](#) writes that between the US and China, even relatively trivial incidents can escalate into full fledged geopolitical polarization and conflict, destroying financial markets and killing hundreds of millions.

Contention 3: Green Progress

Article 194 of the law of the sea demands that member states take all measures necessary to minimize damage to the environment, in order to enforce this, the law of the sea allows for the suing of nations to force them to adopt stricter environmental standards.

[Bandow 12 of the Cato Institute](#) writes that island nations are gearing up to sue America under the law of the sea. Groves of the Heritage Foundation writes that the US would most certainly be a target of these upon accession. The US would be forced to comply with the rulings as [Kirgil of the ASIL](#) writes that under the current American judicial standard international treaties have the same weight as US law.

Because any damage is enough to sue over, [Murray](#) writes that these lawsuits would mean the end of fossil fuel use in the US. This is really important as [Gillis of the NYT](#) reports that the US is accounts for almost 20% of all emissions, tragically [Chen of The Nation](#) reports that air pollution kills 9 million people every year.

Contention 4: Marine Research

[Moore of UVirginia](#) finds that currently, countries are refusing to let US scientists research in their territory. Luckily, [Article 238 of The Law of The Sea](#) guarantees the right of scientists to research wherever they want in any country. Critically, [Malve 16 of Harvard](#) finds that marine research is important for developing medicine to fight major diseases such as cancer and malaria, saving million - The World Bank implicates that currently 54 million people die every year of major disease.

Late Bronx Affirmative

In place of Jake Ryan and David Kinane of Unionville KR, Ridge RW Affirms the resolution.

Contention 1: Asian Nation Domination

[Cole 18 of The National Interest](#) contextualizes that China has pursued a strategy of cyclically escalating tensions in the south and east china sea and then pulling out, only to return months later to escalate again. Furthermore, [The SCMP](#) reported just last week that naval tensions between the US and China are ratcheting up and regional countries are being forced to increase aggression. Specifically, the Economic Times finds that the last FONOP 2 weeks ago has crossed China's red line, finding that China's strategic decision making calculus has changed to the point where China is motivated to risk conflict in order to project strength.

Accession to the law of the sea solves through multilateralism

[Bosco 11 of Indiana University explains](#) Asia's only multination organization is ASEAN, which has very little strategic power and doesn't even include China in it. [French 14 of Columbia University implicates](#) that as a result, China has been able to launch a quest for dominance of the region unopposed. And while [Gates 15 of The Diplomat](#) writes that **the US is the only nation with the power, resources, and relationships** that can build up multilateral structures based around international law because we are not part of the law of the sea we have no legitimacy to do so. Which is why [Yamei 15 of the CIS finds](#) that only by accession can the US **create a strong international framework** to contain China.

The Impact is Preventing Conflict.

[Gady 17 of the Diplomat](#) that if rising militarization and tensions in Asia continue, the instability will eventually reach a boiling point in which war would be inevitable. French 14 corroborates, that if China continues its path of expansion, a regional war will likely break out. Indeed, [Stout 14 of Time Magazine](#) finds that the present day is following the same track as the 1980s, the last regional war which killed 50,000 soldiers in 6 weeks.

Contention 2: International Interpretations

[Stewart 12 of The Atlantic](#) finds that the Law of the Sea is being pushed into new, antithetical directions by countries like Brazil, Malaysia, Peru, and India who have started restricting freedom of navigation and pushing for more coastal state territorial control - however the US can't fight back against this because we have no position within UNCLOS' international framework.

Luckily, [Borgerson 09 from The Council of Foreign Relations](#) writes that joining the Law of the Sea would provide America with the opportunity to take a leadership role in a global maritime partnership of 156 nations committed to freedom of navigation, allowing us to enforce the law with the power of the world at our side.

Smith finalizes that US accession to the law of the sea will force our enemies to restrain themselves as they would now be faced with the power of a global community.

Protecting freedom of navigation is important as [Hensel of UT Austin](#) writes that a shift away from freedom of navigation and towards territorialization would mean a decrease in clear guidelines and greater incentive for nations to expand, increasing conflict by 400%.

Indeed, [Strating 18 of La Trobe University](#) finds that the shift towards territorialization has already driven up the amount of maritime conflicts across the world. The scope and magnitude of these disputes will only get bigger the more the law degrades.

Contention 3: Progress

Subpoint A: Lawsuits

Article 194 of the law of the sea demands that member states take all measures necessary to minimize damage to the environment, in order to enforce this, the law of the sea allows for the suing of nations to force them to adopt stricter environmental standards.

[Bandow 12 of the Cato Institute](#) writes that island nations are gearing up to sue America under the law of the sea. Groves of the Heritage Foundation writes that the US would most certainly be a target of these upon accession. The US would be forced to comply with the rulings as [Kirgill of the ASIL](#) writes that under the current American judicial standard international treaties have the same weight as US law.

Because any damage is enough to sue over, [Murray](#) writes that these lawsuits would mean the end of fossil fuel use in the US. This is really important as [Gillis of the NYT](#) reports that the US is accounts for almost 20% of all emissions, tragically [Chen of The Nation](#) reports that air pollution kills 9 million people every year.

Subpoint B: Marine Medicine

[Moore of UVirginia](#) finds that currently, countries are refusing to let US scientists research in their territory. Luckily, [Article 238 of The Law of The Sea](#) guarantees the right of scientists to research wherever they want in any country. Critically, [Malve 16 of Harvard](#) finds that marine research is important for developing medicine to fight major diseases such as cancer and malaria, saving millions. Indeed, [Bruckner 02 of Issue](#) writes that scientists are 400 times more likely to find a life saving drug through marine research. The World Bank implicates that currently 54 million people die every year of major disease.

NEG

In the name of Jake Ryan and David Kinane of Unionville KR, Ridge RW Negates the resolution.

Contention 1: The Winds of Winter.

Affirming triggers arctic drilling in 2 ways.

Subpoint A: American Industry

[Duff 05 from UMass](#) writes that American corporations are ready, willing, and able to drill in the arctic. However, because the law of the sea governs ocean resources and the US is not part of the treaty, corporations cannot legally drill.

Unfortunately, [Ryan 10 of UDayton](#) reports that accession to the law of the sea would maximize legal certainty regarding the United States' rights to energy resources in large offshore areas, including the areas of the Arctic Ocean.

Subpoint B: Russian Competition

[Stubbs 15 of Reuters](#) writes that there is strong support among the Russian people to move the their economy away from oil. [Slav 17 of Oil Price](#) furthers that Russia is diversifying into sectors like agriculture right now, which is why [Staalesen 17 of the Barents](#) reports that Russian investment into arctic oil drilling has been cut by 17 times.

However, [Huock 13 of Penn State](#) finds that upon accession the US will be able to extend its territorial claims in the arctic by up to 600 miles. [Atkin 18 of New Republic](#) implicates that US arctic expansion would create a race for control in the region, incentivizing Russia to restart drilling in order to win the arctic scramble.

The impact of both subpoints is climate change.

[Walsh 12 of Time](#) writes that arctic drilling releases methane, which is 20x worse than carbon dioxide for the climate. Mckinnon 15 of [Greenpeace](#) finds that as a result, arctic drilling leads to a 5 degree increase in warming. Aton 17 of [Berrens](#) concludes, because warmer temperatures mean more droughts, even a 1 degree increase in climate change means billions in starvation.

Contention 2: Stirring the Pot.

Valencia 18 writes that the South China Sea has entered a sense of normalcy. [Koh of The SCMP](#) further reports 9 days ago that while there may be tensions in the region, they will never escalate to warfare. [Jennings 18 of UC Berkeley](#) also finds that China is toning down its military activities, and [Huebl 18](#) of Nikkei writes that chinese island building has effectively stopped.

Affirming disrupts stability and triggers tension in the region in 2 ways.

First --- Short Circuiting Diplomacy.

[Mogato 16 of Reuters](#) finds that due to a lack of US leadership in the region, nations are not confident enough to challenge China, causing them to turn towards diplomacy instead. [Zhang 16 of Foreign Policy](#) explains that this direct diplomacy between China and regional countries like Vietnam and The Philippines are de-escalating tensions and benefitting everybody.

However, [Ha 18 of The Diplomat](#) finds that accession to the treaty would bolster US leadership, fueling these nations with a sense of false hope to oppose China. Unfortunately, [French 14 of The Atlantic](#) writes that when nations challenge China, China responds through increasing aggression towards them in order to show that resistance is futile.

Second --- Crossing The Red Line

[Lei 17 of The Brown Political Review](#) explains China expands because its people view the South China Sea as historically theirs, robbed after centuries of humiliation brought upon them by western powers. Howard 18 of [The New York Times](#) corroborates Chinese President Xi Jinping has said that he will not cede one inch of the South China Sea.

[Thayer 18 of UChicago](#) writes that the US has recently accommodated this strategy, ceding control of the region to China, ensuring stability. However, [DeRenzi 12 of The Naval War Review](#) writes that accession to the law of the sea would dramatically strengthen America's hand in the South China Sea allowing it to oppose China.

The problem with this comes from [Xiaoming 18 of The National Interest](#) who finds that China is deeply suspicious of the US, seeing it as an interventionist nation who seeks to undermine Chinese interests, meaning any expansion of US power forces China to respond aggressively.

The impact is chaos.

[Heath 18 of the AMTI](#) writes that if China is forced away from its current strategy of diplomacy and towards aggression, the chance of escalation and miscalculation in the South China Sea leading to war will skyrocket. Tragically, [Stout 14 of Time Magazine](#) finds that the last regional war killed 50,000 in 6 weeks.

Even if war doesn't break out, [Wald 15 of Boston University](#) finds that the flaring up of tensions can force the rerouting of the 5 trillion dollars of trade in the region causing massive price spikes of basic goods like energy and food. Tragically, [the World Bank](#) reports that the last food price spike in 2008 put 44 million people into poverty.

CFL AFF

AFF

Ridge KR Affirms: Resolved the US should accede to the United Nations Convention on the Law of The Sea without reservations

Contention 1: Preventing Maritime Conflict

[Stewart 12 of The Atlantic](#) finds that the Law of the Sea is being pushed into new, antithetical directions by countries like Brazil, Malaysia, Peru, and India who are delegitimizing the treaty in order to gain more territorial control.

Stewart explains that while the US wants to take a global role in preventing these countries' expansions, it cannot, because it has no voice within the institutional framework in the law of the sea which governs the oceans.

Luckily, [Borgerson 09 from The Council of Foreign Relations](#) writes that joining the Law of the Sea would provide America with the opportunity to take a leadership role in a global maritime partnership of 156 nations that are committed to peace, allowing us to enforce the law with the world's power at our side.

[Smith](#) finalizes that US accession to the law of the sea will force our enemies to restrain themselves as they would now be faced with the might of a global community.

Critically, [Hensel of UT Austin](#) writes that if these nations get their way in destroying the law of the sea, gaining the ability to recklessly expand, the chance of new maritime conflicts worldwide would increase by 400%.

Contention 2: Foreign Aid

[Groves 11](#) writes that under the law of the sea we would have to pay a tax (aka royalties) for any drilling done on our extended continental shelf such as in the gulf of Mexico. This money would be used as aid to developing nations. [The ECSTF](#) estimates that these payments could be trillions of dollars. In comparison, Africa has received [less than 1 trillion dollars of aid](#) total in the past half century.

This is really important as [Lee 15 of Duksung University](#) writes that aid to foreign governments is often spent on improving healthcare and infrastructure, creating the foundation for long term economic growth. As a result, [Dollar of Stanford University](#) concludes that every 10 billion dollar increase in aid lifts 7 million people out of poverty.

Contention 3: Marine Medicine

[Moore of UVirginia](#) finds that currently, countries are refusing to let US scientists research in their oceans. Luckily, [Article 238 of The Law of The Sea](#) guarantees the right of scientists to research wherever they want in any country. Critically, [Malve 16 of Harvard](#) finds that marine research is important for developing medicine to fight major diseases such as cancer and malaria. Indeed, [Bruckner 02 of Issue](#) writes that scientists are 400 times more likely to find a

life saving drug through marine research. The World Bank implicates that currently 54 million people die every year of major disease.

Contention 4: Green Lawsuits

Article 194 of the law of the sea demands that member states take all measures necessary to minimize damage to the environment, in order to enforce this, the law of the sea allows for the suing of nations to force them to adopt stricter environmental standards. Groves 12 of The Heritage Foundation implicates, that if the US accedes to the treaty, we would be the target of these lawsuits by other countries, and even our own environmental groups.

The US would be forced to comply with the rulings as [Kirgil of the ASIL](#) writes that under the current American judicial standard international treaties have the same weight as US law. Because any damage is enough to sue over, [Murray](#) writes that these lawsuits would mean the end of fossil fuel use in the US [ending 20% of worldwide emissions](#), which [Chen of The Nation](#) reports kills 9 million people every year.

Contention 5: Peace in the South China Sea

[The SCMP](#) finds that the situation in Asia is escalating as US and Chinese warships continuously confront each other and come close to conflict. Luckily [Yamei 15 of the CIS](#) writes that joining the law of the sea would enable America to counter China over a negotiating table, rather than through maritime confrontation due its dispute resolution provisions. This is really important as [Tellis of The CEC](#) writes that even small incidents between America and China can escalate into full fledged geopolitical polarization and conflict, which would destroy financial markets and killing hundreds of millions.

Foreign Aid

[Groves 11](#) writes that under the law of the sea we would have to pay royalties for any drilling done on our extended continental shelf such as in the gulf of mexico or off the coast of california to be used as aid to developing nations. [The ECSTF](#) estimates that these payments would be trillions of dollars. In comparison, sub saharan Africa has received [less than 1 trillion dollars of aid](#) total since 1960.

This is really important as [Lee 15 of Duksung University](#) writes that aid to foreign governments is often spent on improving healthcare and infrastructure, creating the foundation for long term economic growth. As a result, [Dollar of Stanford University](#) concludes that every 10 billion dollar increase in aid lifts 7 million people out of poverty.

CFL NEG

Neg

Aadhavaarasan Raviarasan and I Negate: Resolved the US should accede to the United Nations Convention on the Law of The Sea without reservations

Contention 1: Oil Drilling

Affirming triggers Arctic Oil Drilling in 2 ways.

The First Wei is American Drilling

[Duff 05 from UMass](#) writes that American corporations are ready, willing, and able to drill in the arctic. However, because the law of the sea governs ocean resources and the US is not part of the treaty, corporations cannot legally drill.

Unfortunately, [Ryan 10 of UDayton](#) reports that accession to the law of the sea would maximize legal certainty regarding the United States' rights to energy resources in large offshore areas, including the areas of the Arctic Ocean.

The Second Wei is Russian Drilling

[Stubbs 15 of Reuters](#) writes that there is strong support among the Russian people to move their economy away from oil. [Slav 17 of Oil Price](#) furthers that Russia is diversifying into sectors like agriculture right now, which is why [Staalesen 17 of the Barents](#) reports that Russian investment into arctic oil drilling has been cut by 17 times.

However, [Huock 13 of Penn State](#) finds that upon accession the US will be able to extend its territorial claims in the arctic by up to 600 miles. [Atkin 18 of New Republic](#) implicates that US arctic expansion would create a perception of a race for control in the region, incentivizing Russia to restart drilling in order to win the arctic scramble.

The impact is climate change.

[Walsh 12 of Time](#) writes that arctic drilling releases methane, which is 20x worse than carbon dioxide for the climate. Mckinnon 15 of [Greenpeace](#) finds that as a result, arctic drilling leads to a 5 degree increase in warming. Because warmer climates mean more drought, [Shaver 15 of Princeton University](#) finds that every **1 degree increase in climate change leads to a 30% decrease in African crop yield**. The impact of this is translated by [Berrens 17](#), who then finds that every 1 degree increase in temperature means billions in starvation.

Contention 2: Stirring the South China Sea.

Affirming Triggers tension and conflict in the south China Sea for 2 reasons.

First --- Short Circuiting Diplomacy.

[Mogato 16 of Reuters](#) finds that due to a lack of US leadership in the region, nations are not confident enough to challenge China, causing them to turn towards diplomacy instead. [Zhang](#)

[16 of Foreign Policy](#) explains that this direct diplomacy between China and regional countries like Vietnam and The Philippines are de-escalating tensions and benefitting everybody.

However, [Ha 18 of The Diplomat](#) finds that accession to the treaty would bolster US leadership, fueling these nations with a sense of false hope to oppose China. Unfortunately, [French 14 of The Atlantic](#) writes that Wen nations challenge China, China responds through increasing aggression towards them in order to show that resistance is futile.

Second --- Crossing The Red Line

[Lei 17 of The Brown Political Review](#) explains China expands because its people view the South China Sea as historically theirs, robbed after centuries of humiliation brought upon them by western powers. Howard 18 of [The New York Times](#) corroborates Chinese President Xi Jinping has said that he will not cede one inch of the South China Sea.

[Thayer 18 of UChicago](#) writes that the US has recently accommodated this strategy, ceding control of the region to china, ensuring stability. However, [DeRenzi 12 of The Naval War Review](#) writes that accession to the law of the sea would dramatically strengthen America's hand in the south china sea allowing it to oppose China.

The problem with this comes from [Xiaoming 18 of The National Interest](#) who finds that China is deeply suspicious of the US, seeing it as an interventionist nation who seeks to undermine Chinese interests, meaning any expansion of US power forces China to respond aggressively.

The impact is chaos.

[Heath 18 of the AMTI](#) writes that if China is forced away from its current strategy of diplomacy and towards aggression, the chance of escalation and miscalculation in the South China Sea leading to war will skyrocket. Tragically, [Stout 14 of Time Magazine](#) finds that the last regional war killed 50,000 in 6 weeks.

Even if war doesn't break out [Wald 15 of Boston University](#) finds that the flaring up of tensions can force the rerouting of the 5 trillion dollars of trade in the region causing massive price spikes of basic goods like energy and food. Tragically, [the World Bank](#) reports that the last food price spike put 44 million people into poverty.