Atharva and I negate the resolution;

Our sole contention is drilling me softly.

King '18 finds that the Arctic "holds an estimated 22% of Earth's [undiscovered oil resources, amounting to]... approximately 412 billion barrels [of] oil." Furthermore, Cunningham '12 writes that "U.S. controlled waters...hold... about one-third of total oil reserves believed to be in the Arctic."

Companies are currently unable to exploit the Arctic's vast resources due to a lack of international legal certainty.

Ueno '12 explains that "U.S. [energy] companies are... ready, willing, and able to explore [the Arctic]... but they have made it clear... that they need the maximum level of international legal certainty before they will or could make substantial investments." This is because Rogers '12 finds that "without [accession], U.S. companies operating beyond [our exclusive economic zone] would be... beyond the formal legal protection of the United States. As a result, offshore drilling companies [are unwilling] to assume significant risk in operating... beyond U.S. jurisdiction."

Problematically, acceding to UNCLOS would grant companies the very international legal certainty they need to start energy development in the Arctic.

Kolcz-Ryan '09 writes that "[ratifying the convention] would maximize legal certainty regarding the United States' rights to... [drill in] the Arctic Ocean." This is because Houck '13 explains that "Only by [acceding] can we... best secure international recognition of our [rights]... to the U.S. extended continental shelf in the Arctic." Thus, Allen '11 explains that "[accession] would allow us to secure international recognition of a claim to the continental shelf as far as 600 miles beyond our EEZ... [and provide] American companies with a fair and stable legal framework to invest in [Arctic] mining projects."

There are two devastating implications.

First, the carbon lock-in.

Leary '18 explains that currently, "the cost of renewable energy will [be] on par with, or cheaper than, fossil fuels [by 2020]." Consequently, Perry '17 finds that "green energy [is on track to] overtake fossil fuels by [that year]."

However, the NRDC '16 explains that "drilling in [the Arctic] would trigger [a] 'carbon lock-in,' [or a perpetuation of a fossil fuel-based economy rather than a greentech-based one], promoting fossil fuel use far beyond what… science indicates is justifiable." They continue that the carbon lock-in "is particularly strong for… areas like the Arctic… because of the [infrastructure and investment] required." Problematically, Erickson '15 concludes that as a result of the lock-in, "not only will [Arctic] oil increase carbon emissions in the short term… but [it] will make it harder, and more expensive, to scale down [fossil fuel use in the future]."

Unfortunately, green technology is critical for controlling climate change.

The UCS '13 explains that "In the [US], about 29 percent of global warming emissions come from our electricity sector…[mostly] from fossil fuels like coal and natural gas," continuing that a "25 percent national renewable electricity standard [by 2025] would lower power plant CO2 emissions by 277 million metric tons annually."

Long '16 finds that "renewables [support] nearly 200,000 jobs [and provide] $5.2 billion worth of health benefits through improved air quality." Thus, Radford '17 concludes that "[a switch to renewable energy] would contain climate change...and save up to 7 million lives each year."

Second, the methane bomb.

Walsh '12 finds that "methane and black carbon, [two potent greenhouse gases], will be emitted in significant amounts [by drilling in the Arctic]." This will severely worsen climate change, as Kelly '14 explains that "methane is roughly 30 times more potent [than CO2]."

The impact is terrifying.

McKinnon '15 explains that "[drilling] Arctic oil ... will lead to at least 5 degrees Celsius warming by 2100." Billions would die, as the NRC '11 finds that "each degree [of celsius warming will reduce crop yields by] 5-15%," with 5 degrees of warming leading to a "doubling of global grain prices." Thus, Whiteman '13 estimates that "[Arctic drilling] comes with a… global price tag of $60 trillion," adding that, "80% of [the economic consequences] will occur in poorer economies," as Wolf '17 explains that "[the poorest] countries are located in [regions that are] most likely to be adversely affected; and they are least able to [invest] against… the impact." Indeed, Dell '11 finds that for poorer nations, "per-capita income… [decreases] 8 percent for [every] 1°C increase in temperature." Overall, Staines '09 writes that "[accelerating] climate change… could result in the premature death of billions of people."

Thus, we negate.