# POLITICS – LOST

POLITICS – LOST 1

POLITICS – LOST – 1NC SHELL (1/4) 2

POLITICS – LOST – 1NC SHELL (2/4) 3

POLITICS – LOST – 1NC SHELL (3/4) 4

POLITICS – LOST – 1NC SHELL (4/4) 5

POLITICS – LOST – Internal Link – Obama Key 6

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Arctic Control 7

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – South Asia 8

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Telecommunications 9

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Energy 10

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Rare Earth Metals 11

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – International Law 13

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Power Projection 14

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – National Security 15

POLITICS – LOST – Impact – A2: Hurts Sovereignty 16

AFF POLITICS – LOST – Uniqueness – Won’t Pass 17

AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Link – Generic 18

AFF POLITICS – LOST – Link Turn – GICA 19

AFF POLITICS – LOST – Link Turn – Popular 20

AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Internal Link – DOD Pushes 23

AFF POLITICS – LOST – Impact Turn – Power Projection 24

AFF POLITICS – LOST – Impact Turn – US Economy 27

AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Impact – Generic 29

AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Impact – South China Seas 30

# POLITICS – LOST – 1NC SHELL (1/4)

## LOST passing – support growing

Block, 2012

[Ben is a staff writer with the Worldwatch Institute. “U.S. Leaders Support Law of the Sea Treaty” Worldwatch Institute, May 16, 2012 [http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5993/]](http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5993/%5D) wem

During last week's Cabinet confirmation hearings, leaders in both the U.S. Senate and the administration of newly elected President Barack Obama conveyed support for the treaty, known as the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention, suggesting an end to decades of dispute over U.S. accession. The treaty already has support from a diverse coalition of U.S. interest groups that represent national security, industry, and the environment. Yet continued opposition from Republican lawmakers may stall ratification, in a test for whether the Obama administration can galvanize support for international environmental agreements, observers said. The Law of the Sea has set international standards for fishing, deep sea mining, and navigation since the majority of the world's countries signed it in 1982. It provides coastal nations with exclusive rights to ocean resources within 200 nautical miles of their borders - areas known as "exclusive economic zones," or EEZs. The agreement also oversees an international tribunal to settle fishing, pollution, and property rights disputes, as well as the International Seabed Authority, a body formed to assign mining rights beyond the EEZs. If the United States approves the treaty, the agreement would include the country with the largest EEZ in the world, while also potentially clearing the way for U.S. oil companies to mine the Arctic Ocean. U.S. Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush supported the treaty during their tenures, but conservative members of Congress repeatedly blocked its ratification due to concerns that it would limit commerce and allow international bodies to wield greater control over U.S. interests. President Obama's administration and current Senate leaders have already expressed support for the treaty. During the confirmation hearing for Secretary of State Hilary Clinton, Republican Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska asked whether the treaty would be a priority."Yes, it will be, and it will be because it is long overdue," Clinton said in response. "If people start drilling in areas that are now ice free most of the year, and we don't know where they can and can't drill or whether we can, we're going to be disadvantaged. So I think that you will have a very receptive audience in our State Department and in our administration."Democratic Senator John Kerryof Massachusetts, chair of the foreign relations committee, followed Clinton's response with his own support for the treaty. "We are now laying the groundwork for and expect to try to take up the Law of the Sea Treaty. So that will be one of the priorities of the committee," Kerry said. "The key here is just timing."

## Bipartisanship is key to LOST passage

Rogin 2012

[Josh, Foreign Policy Contributor, New push begins for Law of the Sea Treaty, [http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/05/10/new\_push\_begins\_for\_law\_of\_the\_sea\_treaty]jap](http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/05/10/new_push_begins_for_law_of_the_sea_treaty%5Djap)

Kerry's [efforts](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/27/inside-the-ring-319113972/) to initiate the months-long ratification process on the treaty began last year. He has met with a host of senators on the issue, and his staff has been consulting with businesses and the military and respected national security experts in both parties. But the drive to set up hearings to promote the bill stalled.Hill staffers say that Kerry's committee counterpart Richard Lugar (R-IN) did not want the ratification process to begin before his primary, because he was inclined to support the treaty but recognized that his support could be used against him politically. But with Lugar now out of the way, the ratification process is back on track.

Kerry will soon announce the first hearing, which will be made up of a panel of high-ranking military officials, The Cable has learned. It will be a "24-star hearing," meaning the panel will have six military officers with four stars each. "Senator Kerry has heard for a long time that it'd be helpful for the committee to hold some hearings and review a treaty that hasn't been examined since 2007. The Senate has experienced massive turnover since that period, with 30 new senators," Kerry's Communications Director Jodi Seth told The Cable. She denied, however, that the timing of Lugar's primary was the reason for the delay.

"Senator Kerry considered holding hearings last year, but it wasn't feasible after he was asked to serve on the Super Committee, and there have been other urgent issues from Iran to Syria and the State Department budget that have required the [SFRC's] immediate attention this spring," said Seth. "But now, after hearing from conservative-minded businesses, national security experts of both parties, and the military, all of whom strongly support the treaty, Senator Kerry decided the time was right to initiate some hearings and he hopes they'll be helpful for the committee." **Defense Secretary Leon Panetta also pushed for a new ratification process to pass the treaty in Wednesday remarks at a Law of the Sea symposium in Washington. Panetta called on the Senate to embrace Lugar's bipartisan spirit.**"Our country desperately needs the bipartisan spirit he embodied. It would be an enormous tribute to Senator Lugar's distinguished record to accede to this convention on his watch," Panetta said.

# POLITICS – LOST – 1NC SHELL (2/4)

## Transportation bills spur massive partisan debate in Congress

Lightman 2012

[Partisanship stalls transportation funding, Congress: Lack of long-term legislation could impact economy

DAVID LIGHTMAN; McClatchy Newspapers • Published April 06, 2012, <http://www.theolympian.com/2012/04/06/2059449/partisanship-stalls-transportation.html>]jap

WASHINGTON – Providing money for highways and infrastructure historically has been one of Congress’ easiest tasks. After all, it gives every lawmaker a chance to go home, stand in front of a bumpy highway and explain how he or she is making life better.

When Congress returns to Washington in mid-April after a spring recess, it plans to resume one of the fiercest and most consequential battles of this year: funding highways and infrastructure.

The Senate and House of Representatives are engaged in the kind of ugly impasse that’s grown common in recent years. They’re engaged in what Rep. Earl Blumenauer, D-Ore., called “infrastructure chicken.”

Historically, Congress authorized road and infrastructure programs for several years at a time. Transportation planners could look ahead, set priorities and line up contractors. The last such comprehensive measure passed with strong bipartisan support in 2005. It expired four years later. Since then, as bitter partisanship has become the legislative norm, Congress has been unable to craft a long-term plan. Short-term extensions have become routine. The latest expired March 31.

## LOST key to maritime security and power projection – passage ensures US strategic goals are met

DWK Commentaries 5/23/12

[Will the U.S. Senate Finally Give Its “Advice and Consent” to U.S. Ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty?[http://dwkcommentaries.wordpress.com/2012/05/10/will-the-u-s-senate-finally-give-its-advice-and-consent-to-u-s-ratification-of-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/]jap](http://dwkcommentaries.wordpress.com/2012/05/10/will-the-u-s-senate-finally-give-its-advice-and-consent-to-u-s-ratification-of-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/%5Djap)

On May 9, 2012, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta gave a lengthy speech calling for such ratification. He said this treaty is “the bedrock legal instrument underpinning public order across the maritime domain” and yet the U.S. is the only permanent member of the U.N. Security Council and the only industrialized country in the world that is not a party. This puts the U.S. at a distinct disadvantage, particularly when it comes to disputes over maritime rights and responsibilities. Panetta noted, as detailed above, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings and approved the treaty by large bipartisan majorities and that the treaty is supported among major U.S. industries in order to be able to do their business and to accomplish their goals. The same is true for national security, Panetta said, as demonstrated in comments by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard Commandant. Panetta then listed some of the reasons why this treaty is essential to a strong national security. First, as “the world’s pre-eminent maritime power,” the U.S. with one of the largest coastlines and extended continental shelf in the world “has more to gain from accession to the Convention than any other country because of the interest we have from our coastlines, from our oceans, and from our continental shelves. By . . . sitting at the table of nations that have acceded to this treaty, we can defend our interests, we can lead the discussions, we will be able to influence those treaty bodies that develop and interpret the Law of the Sea. If we’re not there, then . . . [others will] do it, and we won’t have a voice.” Under these circumstances, the U.S. will not be able “to ensure that our rights are not whittled away by the excessive claims and erroneous interpretations of others.” To be a party, on the other hand, “would give us the credibility to support and promote the peaceful resolution of disputes within a rules-based order.” Second, by joining the Convention, the U.S. “would protect our navigational freedoms and global access for our military, our commercial ships, our aircraft, and our undersea fiber optic cables. As it currently stands, we are forced to assert our rights to freedom of navigation, asserting hopefully, through customary international law, which can change to our own detriment.” But by joining the Convention, “we would help lock in rules that are favorable to freedom of navigation and our own global mobility.”
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## Decline in US power projection triggers multiple nuclear wars

Kagan 2007

(Robert, senior associate at Carnegie, “End of Dreams, Return of History” Policy Review, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html#n10, ldg)

This is a good thing, and it should continue to be a primary goal of American foreign policy to perpetuate this relatively benign international configuration of power. The unipolar order with the United States as the predominant power is unavoidably riddled with flaws and contradictions. It inspires fears and jealousies. The United States is not immune to error, like all other nations, and because of its size and importance in the international system those errors are magnified and take on greater significance than the errors of less powerful nations.Compared to the ideal Kantian international order, in which all the world's powers would be peace-loving equals, conducting themselves wisely, prudently, and in strict obeisance to international law, the unipolar system is both dangerous and unjust. Compared to any plausible alternative in the real world, however, it is relatively stable and less likely to produce a major war between great powers. It is also comparatively benevolent, from a liberal perspective, for it is more conducive to the principles of economic and political liberalism that Americans and many others value. American predominance does not stand in the way of progress toward a better world, therefore. It stands in the way of regression toward a more dangerous world. The choice is not between an American-dominated order and a world that looks like the European Union. The future international order will be shaped by those who have the power to shape it.The leaders of a post-American world will not meet in Brussels but in Beijing, Moscow, and Washington. The return of great powers and great games If the world is marked by the persistence of unipolarity, it is nevertheless also being shaped by the reemergence of competitive national ambitions of the kind that have shaped human affairs from time immemorial. During the Cold War, this historical tendency of great powers to jostle with one another for status and influence as well as for wealth and power was largely suppressed by the two superpowers and their rigid bipolar order. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has not been powerful enough, and probably could never be powerful enough, to suppress by itself the normal ambitions of nations. This does not mean the world has returned to multipolarity, since none of the large powers is in range of competing with the superpower for global influence. Nevertheless, several large powers are now competing for regional predominance, both with the United States and with each other. National ambition drives China's foreign policy today, and although it is tempered by prudence and the desire to appear as unthreatening as possible to the rest of the world,the Chinese are powerfully motivated to return their nation to what they regard as its traditional position as the preeminent power in East Asia. They do not share a European, postmodern view that power is passé; hence their now two-decades-long military buildup and modernization. Like the Americans, they believe power, including military power, is a good thing to have and that it is better to have more of it than less. Perhaps more significant is the Chinese perception, also shared by Americans, that status and honor, and not just wealth and security, are important for a nation. Japan, meanwhile, which in the past could have been counted as an aspiring postmodern power -- with its pacifist constitution and low defense spending -- now appears embarked on a more traditional national course. Partly this is in reaction to the rising power of China and concerns about North Korea's nuclear weapons. But it is also driven by Japan's own national ambition to be a leader in East Asia or at least not to play second fiddle or "little brother" to China. China and Japan are now in a competitive quest with each trying to augment its own status and power and to prevent the other 's rise to predominance, and this competition has a military and strategic as well as an economic and political component. Their competition is such that a nation like South Korea, with a long unhappy history as a pawn between the two powers, is once again worrying both about a "greater China" and about the return of Japanese nationalism. As Aaron Friedberg commented, the East Asian future looks more like Europe's past than its present. But it also looks like Asia's past.Russian foreign policy, too, looks more like something from the nineteenth century. It is being driven by a typical, and typically Russian, blend of national resentment and ambition. A postmodern Russia simply seeking integration into the new European order, the Russia of Andrei Kozyrev, would not be troubled by the eastward enlargement of the EU and NATO, would not insist on predominant influence over its "near abroad," and would not use its natural resources as means of gaining geopolitical leverage and enhancing Russia 's international status in an attempt to regain the lost glories of the Soviet empire and Peter the Great. But Russia, like China and Japan, is moved by more traditional great-power considerations, including the pursuit of those valuable if intangible national interests: honor and respect. Although Russian leaders complain about threats to their security from NATO and the United States, the Russian sense of insecurity has more to do with resentment and national identity than with plausible external military threats. 16 Russia's complaint today is not with this or that weapons system. It is the entire post-Cold War settlement of the 1990s that Russia resents and wants to revise. But that does not make insecurity less a factor in Russia 's relations with the world; indeed, it makes finding compromise with the Russians all the more difficult. One could add others to this list of great powers with traditional rather than postmodern aspirations. India's regional ambitions are more muted, or are focused most intently on Pakistan, but it is clearly engaged in competition with China for dominance in the Indian Oceanand sees itself, correctly, as an emerging great power on the world scene. In the Middle East there is Iran, which mingles religious fervor with a historical sense of superiority and leadership in its region. 17 Its nuclear program is as much about the desire for regional hegemony as about defending Iranian territory from attack by the United States. Even the European Union, in its way, expresses a pan-European national ambition to play a significant role in the world, and it has become the vehicle for channeling German, French, and British ambitions in what Europeans regard as a safe supranational direction. Europeans seek honor and respect, too, but of a postmodern variety. The honor they seek is to occupy the moral high ground in the world, to exercise moral authority, to wield political and economic influence as an antidote to militarism, to be the keeper of the global conscience, and to be recognized and admired by others for playing this role. Islam is not a nation, but many Muslims express a kind of religious nationalism, and the leaders of radical Islam, including al Qaeda, do seek to establish a theocratic nation or confederation of nations that would encompass a wide swath of the Middle East and beyond. Like national movements elsewhere, Islamists have a yearning for respect, including self-respect, and a desire for honor. Their national identity has been molded in defiance against stronger and often oppressive outside powers, and also by memories of ancient superiority over those same powers. China had its "century of humiliation." Islamists have more than a century of humiliation to look back on, a humiliation of which Israel has become the living symbol, which is partly why even Muslims who are neither radical nor fundamentalist proffer their sympathy and even their support to violent extremists who can turn the tables on the dominant liberal West, and particularly on a dominant America which implanted and still feeds the Israeli cancer in their midst. Finally, there is the United States itself. As a matter of national policy stretching back across numerous administrations, Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, Americans have insisted on preserving regional predominance in East Asia; the Middle East; the Western Hemisphere; until recently, Europe; and now, increasingly, Central Asia. This was its goal after the Second World War, and since the end of the Cold War, beginning with the first Bush administration and continuing through the Clinton years, the United States did not retract but expanded its influence eastward across Europe and into the Middle East, Central Asia, and the Caucasus.Even as it maintains its position as the predominant global power, it isalso engaged in hegemonic competitions in these regions with China in East and Central Asia, with Iran in the Middle East and Central Asia, and with Russia in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus.The United States, too, is more of a traditional than a postmodern power, and though Americans are loath to acknowledge it, they generally prefer their global place as "No. 1" and are equally loath to relinquish it. Once having entered a region, whether for practical or idealistic reasons, they are remarkably slow to withdraw from it until they believe they have substantially transformed it in their own image. They profess indifference to the world and claim they just want to be left alone even as they seek daily to shape the behavior of billions of people around the globe. The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying -- its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most
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of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between themless likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond.Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War I and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War ii would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even todayEurope's stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United Statescould step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger ofworld war. People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that 's not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world's great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States. Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United Statesweakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China 's neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene -- even if it remained the world's most powerful nation -- could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe -- if it adopted what some call a strategy of "offshore balancing" -- this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances. It is also optimistic to imagine that a retrenchment of the American position in the Middle East and the assumption of a more passive, "offshore" role would lead to greater stability there. The vital interest the United States has in access to oil and the role it plays in keeping access open to other nations in Europe and Asia make it unlikely that American leaders could or would stand back and hope for the best while the powers in the region battle it out. Nor would a more "even-handed" policy toward Israel, which some see as the magic key to unlocking peace, stability, and comity in the Middle East, obviate the need to come to Israel 's aid if its security became threatened. That commitment, paired with the American commitment to protect strategic oil supplies for most of the world, practically ensures a heavy American military presence in the region, both on the seas and on the ground. The subtraction of American power from any region would not end conflict but would simply change the equation.In the Middle East, competition for influence among powers both inside and outside the region has raged for at least two centuries. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism doesn't change this. It only adds a new and more threatening dimension to the competition, which neither a sudden end to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians nor an immediate American withdrawal from Iraq would change. The alternative to American predominance in the region is not balance and peace. It is further competition. The region and the states within it remain relatively weak. A diminution of American influence would not be followed by a diminution of other external influences. One could expect deeper involvement by both China and Russia, if only to secure their interests. 18 And one could also expect the more powerful states of the region, particularly Iran, to expand and fill the vacuum. It is doubtful that any American administration would voluntarily take actions that could shift the balance of power in the Middle East further toward Russia, China, or Iran. The world hasn 't changed that much. An American withdrawal from Iraq will not return things to "normal" or to a new kind of stability in the region. It will produce a new instability, one likely to draw the United States back in again. The alternative to American regional predominance in the Middle East and elsewhere is not a new regional stability. In an era of burgeoning nationalism, the future is likely to be one of intensified competition among nations and nationalist movements. Difficult as it may be to extend American predominance into the future, no one should imagine that a reduction of American power or a retraction of American influence and global involvement will provide an easier path.
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## LOST debate happening soon – Obama key

Connor 6/10/12

[Paul, Re[http://dailycaller.com/2012/06/10/national-security-expert-law-of-the-sea-treaty-a-question-of-sovereignty-video/]jap](http://dailycaller.com/2012/06/10/national-security-expert-law-of-the-sea-treaty-a-question-of-sovereignty-video/%5Djap)

For three decades, the United States has declined to sign on to a U.N. treaty that would give unprecedented taxing and permitting authority over activity on international waters to a U.N.-created agency.

But the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea has been making its way though committee in the Senate, and a vote could come up before the end of the year. (RELATED: Trent Lott explains support for treaty he once opposed in the Senate)

National security analyst Frank Gaffney warns that signing the treaty would cede a significant portion of American sovereignty to an international body that is not electorally accountable to U.S. citizens.

“Suddenly, there isn’t a part of our society, our economy, our industrial capacity that isn’t going to be at the mercy of people who are completely unaccountable to us,” Gaffney told The Daily Caller’s Ginni Thomas. “This is a question of sovereignty.”

**“It’s a question of America as we have known it, and I believe President Obama is determined to try and jam this through, because he recognizes it will be the perfect complement to the other wrecking operations that he’s been running against the rest of our country,**” he continued.

## Obama pushing for LOST now

O’Reilly 5/23/12

[Cary, Bloomberg Reporter, Washington Daybook: Senators to Probe Scandal at Secret Service, [http://go.bloomberg.com/political-capital/author/caryoreilly/]jap](http://go.bloomberg.com/political-capital/author/caryoreilly/%5Djap)

For a sign of how serious the Obama administration is about the Law of the Sea Treaty, look who’s being sent to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They’ll tell the panel that the U.S. must join the 30-year-old international treaty to counter China’s rise and maintain influence in Asia. Republican critics say doing so would undermine U.S. sovereignty.

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Arctic Control

## LOST key to control of the Arctic – key engine for trade

DWK Commentaries 5/23/12

[Will the U.S. Senate Finally Give Its “Advice and Consent” to U.S. Ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty?[http://dwkcommentaries.wordpress.com/2012/05/10/will-the-u-s-senate-finally-give-its-advice-and-consent-to-u-s-ratification-of-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/]jap](http://dwkcommentaries.wordpress.com/2012/05/10/will-the-u-s-senate-finally-give-its-advice-and-consent-to-u-s-ratification-of-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/%5Djap)

Fourth, “accession would ensure our ability to reap the benefits of the opening of the Arctic – a region of increasingly important maritime security and economic interest. We already see countries that are posturing for new shipping routes and natural resources as Arctic ice cover melts and recedes. The Convention is the only means for international recognition and acceptance of our extended continental shelf claims in the Arctic, and we are the only Arctic nation that is not party to the Convention.” Accession would also “preserve our navigation and over-flight rights throughout the Arctic, and strengthen our arguments for freedom of navigation through the Northwest Passage and Northern Sea Route.”

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – South Asia

## LOST key to US naval presence in South Asia – key to US power in the region

DWK Commentaries 5/23/12

[Will the U.S. Senate Finally Give Its “Advice and Consent” to U.S. Ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty?[http://dwkcommentaries.wordpress.com/2012/05/10/will-the-u-s-senate-finally-give-its-advice-and-consent-to-u-s-ratification-of-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/]jap](http://dwkcommentaries.wordpress.com/2012/05/10/will-the-u-s-senate-finally-give-its-advice-and-consent-to-u-s-ratification-of-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/%5Djap)

Finally, the new U.S. “defense strategy emphasizes the strategically vital arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia.” Many countries “sit astride critical trade and supply routes and propose restrictions on access for military vessels in the Indian Ocean, Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea.” The U.S. has had a consistent naval presence and engagement in these critical regions. Becoming a party to the Convention would strengthen the U.S. position in these key areas. By not acceding to the Convention, the U.S, potentially is undercutting “our credibility in a number of Asia-focused multilateral venues – just as we’re pushing for a rules-based order in the region and the peaceful resolution of maritime and territorial disputes.” Being a party to the treaty is also important for the U.S. efforts to preserve freedom of transit in the Strait of Hormuz in the face of Iranian threats to impose a blockade.

## Law of the Sea ratification key to resolving dispute in South China Sea

Bower and Poling 2012

{Ernest Z. Bower is director and senior adviser for the Center for Strategic and International Studies Southeast Asia program. Gregory Poling is a research associate with the CSIS Southeast Asia program; <https://csis.org/staff/gregory-poling>; 7/6/12}DS

The credibility of the United States in the Asia Pacific is at stake on a decision whether to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). While there are other compelling arguments for ratification, none is as urgent as the requirement for the United States to solidify its commitment to the rule of international law, including in the Asia Pacific. This is particularly true in regard to one of the world’s most important foreign policy and security challenges: resolving disputes in the South China Sea.This week, the Obama administration went all in on UNCLOSand sent Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, and the chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of ratification. The ball is now in the Senate’s court. A decision to anchor the United States in UNCLOS is one that cannot be delayed. The president has wisely refocused the country on Asia to advance U.S. interests, from economic recovery and growth to regional peace and security to developing new sources of innovation. Countries around the Asia Pacific are assessing whether the United States has the political will, the pocketbook, and the commitment to further institutionalize its presence in the region.UNCLOS ratification is necessary to answer those important questionsin the affirmative.

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Telecommunications

## LOST key to telecommunication

Perrera 2012

[David Perera is executive editor of the FierceMarkets Government Group, Law of the Sea Treaty necessary for international telecom stability, seabed resource extraction, say execs, June 12, 2012, http://www.fiercehomelandsecurity.com/story/law-sea-treaty-necessary-international-telecom-stability-seabed-resource-ex/2012-07-02]jap

Private sector executives urged Law of the Sea ratification during a June 28 Senate hearing, calling its ratification necessary to enable seabed resource extraction and protect international telecommunications, which is highly dependent on seabed cables.

The hearing, called by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was the second in a series meant to push ratification back to the forefront of Senate consideration. The United States is the only major seafaring or industrialized country not to have acceded to the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention, which has been in effect globally since 1994. U.S. ascension to it has the support of military and diplomatic officials.

During the hearing, Lowell McAdam, chairman and chief executive officer of Verizon Communications, said the treaty would provide an international framework for the protection of submarine cables that's currently lacking. The vast majority of American international communications traffic, aside from that with Mexico or Canada, travels via 38 submarine cables "each roughly the diameter of a garden hose," McAdam said.

**Those cables pass through seabed claimed by some nations, and the treaty allows for cable transit without interference**, McAdam said. But some countries use the fact of cable passage as a way to extract fees, McAdam said, citing the Mediterranean island country of Malta as an example.

He also said that without the treaty's protection, U.S. companies are stymied in attempts to get compensation for damaged cables, as was the case in 2007 when Vietnamese commercial vessels damaged 106 miles of seabed cable.

"It would have been very helpful if the United States, as well as affected U.S. companies, including Verizon, had been able to use the convention to compensate cable owners, arbitrate disputes over service disruptions and deter future violations," McAdam said.

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Energy

## LOST passage is key to energy investment – major companies agree

Wingfield 6/28/12

[Brian, Bloomberg Reporter, Verizon Joins Oil Industry To Support Obama On Sea Treaty, [http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-28/verizon-joins-oil-industry-to-support-obama-on-maritime-treaty.html]jap](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-28/verizon-joins-oil-industry-to-support-obama-on-maritime-treaty.html%5Djap)

Verizon Communications Inc. (VZ), an investor in 80 underwater cable systems, and an industry group for U.S. energy companies have joined President Barack Obama’s administration in support of a global maritime accord.

Ratifying the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea will provide certainty for U.S. companies investing in sometimes contested international waters, trade organizations told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington today.

**“Some nations have attempted to encroach on the ability of U.S. operators to deploy, maintain and repair undersea cables**,” Lowell McAdam, chief executive officer of New York-based Verizon, said at the hearing. **Embracing the treaty would give the U.S. a voice in resolving such disputes, he said.**

The 30-year-old treaty is supported by more than 160 nations, and the U.S. is the only industrialized nation missing from the roster. President Ronald Reagan refused to back the accord unless changes were made to provisions covering mining for underwater minerals.

The treaty went into effect in 1994 and establishes economic and navigational rights in the world’s oceans. It also sets rules for claims to natural resources, including the rare earths that are used in high-tech equipment, under the sea floor in international waters.

“Our companies want this treaty -- quite simply, bottom line -- because it affects their bottom line,” said Senator John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat and committee chairman.

## LOST key to hegemony and the economy – access to more commercial seabed and more military control over waters

Warner and Donohue 6/10

[[http://savannahnow.com/column/2012-06-10/warner-america-and-sea]](http://savannahnow.com/column/2012-06-10/warner-america-and-sea%5D)

The expansion of U.S. territory by international treaty dates back to the earliest years of our republic.

America now has an opportunity for another great expansion of national sovereignty, in this case over the extended continental shelf, but only if the Senate approves the Law of the Sea Treaty.

The secretary of defense and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff joined business leaders and national security experts to publicly call for the U.S. Senate to approve the Law of the Sea Treaty. The speakers representeda broad, diverse group of leaders and experts who understand why approval is imperative to expand U.S. territory beneath the oceans, protect vital national security interests, develop new commercial interests and create jobs.

By approving the treaty, to which 161 nations are already party, the Senate would secure exclusive American access to the full U.S. extended continental shelf. This would mean, for example, a 600-mile extension beyond the coast of Alaska — three times the current internationally recognized 200-mile limit — securing for America a seabed area the size of California that contains enormous natural wealth, including abundant oil and natural gas resources and extensive mineral deposits, particularly vital rare earth minerals used in advanced technology products.

Further, the United States would gain a permanent seat — and a permanent veto — on the international body that regulates access to ocean mineral resources in international waters. We need our government actively involved in this body to defend U.S. claims and interests. Failure to approve the treaty would pose a strategic commercial and security disadvantage for the nation.

Senate approval would also assure U.S. armed forces the legal right to move through and over the world’s oceans (including hot spots like the South China Sea and the Strait of Hormuz), and give the United States access to an internationally recognized system for resolving commercial disputes in foreign waters while protecting America’s exclusive right to address military disputes directly and on its own terms.

Ratification would give America a firmer hand in dealing with the risks of Cuba’s proposed effort to drill for oil off of Florida and Iran’s threats to peaceful transit through the Strait of Hormuz.

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Rare Earth Metals

## LOST breaks China REM monopoly

Sebastian Moffet 012

[[http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-eu-china-rareearths-idINBRE85Q0KJ20120627]](http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-eu-china-rareearths-idINBRE85Q0KJ20120627%5D)

In a separate development, U.S. business groups held a news conference on Wednesday to urge Congress to pass the 30-year-old Law of the Sea Convention, which they argued would give U.S. companies the legal certainty they need to make huge investments to mine rare earths in the ocean seabed.

"We think the Law of the Sea treaty offers the best path to breaking China's dominance in the rare earth area," said Roger Ballantine, a board member of RARE, a U.S. rare earth association. "The current situation with China having a stranglehold in the area is not sustainable."

## LOST passage increases US control of rare earth metals

Wingfield 6/28/12

[Brian, Bloomberg Reporter, Verizon Joins Oil Industry To Support Obama On Sea Treaty, [http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-28/verizon-joins-oil-industry-to-support-obama-on-maritime-treaty.html]jap](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-28/verizon-joins-oil-industry-to-support-obama-on-maritime-treaty.html%5Djap)

The Law of the Sea Convention “will advance and protect America’s energy interests,” Jack Gerard, chief executive officer of the American Petroleum Institute, a Washington-based industry group for companies including Exxon Mobil Corp. (XOM) and Chevron Corp. (CVX), said at the hearing.

The treaty broadens the definition of the Continental Shelf, placing under U.S. jurisdiction as much as 4.1 million additional square miles of sea in regions including the Arctic, Gerard said.

**China controls more than 90 percent of the world’s production of rare earths, and ratification would let the U.S. secure claims to such minerals in regions including the Pacific Ocean**, Jay Timmons, chief executive officer of the National Association of Manufacturers, a Washington-based industry group, said at the hearing.

Senator Bob Corker, a Tennessee Republican, questioned how the treaty would improve a company’s claims, when multinational companies can file claims using operations in nations that have ratified it. Kerry said that without signing the accord, the U.S. wouldn’t have access to the dispute-resolution process.

Technology now makes it possible to extract minerals from deposits beyond the typical 200-mile limit of a nation’s control of offshore assets and the start of international waters, Deputy Secretary of State Tom Nides said yesterday in a phone interview.

“The technology is so much more sophisticated than it was in the Reagan era, when we last debated the treaty,” he said. “Other countries can do so much more, which frankly scares us.”

## LOST gives the US access to the arctic – key to rare earth minerals

Snow 12[[http://www.ogj.com/articles/2012/06/us-should-ratify-law-of-the-sea-treaty-senate-panel-told.html](http://www.ogj.com/articles/2012/06/us-should-ratify-law-of-the-sea-treaty-senate-panel-told.html%5D)]

It’s becoming increasingly urgent for the US to join the Law of the Sea treaty, witnesses from the American Petroleum Institute and other business organizations told the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 28. “This treaty would give us an opportunity to develop more of our own Outer Continental Shelf, particularly in the Arctic where an estimated 25% of the world’s remaining energy resources lie,” API Pres. Jack N. Gerard said.

He explained that Canada, Russia, Norway, and other countries that already are active in the Arctic sit on the council of the International Seabed Authority, which the treaty established. “Some have already filed claims,” Gerard said. “We are sitting on the sidelines and could wake up 30 years from now with less than what we deserve because we didn’t come on board now.”

US Chamber of Commerce Pres. Thomas J. Donohue noted, “This treaty promotes our sovereignty by codifying our rights, but it’s not perfect. It will change, and we’d better be sitting at the table. The bottom line is simple: The benefits would accrue to this country if we are part of this, and we’d better move on this treaty.”

National Association of Manufacturers Pres. Jay Timmons said US Senate ratification of the treaty would help US manufacturers by opening up more resources for development, and by providing access to new rare earth deposits to produce rare earth minerals used to make a wide range of goods including petroleum refining catalysts.

“If we don’t ratify the treaty and businesses don’t start mining more rare earths from the seabed floor, China could start to use all the rare earths it mines for its own industries,” Timmons warned, adding, “That would be devastating.”

## LOST key to rare earth metal control – expands seabed authority

Gaouette 5/23/12

[Nicole Gaouette, Clinton Pushes Senate On Sea Treaty For U.S. Business, [http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-23/obama-to-push-senate-to-ratify-sea-treaty-to-counter-china-rise.html]jap](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-23/obama-to-push-senate-to-ratify-sea-treaty-to-counter-china-rise.html%5Djap)

The original U.S. objection to the treaty under President Ronald Reagan was over one section that dealt with marine natural resources in the seabed beyond any state’s territorial waters. It established an International Seabed Authority to authorize exploration and mining, and to collect and distribute royalties. The U.S. objected, arguing that this section was unfavorable to its security and economic interests.

Kerry pointed to “major interests we’re foregoing” as a result of not signing the treaty, particularly the chance to mine rare-earth minerals from the ocean floor.

“We’re depending on China,” he said. “**We could be mining rare-earth minerals under the sea, but the companies that do it won’t do it unless we’re signatories to the treaty,**” he said, explaining that these firms’ claims aren’t protected if they work for countries that aren’t part of the convention.

“We rely on other countries for resources we could be developing ourselves,” Kerry said.

Panetta told a May 9 forum at the Atlantic Council, a Washington policy group, “this treaty is absolutely critical to U.S. national security.”

Administration officials argue that the treaty “codifies navigational rights and freedoms essential for our global mobility,” as Dempsey said at the same panel.

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – International Law

## US passage of LOST is key to International law – keeps countries from changing it in light of US hypocrisy

Gaouette 5/23/12

[Nicole Gaouette, Clinton Pushes Senate On Sea Treaty For U.S. Business, [http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-23/obama-to-push-senate-to-ratify-sea-treaty-to-counter-china-rise.html]jap](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-23/obama-to-push-senate-to-ratify-sea-treaty-to-counter-china-rise.html%5Djap)

Ratifying the treaty would also let the U.S. counter efforts by rising powers to redefine international law, said Heather Conley, a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington policy group.

She cited China’s “outsized claim to the entire South China Sea region” as an example of how countries are interpreting laws “in ways that run counter to long-standing interpretation and, more importantly for our purposes, to American national interests.”

As the administration has made Asia a focus of its foreign and defense policy agenda, Conley asked, “How can we argue that other nations must abide by international rules when we haven’t officially accepted those rules ourselves?”

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – Power Projection

## LOST key to power projection – provides the military with critical access to transit routes and overall increases global communications

Herald Tribune 6/5/2012

[Senate should ratify sea treaty, http://www.heraldtribune.com/article/20120604/archives/206041002?p=2&tc=pg]jap

An analysis by Pew expands on the potential benefits of participation: •The treaty would grant the United States worldwide commercial access to undersea communications cables that keep America connected across the globe. •The U.S. military would be in the strongest possible position to protect our legal rights to move through and over the world's oceans (via ships and aircraft), and ensure unimpeded access to critical maritime transit routes. This includes traveling through geopolitically important choke points such as the Strait of Hormuz. •The treaty would strengthen America's claim to the full outer continental shelf. In the case of Alaska, this would extend U.S. sovereignty 600 miles offshore, instead of the current 200-mile limit.So far, 161 nations -- including neighbors Canada and Mexico -- have ratified the treaty. Thirty-five nations, including the United States, Iran, Libya and North Korea, have not. Does the U.S. really want to be in that increasingly exclusive company?

**LOST is of national interest**

**Borgerson, 2009**

[Scott G. is the author of the Council Special Report “The National Interest and the Law of the Sea”, May 2009, http://www.cfr.org/global-governance/national-interest-law-sea/p19156] wem

In this Council Special Report, Scott G. Borgerson explores an important element of the maritime policy regime: the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. He examines the international negotiations that led to the convention, as well as the history of debates in the United States over whether to join it. He then analyzes the strategic importance of the oceans for U.S. foreign policy today. The report ultimately makes a strong case for the United States to accede to the Convention on the Law of the Sea, contending that doing so would benefit U.S. national security as well as America’s economic and environmental interests. Among other things, the report argues, accession to the convention would secure rights for U.S. commercial and naval ships, boost the competitiveness of American firms in activities at sea, and increase U.S. influence in important policy decisions, such as adjudications of national claims to potentially resource-rich sections of the continental shelf.

## LOST key to US power projection – current Naval power doesn’t solve

Perrera 2012

[David Perera is executive editor of the FierceMarkets Government Group, Law of the Sea Treaty necessary for international telecom stability, seabed resource extraction, say execs, June 12, 2012, http://www.fiercehomelandsecurity.com/story/law-sea-treaty-necessary-international-telecom-stability-seabed-resource-ex/2012-07-02]jap

McAdam dismissed the argument held among opponents to U.S. ratification that the United States is able to enforce its will via the Navy. "For me to try to convince the Navy to go dispatch a destroyer to fight over a garden hose-size cable going into another country seems to be a bit of overkill," he said.International agreement on the extent of undersea sovereignty would likewise help resource extraction companies, said Tom Donahue, Chamber of Commerce president and CEO."The argument that we're the toughest guys on the block so it's simple--we'll just, you know, go in there and do what we want is probably not the best argument for us to make," he said.The treaty recognizes a 200 nautical mile exclusive economic zone from the coastline but allows that it could extend further based on how far the continental shelf extends from land. In the United State's case, sovereignty could extend out to 600 miles, Donahue said.It is true that the treaty requires companies to pay a royalty in the sixth year of production, Donahue said, but that drilling and mining companies "prefer to pay a small royalty…in return for an international system that gives them undisputed claim to the resource produced."

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – National Security

## LOST key to national security – international law is too vague to protect critical resources

Herald Tribune 6/5/2012

[Senate should ratify sea treaty, http://www.heraldtribune.com/article/20120604/archives/206041002?p=2&tc=pg]jap

Opponents of the treaty are, however, swimming against the tide. As the former secretaries of state wrote, previous flaws in the law have been solved. Participation in the treaty would establish that the United States has the right to declare an "Exclusive Economic Zone" extending 200 nautical miles from its shoreline; in that zone, the largest in the world, America would have the clear right to explore and use natural resources -- from fish to oil and minerals. As a signatory, the U.S. would also protect its rights to claims on vast areas of the Arctic, a potential source of energy and an emerging passage for shipping.

The ex-secretaries of state wrote in the Journal that customary international laws are too vague as it relates to the seas, have inadequate methods of dispute resolution and don't provide a strong foundation for protecting vital national security rights.

# POLITICS – LOST – Impact – A2: Hurts Sovereignty

## LOST wouldn’t hurt sovereignty – rules are made around greater access

Stewart Patrick 12[Senior Council on Foreign relations and Director of the Program on International Institutions and Global Governance. URL:http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/06/-almost-everyone-agrees-the-us-should-ratify-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/258301/]

It is high time the United States joined 162 other states and the European Union in becoming party to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)--thirty years after the Reagan administration first negotiated the treaty.

On May 23, the White House dispatched its big guns to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where Senator Kerry is holding hearings on UNCLOS. The message from Secretary of State[Hilary Clinton](http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/REVISED_Secretary_Clinton_Testimony.pdf), Secretary of Defense[Leon Panetta](http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/SecDef_Leon_Panetta_Testimonydocx.pdf)and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General [Martin Dempsey](http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/General_Dempsey_Testimony%20%282012-05-23%29%20%28Final%29.pdf), was unequivocal: Acceding to the treaty is [profoundly in the U.S. national interest](http://www.cfr.org/global-governance/national-interest-law-sea/p19156).

That, of course, is the unanimous view of every one of their predecessors, under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

And yet the treaty continues to face stubborn opposition from a vocal conservative minority of purported defenders of U.S. sovereignty, still trotting out long-discredited talking points.

All of the uniformed services--and especially the U.S. Navy--are solidly behind UNCLOS. American military leaders have always been discriminating when it comes to treaties, traditionally resisting those (like the Rome Statute of the ICC) that might put U.S. servicemen and women at risk. But they support UNCLOS because it will enable, rather than complicate, their mission. Because the United States was the principal force behind the negotiation of UNCLOS, it contains everything the U.S. military wants, and nothing that it fears.

The treaty's primary value to the U.S. military is that it establishes clear rights, duties, and jurisdictions of maritime states. The treaty defines the limits of a country's "territorial sea," establishes rules for transit through "international straits," and defines "exclusive economic zones" (EEZs) in a way compatible with freedom of navigation and over-flight. It further establishes the "sovereign inviolability" of naval ships calling on foreign ports, providing critical protection for U.S. vessels. More generally, the treaty allows states party to exempt their militaries from its mandatory dispute resolution provisions--allowing the United States to retain complete military freedom of action. At the same time, the treaty does nothing at all to interfere with critical U.S.-led programs like the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). Nor does it subject any U.S. military personnel to the jurisdiction of any international court.

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – Uniqueness – Won’t Pass

## Won’t pass – congressional security concerns and Obama won’t push

Farrah 12

[[http://www.wnd.com/2012/06/lost-appears-lost-for-the-year/?cat\_orig=world]](http://www.wnd.com/2012/06/lost-appears-lost-for-the-year/?cat_orig=world%5D)

While the Obama administration has been pressing hard for passage of the Law of the Sea Treaty, its prospects this year appear dim, according to a report in [Joseph Farah’s G2 Bulletin.](http://g2.wnd.com/)

The U.S. Senate has been trying to pass the treaty since 1994. For those who object to it, there remain serious security and sovereignty concerns.

Also, there is an upcoming presidential election in which Barack Obama will want to avoid controversy surrounding the treaty as long as those concerns remain.

The Senate needs 67 votes to agree to the treaty and even supporters believe there is little prospect of obtaining that number.

## LOST won’t pass - lobbies

Dominic Triney 12

[Associate proffessor of political science, <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/06/the-rise-of-un-derangement-syndrome/258454/>]

The debate over whether or not Congress should [finally ratify](http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/06/-almost-everyone-agrees-the-us-should-ratify-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/258301/) the Law of the Sea Treaty has triggered a full-blown outbreak of UN Derangement Syndrome, the primary symptom of which is an overblown fear of international organizations.

The United Nations' Law of the Sea Treatyprovides international rules for protecting the freedom of the seas, establishing national maritime zones, and accessing deep-sea resources.For the 160 countries that ratified the treaty, including such close U.S. allies as Britain, Germany, Canada, India, Australia, South Korea, and Japan, it's a largely uncontroversial pact that creates order and predictability over maritime issues.

In the United States, however, a small but motivated lobby of unilateralists, exhibiting the symptoms of UN Derangement Syndrome, oppose ratification. The Law of the Sea Treaty is a kind of Rorschach test, in which, if the right sort of person looks closely enough, one can discern all the evils of the United Nations and international law. A bunch of dictators will ride roughshod over American interests. The United States will be constrained by weaker powers, like Gulliver pinned down by the Lilliputians. And Obama's real identity as a one-world government socialist will be exposed.

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Link – Generic

**Great time for government spending on infrastructure**

**Holahan & Kroncke 6/13/12** {

Congressional inaction reflects the public concern over "runaway spending" and the rapid rise in the debt over the past 30 years, and especially the last five. Much of this concern rests on the falsely imagined equivalence of all government spending. But consumption spending and investment spending play very different roles in the economy, whether done by a firm, a family or the government. Our national debate should pivot from a narrow focus on debt alone to one that separates investment from consumption, that is, whether the borrowed money is spent in ways that repayment can be expected through increased future productivity. Carefully chosen infrastructure spending is an investment that pays for itself in greater economic growth; in fact, failure to make these investments can retard growth. Infrastructure investment spending is more likely to be accepted by struggling taxpayers than increased consumption spending on safety net programs such as food stamps or extended unemployment insurance,

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – Link Turn – GICA

**GICA likes the plan**

**ramp2012**

**RAMP CONTINUES TO GAIN SUPPORT! ’12,** <http://www.ramphmtf.org/news.html>] PO

**The Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association (GICA) passed a resolution in support of RAMP at its annual meeting** last week **in New Orleans**. **GICA has long been a strong supporter of the maritime industry** and associated dredging issues. The HMTF Fairness Coalition welcomes **the support of this 212 member association** that **includes most of the ports in the Gulf as well as port users, vendors, and support companies**. [the resolutions adopted at the 103rd annual convention](http://www.ramphmtf.org/gica.doc).

The GICA meeting also included an address by Congressman Charles Boustany of Louisiana, who spoke clearly and eloquently about using all of the HMTF revenue for its intended purpose, maintenance dredging.

[the resolution adopted at the 103rd annual convention](http://www.ramphmtf.org/gica.doc)

**RESOLUTION IX.The Association affirms its support of the “Realizing America’s Maritime Promise”coalition (RAMP) and others who seek to apply Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund collections toward the dredging of our ports and harbors as originally intended.**

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – Link Turn – Popular

## The Ramp Act has bipartisan support

The Santa Barbra Independent 2012

**{**a news and art weekly newspaper published in Santa Barbra, California, <http://www.independent.com/news/2012/apr/20/capps-applauds-house-passage-bipartisan-amendment-/> 7/3/12} DS

The proposal came in the form of an amendment to H.R. 4348, legislation regarding federal highway, transit and other transportation programs, and would protect funding for regular maintenance and dredging of the nation’s harbors by making sure that funds available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) match revenue expended from it each fiscal year. The amendment is based the Realize America’s Maritime Promise Act (RAMP) Act (H.R. 104) which Capps and a bipartisan group of other Representatives introduced. The RAMP Act is also supported by a large coalition of organizations, including maritime businesses and agricultural operators, as well as the California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference, which represents Central Coast ports and harbors.

## Port maintenance has bipartisan support

The Santa Barbra Independent 2012

**{**a news and art weekly newspaper published in Santa Barbra, California, <http://www.independent.com/news/2012/apr/20/capps-applauds-house-passage-bipartisan-amendment-/> 7/3/12} DS

“Our ports and harbors are a vital part of our local economy, but the growing backlog of dredging needs at these waterways continues to stand in the way of their full utilization,” said Capps. “I’ve heard repeatedly from Central Coast port directors and harbor masters that their navigation channels aren’t being maintained at their authorized depths. And while I’ve been able to work with both Republican and Democratic administrations to secure federal funds to conduct critical maintenance dredging on the Central Coast, I know that more can and must be done. That’s why I supported this common sense amendment to ensure HMTF funds will be used for their intended purpose – the dredging and maintenance of our coastal ports and harbors.”

## Congress approves of transportation

O’Keefe 6/30/12

{Ed O’Keefe is a journalist for the Washington Post, who covers the topic of Congress and is the author of 2chambers and The Federal Eye, <http://www.post-gazette.com/stories/news/us/congress-bipartisan-deal-oks-transportation-funds-student-loan-rate-642596/> 7/4/12} DS

Lawmakers approved a broad measure Friday that freezes federally subsidized student loan rates for another year, reauthorizes the government flood insurance program and extends federal transportation funding for two more years.The deal resolved months of acrimonious debate on key legislative concerns on the eve of the July Fourth recess, and offered President Barack Obama an opportunity to claim victory after a high-profile campaign to pressure Congress into action on both the student loan and transportation issues.

## Congressional support for port maintenance

JAXPORT 2012 {

the Jackson Port Authority owns three major marine terminals, and manages and markets them to promote growth of maritime industries <http://www.jaxport.com/about-jaxport/newsroom/news/jax-chamber-and-jaxport-applaud-congressional-delegation-support-harbor-> 7/4/12} DS

The JAX Chamber and Jacksonville Port Authority (JAXPORT)applaud the Northeast Florida Congressional Delegation for its commitment and actions related to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF),legislation that supports the development of ports by requiring the full use of these funds for their intended, critical purpose: the maintenance of the nation’s federal shipping channels. “Ports and the efficient movement of goods are the foundation of our nation’s economy,” said JAXPORT CEO Paul Anderson. “Our elected officials are now recognizing the importance of our ports and the critical need to invest in port development. They stand unified behind this legislation that will ensure we can fulfill our mission and support the growth of jobs and positive economic benefit.”

## Congressional support for transportation infrastructure

Johnson 12

{Fawn Johnson is a correspondent for National Journal, covering a range of issues including immigration, transportation and education, previously reporting for Dow Jones Newswires and the Wall Street Journal where she covered financial regulation and telecommunicationshttp://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/good-spending-and-bad-spending.php 7/4/12} DS

Republicans' singular focus on curbing government spending has transformed the discussion on transportation over the last year. Earmarks, which once drove the entire surface transportation authorization process, are now a thing of the past. Only recently have congressional leaders agreed that cutting infrastructure spending, as originally proposed in the House, is a bad idea. There were even some questions last fall about whether an extension of the federal gas tax was appropriate under the House's conservative fiscal guidelines. (Both Republicans and Democrats determined that the current 18.4 cent-per-gallon tax is OK, but raising it is a no-no.)President Obama asked for $200 billion from war savings to be directed toward highways and bridges in his State of the Union address. The proposal is a response to House Republicans' idea to pay for a six-year highway bill with new domestic drilling, according to a senior administration official.

## RAMP is popular.

Boustany ’12

(Rep. [Charles W. Boustany](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15050459867&returnToId=20_T15050464927&csi=299219&A=0.07564110297068527&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A1S9%23&searchTerm=Charles%20W.%20Boustany%20&indexType=P)Jr., R-La. (7th CD), issued the following news release after addressing a letter with [Congressman Joe Courtney](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15050459867&returnToId=20_T15050464927&csi=299219&A=0.07564110297068527&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0XN%23&searchTerm=Congressman%20Joe%20Courtney%20&indexType=P)on June 26th)

**"With a total of 77****bipartisan signatures, the attached letter shows the fervent****support this issue garners**not only in South Louisiana but **across the entire country**. As the economy struggles to recover, we cannot afford to threaten commerce and trade by failing to maintain our harbor infrastructure. **It plays an integral role in supporting jobs, growing our economy, and competing successfully in this global economy,"**stated Boustany. "**The broad,****bipartisan coalition** that joined [Congressman Boustany](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15050459867&returnToId=20_T15050464927&csi=299219&A=0.07564110297068527&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A1S9%23&searchTerm=Congressman%20Boustany%20&indexType=P)and me in advocating**for the inclusion of our****RAMP Act language is more evidence that maintaining our harbors and waterways benefits communities across the country**,"said Congressman Courtney. Courtney continued, "As we have seen in towns like Clinton and Westbrook in my district, accessible, functioning waterways have immediate economic benefits to the communities around them. Maintaining these waterways is critical to growing new markets at home and abroad for local businesses. In Connecticut today, more than $100 million in dredging is necessary, according to the Army Corps of Engineers. This funding would help meet that need and ensure that our communities get the help they need to spur job growth and continue our economic recovery."

## Congressman urges to pass the RAMP act

Charles Boustany (direct quote) 12[Congressman]

Congressman Charles W. Boustany, Jr., released the following statement after the House voted to pass the FY 2013 Energy & Water Appropriations bill.

This bill continues to ignore South Louisiana’s coastline and wetlands and severely underfunds the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Operations & Maintenance account at the expense of the nation’s waterways. Boustany, an outspoken critic of this legislation, voted against the bill:

“This bill continues to steal money from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) at the expense of our nation’s ports and harbors. The Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) will generate $1.6 billion next year, but only a little over half will be used toward dredging and maintenance. The rest will be funneled off into other accounts. This vote allows for approximately $658 million of a dedicated user fee to continue to be diverted from the HMTF for unrelated appropriations and budget gimmicks.

“As Chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight, with jurisdiction over taxes and revenues, I held a February hearing looking into this issue. At a time when Americans are concerned about our nation’s competitiveness, the federal government seems to be content with allowing our ports and waterways to fall into disrepair. This is a blatant abuse of the dedicated federal tax meant to maintain and care for our nation’s main avenue for trade exports. Louisiana is the nation’s 4th largest trading state and our farmers, shippers, mariners, and port workers deserve and are demanding full use of the HMT.

“This bill goes a step further in negatively impacting South Louisiana. Since Hurricane Rita, dollars invested in the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Feasibility Study have advanced this comprehensive protection and restoration plan. This legislation contains zero funding for the Southwest Study. South Louisianans need comprehensive hurricane and storm protection to protect vital energy infrastructure and their livelihoods. The Study will provide key information needed to protect and restore Calcasieu, Cameron, and Vermilion Parishes from devastating hurricanes. Much needed funding to accelerate completion of the Study is critical not just to Louisiana, but to our entire country.

“Through my efforts, the funding level is historic, but we are at a critical juncture. I will not support a bill that steals from our nation’s waterways. Doing so will directly harm small businesses, industries, and families in South Louisiana. The issue will not be solved until the amount of HMT receipts equal the amount of expenditures. With 195 cosponsors, the RAMP Act, H.R. 104, gained wide bipartisan support because it seeks to fix the current raiding of the HMTF.”

## Plan popular, Port bills receive support

McCarter 12

[[http://www.hstoday.us/briefings/today-s-news-analysis/single-article/aviation-port-security-bills-enjoy-bipartisan-support-from-house-lawmakers/8774d00b80793d7b125324dc9dad3510.html]](http://www.hstoday.us/briefings/today-s-news-analysis/single-article/aviation-port-security-bills-enjoy-bipartisan-support-from-house-lawmakers/8774d00b80793d7b125324dc9dad3510.html%5D)

The bills, including the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act (HR 1447), the Securing Maritime Activities through Risk–based Targeting (SMART) for Port Security Act (HR 4251) and the Gauging American Port Security (GAPS) Act (HR 4005) enjoyed bipartisan support.None of the bills has companion legislation in the Senate but all three moved there for consideration. The Senate could take up the bills or they could become included in a conference for the homeland security appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013.Rep. Bennie Thompson (D-Miss.), ranking member of the House Homeland Security Committee, pointed out that Democrats on his committee sponsored to two of the bills and had significant input on the third.Thompson himself introduced the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act, which would authorize the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) to provide feedback on policies and procedures at the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). The ASAC would be made up of travel industry stakeholders that are impacted by TSA regulations. Under the bill, the administrator of TSA would appoint ASAC members and set up working groups for air cargo, general aviation and perimeter security.The SMART Port Security Act, introduced by Rep. Candice Miller (R-Mich.), would improve coordination between US Customs and Border Protection and the US Coast Guard, as [previously reported by Homeland Security Today](http://www.hstoday.us/briefings/daily-news-briefings/single-article/house-passes-smart-port-security-act/72d3848e4364b08c68905deac8f0d51f.html). The bill also would provide relief to port workers who face the prospect of having to renew their Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) cards in October 2012. Thompson pressed for that provision, given that the Coast Guard has not yet set up readers for the TWIC cards, which essentially have been reduced to regular identification cards despite the promise of their biometric verification capabilities.The cost of a TWIC card, $132.50, for another five-year period would be unreasonably burdensome on port workers who cannot take advantage of all of its security features, Thompson argued. "Changes to the TWIC program could affect offsetting receipts and subsequent direct spending; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply," the Congressional Budget Office said of Thompson's provision in a report on June 11. Finally, the GAPS Act would require the Department of Homeland Security to examine gaps in port security and report to Congress with a plan to address those gaps. Rep. Janice Hahn (D-Calif.), who sponsored the bill, hailed its passage, 411-9, Thursday. In a statement, Hahn said, "The loopholes that continue to exist in port security keep me up at night. My first question as a member of the Homeland Security Committee was to Lee Hamilton, vice chair of the 9/11 Commission, on what Congress should be doing to protect our ports. Mr. Hamilton's response that Congress wasn't focused enough on our ports meant we needed to act." US ports receive roughly 50,000 calls from ships annually, with 2 billion tons of freight and 134 million passengers, Hahn reported. The contribution of this cargo to the US economy is staggeringly significant, but only 3 percent or less of cargo undergoes scanning. That low amount opens up opportunities for terrorists to smuggle people or weapons into the United States, she argued. A terrorist attack on the Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach would cost billions to the economy of California and displace thousands of port workers, Hahn warned. Geraldine Knatz, executive director of the Port of Los Angeles, praised the GAPS Act as an effort to prevent such a catastrophe. "It's a tribute to both the importance of the issue and Representative Hahn's tenacity that Congress passed her legislation a mere four months after she introduced the bill," Knatz said in a statement. "Trade gateways, like the Port of Los Angeles, are critical pieces of our nation's economic infrastructure. Keeping these gateways safe is a national priority." Thompson also welcomed passage of all three bills Thursday. "As all of us have a stake in securing our nation, my Aviation Security Advisory Committee bill will ensure that the stakeholders who are expected to comply with the policies and procedures developed by TSA have a seat at the table.  Then we can be confident that TSA policies are both effective from a security standpoint and address the economic and commercial realities of our nation's airports," Thompson said in a statement. "The SMART Port Act is rooted in not only the improvements to the TWIC program but also what it seeks to do to improve coordination and cooperation between DHS' maritime components and strengthen procurement practices.  This bill is the result of bipartisan efforts to strengthen the security of America's ports and waterways and ensure the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security efforts are as effective and efficient as practicable," Thompson added.

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Internal Link – DOD Pushes

## No internal link – DOD pushes LOST

Carlo Munoz 012

[[http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/230839-dod-looks-to-overseas-allies-for-help-passing-law-of-the-sea-treaty-]](http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/230839-dod-looks-to-overseas-allies-for-help-passing-law-of-the-sea-treaty-)

The Defense Department is looking for a little help from its friends overseas as the Pentagon and White House try to break Senate opposition to an international treaty on maritime law.Meeting with the defense chiefs of several Asian powers during the Shangri-La defense talks over the weekend, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta took the opportunity to continue his push for Senate ratification of the controversial Law of the Sea treaty. “The United States believes it is critical for regional institutions to develop mutually agreed rules of the road that protect the rights of all nations to free and open access to the seas,” Panetta told Asian defense leaders during the high-level security conference on Saturday.

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – Impact Turn – Power Projection

## US Navy solves power projection now – LOST kills US ability to use its power

Meese 6/5/2012

[Edwin Meese III, U.S. attorney general in the Reagan administration, is chairman of the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies at the Heritage Foundation. Still lost on the Law of the Sea Treaty, [http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-meese-law-of-the-sea-20120605,0,6473043.story]jap](http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-meese-law-of-the-sea-20120605%2C0%2C6473043.story%5Djap)

President Reagan so strongly opposed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea that he didn't just not sign the treaty. He very publicly refused to sign it. He also dismissed the State Department staff that helped negotiate it. And in case anyone didn't get the message, he sent special envoy Donald Rumsfeld on a globe-trotting mission to explain his opposition and urge other nations to follow suit.

How odd, then, to hear proponents of the convention (also known as the Law of the Sea Treaty, or LOST) insist that Reagan would gladly sign on today. To hear them tell it, the Gipper's reservations were few, minor and subsequently taken care of in a 1994 agreement now incorporated in the treaty.

But with the treaty again under consideration by the Senate, it's important to note that Reagan's objections to it were anything but trivial. In his view, articulated long before he entered the Oval Office, its fatal flaw was as great as it was simple: LOST posed a direct threat to American sovereignty.

In a 1978 radio address titled "Ocean Mining," he asserted that "no nat[ional] interest of ours could justify handing sovereign control of two-thirds of the Earth's surface over to the Third World." He added: "No one has ruled out the idea of a [Law of the Sea] treaty — one which makes sense — but after long years of fruitless negotiating, it became apparent that the underdeveloped nations who now control the General Assembly were looking for a free ride at our expense, again."

What had begun as an effort to codify certain navigational rights had, during the course of extended negotiations, morphed into a "constitution for the oceans" that would push nations further along the road to a world government. Of particular concern was Part XI of the treaty, which created supra-national executive, legislative and judicial mechanisms to regulate the mineral resources of the world's oceans.

One of these institutions — the International Seabed Authority — is assigned the power to regulate deep seabed mining and development on the extended continental shelf. In return for "assuring" those rights, the ISA would receive royalties from gas and oil exploration. Those revenues would then be redistributed to poorer countries.

Those who claim that the U.S. is out of step with LOST need to know that in 1983, after rejecting the treaty, Reagan issued an "ocean policy statement" affirming the U.S. intent to abide by most of the pact's provisions, such as navigational rights. After all, most of them merely recapitulate rights established by customary international law. Reagan's statement also proclaimed that the U.S. had a 200-nautical-mile "exclusive economic zone" in conformity with the treaty. No foreign nation has challenged the existence or breadth of that U.S. zone.

The statement specifically took exception to the treaty's deep seabed mining provisions. Some have claimed those provisions were the only ones that troubled Reagan. But his diary entry of June 29, 1982, makes it clear that the problems went far beyond that: "Decided in [National Security Council] meeting — will not sign 'Law of the Sea' treaty even without seabed mining provisions."

After taking office, the Reagan administration tried for months to negotiate extensive changes in the draft treaty. But the effort failed to produce a document the president could sign.

The man who tried to renegotiate the treaty was Ambassador James Malone. In 1984, he explained why Reagan considered LOST to be unacceptable: "The treaty's provisions were intentionally designed to promote a new world order — a form of global collectivism … that seeks ultimately the redistribution of the world's wealth through a complex system of manipulative central economic planning and bureaucratic coercion."

Eleven years later, Malone declared: "This remains the case today." Despite the claims that the 1994 agreement "fixed" the offending deep seabed provisions, the "new and improved" pact remained fundamentally objectionable.

As senators ponder the treaty yet again, they would do well to consider the question: What, exactly, do we gain by joining LOST? In the most recent Senate hearing, Sen. Chris Coons (D-Del.) asked Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs: "Does failure to ratify this treaty … in any way compromise the ability of the United States to project force around the world, to support and sustain our allies…? Are we at risk as a result of failure to ratify this treaty?"

Dempsey's response boiled down to "no."

"Our ability to project force will not deteriorate," he said, if we refrain from ratifying the treaty.

Why risk sacrificing U.S. sovereignty under the treaty if it makes us no more secure? After all, what initially established and still ensures freedom of navigation under international law is naval power. To secure navigational freedom, territorial rights and all national and international interests addressed in LOST, we must maintain the strength of theU.S. Navy, not look to an anachronistic pact that is intent on advancing a one-world agenda.

## LOST kills US sovereignty

Meese, June ‘12

(Still LOST on the Law Of The Sea Treaty; [http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-meese-law-of-the-sea-20120605,0,6473043.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-meese-law-of-the-sea-20120605%2C0%2C6473043.story) ; Edwin Meese ; *, U.S. attorney general in the Reagan administration, is chairman of the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies at the Heritage Foundation.*)

But with the treaty again under consideration by the Senate, it's important to note that Reagan's objections to it were anything but trivial. In his view, articulated long before he entered the Oval Office, its fatal flaw was as great as it was simple: **LOST posed a direct threat to American sovereignty.** In a 1978 radio address titled "Ocean Mining," he asserted that "**no nat[ional] interest of ours could justify handing sovereign control of two-thirds of the Earth's surface over to the Third World**." He added: "**No one has ruled out the idea of a [Law of the Sea] treaty — one which makes sense — but after long years of fruitless negotiating, it became apparent that the underdeveloped nations who now control the General Assembly were looking for a free ride at our expense, again." What had begun as an effort to codify certain navigational rights had, during the course of extended negotiations, morphed into a "constitution for the oceans" that would push nations further along the road to a world government.** Of particular concern was Part XI of the treaty, which created supra-national executive, legislative and judicial mechanisms to regulate the mineral resources of the world's oceans.

## LOST kills hegemony – puts the US out of a unipolar position

Schlafly 2012

[Phyllis is the Founder and President of Eagle Forum, a national radio show host, and a best-selling author. “Defeat the Law of the Sea Treaty” The Moral Liberal July 4, 2012 http://www.themoralliberal.com/2012/07/04/defeat-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty/] wem

The United Nations Law of the Sea Treaty was rejected by President Ronald Reagan, but now Barack Obama is trying to get the U.S. Senate to ratify it this year so he can pretend he has a foreign policy victory. It’s a terrible treaty that would do many bad and costly things to our country, and it ought to be defeated permanently. Americans today are in no mood to subordinate U.S. sovereignty, plus 70% of the world’s surface area, to another United Nations global bureaucracy.

President Obama has gotten the U.S. Navy to say we need this treaty to preserve our freedom of the seas in dangerous waters such as the Strait of Hormuz, which Iran has threatened to block, and the South China Sea, where China wants to be the dominant naval power. In fact, freedom of navigation is recognized by centuries of international law, effectively policed by the British Navy for 400 years, and by our U.S. Navy for t he last 200 years. The United Nations has no navy of its own, so American sailors will still be expected to protect the world’s sea lanes and punish piracy.

The Law of the Sea Treaty plans to regulate deep-sea production everywhere in the world, most of which is paid for by American money. But the treaty would tax this for the benefit of foreign freeloaders. The environmentalists support the Law of the Sea because they think it will enable their lawyers to sue Americans before a 21-member International Tribunal in Hamburg, Germany, where judgments can be issued against Americans and cannot be appealed to any U.S. court. The whole concept of putting the United States in the noose of another global organization, in which the U.S. has only the same one vote as Cuba, is offensive to Americans. The Law of the Sea Treaty must be defeated.

## LOST kills hegemony – transfers governing power to the international world

May 12

[[http://www.newschief.com/article/20120702/NEWS/207025007]](http://www.newschief.com/article/20120702/NEWS/207025007%5D)

At some point this year, President Barack Obama is expected to ask the Senate to ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty, known to its critics as LOST. Every living former secretary of state has endorsed LOST.

The U.S. Navy is on board. So are many business groups. Can they all be wrong? As former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said this month in an op-ed and testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "Yes."

LOST has been kicking around for decades. The "Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations had all gone along with it," Rumsfeld noted, before it landed on the desks of President Ronald Reagan and then-British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Both were adamant in their opposition, seeing it as a "sweeping power grab" by international bureaucrats seeking to create "the largest mechanism for the worldwide redistribution of wealth in human history."

The late Jeane Kirkpatrick, ambassador to the United Nations under Reagan, testified against the treaty in 2004, telling the Senate it would "diminish our capacity for self-government, including, ultimately, our capacity for self-defense."

Ratification of the treaty would make the U.S. a member of the "International Seabed Authority," an "autonomous international organization" established in 1994 in Kingston, Jamaica. The authority has 161 member states including Zimbabwe, Belarus, Cuba and Sudan, and if the U.S. joins it will have an equal voice - though we will be obliged to contribute 22 percent of the budget.

But that's the least of it. Accession, Rumsfeld stressed, means granting to the authority the power to "regulate American citizens and businesses," even though it "would not be accountable politically to the American people."

The U.S. would accept the authority's control of all ocean resources. We would agree to transfer to the authority a share of all wealth Americans produce from the seas, including from the American continental shelf, the seabed contiguous to our coasts. These payments would be called "international royalties" but with equal accuracy they could be called a new tax on Americans - one paid not to the U.S. Treasury but to an institution of global governance.

"Over time, hundreds of billions of dollars could flow through the authority with little oversight," Rumsfeld told Congress. "The United States could not control how those revenues are spent. ... It would constitute a massive form of global welfare, courtesy of the American taxpayer."

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – Impact Turn – US Economy

## LOST will sink the US economy

Hatch, June ’12

(http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/05/23/law-sea-treaty-will-sink-america-economy/ ; [The *Law of the Sea treaty* will sink America's economy](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=law%20of%20the%20sea%20treaty&source=web&cd=10&sqi=2&ved=0CHAQFjAJ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.foxnews.com%2Fopinion%2F2012%2F05%2F23%2Flaw-sea-treaty-will-sink-america-economy%2F&ei=vQP3T9OCCKil6wHp-_TvBg&usg=AFQjCNEcUjLFpan2rNca0JSG_P4EvnK2Wg&cad=rja) ; senator orrin hatch)

The treaty that Reagan refused to sign in 1982 is reappearing once again in the Senate.  The truth is, **LOST contains numerous provisions that hurt the U.S. economy at a time when we need more jobs – not fewer.  Under the guise of being for “the good of mankind, ” LOST would obligate the United States to share information and technology in what amounts to global taxes and technology transfer requirements that are really nothing more than an attempt to redistribute U.S. wealth to the Third World.** At the center of these taxes and transfers is the International Seabed Authority (ISA), a Kingston, Jamaica based supra-national governing body established by the treaty for the purpose of redistributing cash and technology from the “developed world” to the “developing world.” Ceding authority to the ISA would mean that the sovereignty currently held by the U.S. over **the natural resources located on large parts of the continental shelf would be lost**.  **That loss would mean lost revenue for the US government in the form of lost royalties that the U.S. government collects from the production of those resources.According to the U.S. Extended Continental Shelf Task Force, which is currently mapping the continental shelf, the resources there “may be worth billions if not trillions” of dollars.**

## US will lose economic leadership if LOST is passed

Hatch, June ’12

(http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/05/23/law-sea-treaty-will-sink-america-economy/ ; [The *Law of the Sea treaty* will sink America's economy](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=law%20of%20the%20sea%20treaty&source=web&cd=10&sqi=2&ved=0CHAQFjAJ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.foxnews.com%2Fopinion%2F2012%2F05%2F23%2Flaw-sea-treaty-will-sink-america-economy%2F&ei=vQP3T9OCCKil6wHp-_TvBg&usg=AFQjCNEcUjLFpan2rNca0JSG_P4EvnK2Wg&cad=rja) ; senator orrin hatch)

**Proponents of the treaty will claim that the technology transfer portion of the treaty has been significantly changed.**  In truth, **nations with mining and resource recovery technologies like the United States will be obligated to share those technologies with Third World competitors**, and that is one of the many issues, which trouble those of us opposed to the treaty. **In other words, US companies would be forced to give away the very types of innovation that historically have made our nation a world leader while fueling our economic engine.** Under the best of US economic circumstances, the Senate should say no to such an egregious breach of the trust Americans have placed in us. Our current economic struggles are all the more reason to say no to a treaty that is all cost and no benefit.

## LOST hurts US companies.

Wong, ’12

(<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/14/rumsfeld-hits-law-of-sea-treaty/> ; Rumfeld Hits Law Of Sea Treaty ; Kristina Wong is a national security reporter for The Washington Times, covering defense, foreign policy and intelligence affair)

**Former Defense Secretary** [**Donald H. Rumsfeld**](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/donald-h-rumsfeld/) **criticized the** [**U.N.**](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/united-nations/)**’s Law of the Sea Treaty as a potential burden on U.S. companies**, just hours after six four-star military officers had hailed the treaty as a key diplomatic tool. The diametrically opposed assessments of the treaty were aired before the [Senate Foreign Relations Committee](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/united-states-senate-committee-on-foreign-relations/) on Thursday. **The military officers said the U.S. would have to rely solely on military might to project power abroad and could lose access to energy resources in the extended U.S. continental sea shelves if the** [**Senate**](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) **does not ratify the treaty.** “Competing claims in the maritime domain by some coastal states are becoming more numerous and contentious. Some of these claims, if left unchallenged, would put us at risk our operational rights and freedoms in key areas of the Asia-Pacific,” said Navy [Adm. Samuel J. Locklear III](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/samuel-j-locklear-iii/), commander of [U.S. Pacific Command](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/us-pacific-command/). The officers also argued that ratifying the treaty would give the U.S. more credibility with other treaty members when resolving maritime disputes and conducting naval operations. “We have young lieutenants that are commanding patrol boats … and they need the clarity and the continuity and the predictability this convention provides in terms of making determinations on a daily basis on jurisdictional issues and other things,” said [Adm. Robert J. Papp Jr.](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/robert-j-papp-jr/), commandant of the Coast Guard. So far, 162 countries have signed and ratified the treaty, which became effective in 1994. The U.S. has signed but not ratified the pact. Some senators fear it would yield U.S. sovereignty to international law, impose environmental pollution fees and burden U.S. companies with royalties for energy exploitation. They also note that some treaty members, such as China, do not abide by its rules. “This thing hasn’t helped one bit to resolve the tensions, the disputes that are going on in the South China Sea,” said Sen. James E. Risch, Idaho Republican. In his testimony, [Mr. Rumsfeld](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/donald-h-rumsfeld/) argued against ratification, calling **the royalties that U.S. companies would have to pay under the pact “a new idea of enormous consequence.**” **Under the treaty, industrialized countries pay royalties to less-developed nations for profits made while exploiting unclaimed energy resources, he said, adding that this type of wealth redistribution is a “novel principle that has, in my view, no clear limits**” that “could become a precedent for the resources of outer space.”

## LOST would hurt the United States and its economy

Hatch & Cornyn 2012

[Utah Republican Senator Orrin is the ranking Member of the Senate Finance Committee. Texas Republican Sen. John is a senior member of the Senate Finance Committee. “The Law of the Sea treaty will sink America's economy” Fox News, May 23, 2012 http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/05/23/law-sea-treaty-will-sink-america-economy/#ixzz1znYyv5PQ] wem

The treaty that Reagan refused to sign in 1982 is reappearing once again in the Senate.  The truth is, LOST contains numerous provisions that hurt the U.S. economy at a time when we need more jobs – not fewer.

Under the guise of being for “the good of mankind, ” LOST would obligate the United States to share information and technology in what amounts to global taxes and technology transfer requirements that are really nothing more than an attempt to redistribute U.S. wealth to the Third World.

At the center of these taxes and transfers is the International Seabed Authority (ISA), a Kingston, Jamaica based supra-national governing body established by the treaty for the purpose of redistributing cash and technology from the “developed world” to the “developing world.”

Ceding authority to the ISA would mean that the sovereignty currently held by the U.S. over the natural resources located on large parts of the continental shelf would be lost.  That loss would mean lost revenue for the US government in the form of lost royalties that the U.S. government collects from the production of those resources. According to the U.S. Extended Continental Shelf Task Force, which is currently mapping the continental shelf, the resources there “may be worth billions if not trillions” of dollars.

In case proponents of LOST have not noticed, the US is over $15 trillion in debt, and we still have more than 20 million Americans who can’t find a job. The last thing we need to do redistribute funds from our country to our economic and strategic competitors.

To make matters worse, the US would have no control over how or to whom the taxes and technology would be redistributed.

Undoubtedly funds that rightfully belong to the American taxpayer would be sent to corrupt governmental regimes, make dictators wealthier, and could even be used for activities directed against the United States and our interests.

Under the treaty, the transfer of these funds does not end with nation states.  These royalty revenues would even be extended to “peoples who have not attained full independence or other self-governing status.”  That means groups like the Palestinian Authority and potentially other groups with terrorist ties.

## LOST hurts US economy

Will 2012

[George is an ABC News commentator and regular panelist on “This Week.” He has a PhD from Princeton and has published numerous books. “The LOST sinkhole” Washington Post, June 22, 2012 http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/george-will-the-law-of-the-sea-treaty-should-sink-to-the-bottom/2012/06/22/gJQALwq2vV\_story.html] wem

For centuries there has been a law of the sea. There might be marginal benefits from LOST’s clarifications and procedures for resolving disputes arising from that law — although China and the nations involved in contentious disputes about the South China Sea have all ratified LOST, not that it seems to matter. But those hypothetical benefits are less important than LOST’s actual derogation of U.S. sovereignty by empowering a U.N. bureaucracy — the International Seabed Authority (ISA), based in Jamaica — to give or withhold permission for mining, and to transfer perhaps hundreds of billions of dollars of U.S. wealth to whatever nation it deems deserving — “on the basis of equitable sharing criteria, taking into account the interests and needs of developing states, particularly the least developed and the land-locked among them.”

Royalties paid by nations with the talent and will for extracting wealth from the seabed will go to nations that have neither, on the principle that what is extracted from 56 percent of the earth’s surface is, the United Nations insists, “the common heritage of mankind.” And never mind U.S. law, which says that wealth gained from the continental shelf — from which the ISA would seek royalty payments — is supposed to be held by the U.S. government for the benefit of the American people.

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Impact – Generic

## Congressional approval for LOST is simply vote gathering – LOST doesn’t solve resources, hegemony or economy – Presidential powers establish authority and hidden measures removes economic benefits. YEARS of proof

Gaouette 5/23/12

[Nicole Gaouette, Clinton Pushes Senate On Sea Treaty For U.S. Business, [http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-23/obama-to-push-senate-to-ratify-sea-treaty-to-counter-china-rise.html]jap](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-23/obama-to-push-senate-to-ratify-sea-treaty-to-counter-china-rise.html%5Djap)

“The big question is ’why do we need it?’” Grove said in a telephone interview. “I’ve never heard an adequate answer and I’ve been working on this for years.”

Grove said the U.S. doesn’t need the treaty to develop offshore oil and gas resources because the government uses presidential proclamations, acts of Congress and bilateral treaties to establish the boundaries of its continental shelf.

Navigational rights are ensured by customary international law, Grove said. And, if the U.S. ratifies the treaty, it would have to pay royalties to the International Seabed Authority, which “could then distribute those funds to developing and landlocked nations, including some that are corrupt, undemocratic or even state sponsors of terrorism,” Grove said.

Grove said that one reason to start the hearings now may be to take advantage of Lugar’s presence. Another may be for Kerry to win a victory for the administration.

“Getting a major policy win, like the long-languishing sea treaty, would be a big feather in Senator Kerry’s cap,” Grove said.

## No impact, LOST is ultimately useless.

Meese, June ‘12

(Still LOST on the Law Of The Sea Treaty; [http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-meese-law-of-the-sea-20120605,0,6473043.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-meese-law-of-the-sea-20120605%2C0%2C6473043.story) ; Edwin Meese ; *, U.S. attorney general in the Reagan administration, is chairman of the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies at the Heritage Foundation.*)

**As senators ponder the treaty yet again, they would do well to consider the question: What, exactly, do we gain by joining LOST?** In the most recent Senate hearing**, Sen. Chris Coons** (D-Del.) **asked Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs: "Does failure to ratify this treaty … in any way compromise the ability of the United States to project force around the world, to support and sustain our allies…? Are we at risk as a result of failure to ratify this treaty?" Dempsey's response boiled down to "no.""Our ability to project force will not deteriorate,"** he said, if we refrain from ratifying the treaty. **Why risk sacrificing U.S. sovereignty under the treaty if it makes us no more secure?** After all, what initially established and still ensures freedom of navigation under international law is naval power. To secure navigational freedom, territorial rights and all national and international interests addressed in LOST, we must maintain the strength of the U.S. Navy, not look to an anachronistic pact that is intent on advancing a one-world agenda.

# AFF POLITICS – LOST – No Impact – South China Seas

## No solvency – China doesn’t apply LOST to the SCS area AND US naval power solves now

Human Events 12

[LAW OF THE SEA TREATY MAY BE IMPROVED, BUT REMAINS DEEPLY FLAWED, [http://www.humanevents.com/2012/06/10/law-of-the-sea-treaty-may-be-improved-but-remains-deeply-flawed/]jap](http://www.humanevents.com/2012/06/10/law-of-the-sea-treaty-may-be-improved-but-remains-deeply-flawed/%5Djap)

LOST supporters, such as a May 9 editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, also contend that it would help temper Chinese claims to large portions of the South China Sea and other areas. China is one of 162 countries that have signed the treaty. “I am utterly baffled by how they think the Chinese will behave better under the treaty,” Bandow said. “China already said LOST doesn’t apply to the South China Sea. In a real crisis, it won’t matter. These are issues of great power politics.”

Currently, American sea interests are protected by the U.S. Navy, by far the most powerful naval force on earth. Critical shipping lanes such as the Strait of Hormuz or the Strait of Malacca are more likely to be kept open by the U.S. Navy, not by treaty.