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**We negate- Resolved: The United States should accede to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea without reservations.**

## Contention One is Piracy

**The J.C.P.A in 2009 writes that UNCLOS establishes exclusive rights as far as 200 miles out,** **but as the international law of piracy only applies on the high seas, UNCLOS reduces the area where piracy can be internationally policed. Thus, they conclude that pirates take advantage of territorial waters of weak states, creating choke points for international shipping. However, by not acceding to UNCLOS, Luce of Foreign Policy in 2016 writes that the U.S.** **has launched international navel missions to fend off pirates along sea lanes off the Horn of Africa. Fortunately, there has been American success, as Urban for the Naval Forces Command in 2016 notes that maintaining current U.S anti-piracy efforts is a proven and effective way to ensure piracy incidents in the region remain low. The impact is slowing growth. Ward of Vox explains that terrorists have built a working relationship with pirates that is helping them continue to refill weapons caches, coffers, and ranks of fighters, all prolonging the terror fight in impoverished countries. Problematically, Sandler in 2009 writes that in developing nations, an additional terrorist incident reduces GDP per capita growth by 1.5 percent,**

**Kontorovich**, Eugene. “Piracy and International Law.” **Jerusalem Center For Public Affairs**, 8 Feb. **2009**, [jcpa.org/article/piracy-and-international-law/](http://jcpa.org/article/piracy-and-international-law/)

While universal jurisdiction over piracy developed through unwritten customary international law, it has been codified in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which has been ratified by almost every country in the world (with the significant exception of the United States).23 UNCLOS defines piracy more broadly than did the customary law of nations. The treaty includes “any illegal acts of violence or detention, or any act of depredation, committed for private ends.”24 Thus assault and murder on the high seas would be universally punishable under UNCLOS, whereas under traditional international law such crimes ironically had to go unpunished.25 **In some ways, UNCLOS might make fighting piracy harder. Other provisions of the** treaty extend nations’ territorial seas 12 miles from the coast, a significant expansion of the traditional three-mile zone.Moreover, the **treaty gives coastal states certain exclusive rights as far as 200 miles out**. **Because the international law of piracy only applies on the “high seas,” UNCLOS has the unintended effect of reducing the area where piracy can be internationally policed.26 This presents an opportunity for pirates to take advantage of the territorial waters of weak or failed states.** This can have an important effect in gulfs, straits, and archipelagoes, where international shipping must transit through or close to sovereign waters. **This helps explain why the two leading piracy problem areas of the Gulf of Aden and the Straits of Malacca, both choke-points for international shipping.**

**Luce**, Dan De. “Why Is It So Hard to Stop West Africa's Vicious Pirates?” **Foreign Policy**, Foreign Policy, 26 Sept. **2016**, [foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/23/the-world-beat-somali-pirates-why-cant-it-stop-west-african-piracy/](http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/23/the-world-beat-somali-pirates-why-cant-it-stop-west-african-piracy/)

**But the most visible effort against the Somali pirates came at sea.** In 2009, **the United States launched an international naval mission** — Task Force 151 — **to fend off pirates along the [busy] sea lanes off the Horn** **of Africa**. The European Union and NATO each set up counterpiracy flotillas. And China, Russia, and India sent warships in their own separate efforts. **The U.S. Navy famously captured and killed groups of pirates in a few cases and prosecuted a small number in American courts who had fired on U.S. warships.** European naval forces also captured pirates and destroyed a number of warehouses along the coast which were being used by the armed gangs. The international naval forces, however, mostly served as a deterrent, and as a source of crucial information and surveillance that was shared with commercial ships plying the Gulf of Aden.

**Luce**, Dan De. “Why Is It So Hard to Stop West Africa's Vicious Pirates?” **Foreign Policy**, Foreign Policy, 26 Sept. **2016**, [foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/23/the-world-beat-somali-pirates-why-cant-it-stop-west-african-piracy/](http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/23/the-world-beat-somali-pirates-why-cant-it-stop-west-african-piracy/)

The U.S. Navy has no plans to pull out of the 31-nation counterpiracy task force it set up seven years ago, despite the sharp drop in hijackings off the Horn of Africa, said **Cmdr. Bill Urban, spokesman for U.S. Naval Forces Central Command**. “**Maintaining current U.S**. and international community **anti-piracy efforts is a proven and effective way to ensure the incidence of piracy in the region remains low,” Urban told FP.**

<https://www.vox.com/world/2017/7/13/15948184/pirates-terrorists-somalia-isis-shabaab>

There, the US has been striking terrorists only when they threaten US-backed Somali forces. But far from American eyes, the **terrorists** seem to **have built a working relationship with pirates that is helping them continue to refill weapons caches, coffers, and ranks of fighters, all prolonging the terror fight that has ravaged the impoverished country.**

Khusrav Gaibulloev & Todd **Sandler**, **2009**. "The Impact Of Terrorism And Conflicts On Growth In Asia," Economics and Politics, Wiley Blackwell, vol. 21(3), pages 359-383, November <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/156752/adbi-dp113.pdf>

**[In developing nations] An additional terrorist incident** per million persons **reduces gross domestic product per capita growth by about 1.5%.** In populous countries, many additional attacks are needed to achieve such a large impact. Transnational terrorism reduces growth by crowding‐in government expenditures. Unlike developing countries, developed countries are able to absorb terrorism without displaying adverse economic consequences. An internal conflict has the greatest growth concern, more than twice that of transnational terrorism. Conflict variables are associated with smaller investment shares and increased government spending, with the crowding‐in of government spending being the dominant influence.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279931741\_Impact\_of\_GDP\_Growth\_Rate\_on\_Poverty\_of\_Pakistan\_A\_quantitative\_Approach [accessed Aug 26 2018].](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279931741_Impact_of_GDP_Growth_Rate_on_Poverty_of_Pakistan_A_quantitative_Approach%20%5baccessed%20Aug%2026%202018%5d.)

But relationship between GDP growth rate and poverty is proved to be negative so we reject the null hypotheses and accept the alternate hypotheses that there is a significant impact of GDP growth rate on poverty. **As GDP growth rate increases poverty decreases and vice versa.**

## Contention Two is Foreign Aid

**Groves of The Heritage Foundation writes that if the U.S. becomes a member of UNCLOS, it will be required to transfer a large portion of the royalties generated on the U.S. extended continental shelf to the International Seabed Authority. Acceding to UNCLOS puts America poised to supply money, as he furthers that the Alaskan and Gulf continental shelves will continue to generate revenue for the U.S. for many years to come, and assuming a minimum royalty, exploitation in these two areas would generate almost 92 billion dollars in royalty revenue over the next 50 years.**

**Groves**, Steven. “U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea Erodes U.S. Sovereignty over U.S. Extended Continental Shelf.” The Heritage Foundation, 7 June **2011**, www.heritage.org/report/un-convention-the-law-the-sea-erodes-us-sovereignty-over-us-extended-continental-shelf

**If the U.S. becomes a member of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it will be required to transfer a large portion of the royalties generated on the U.S. extended continental shelf to the International Seabed Authority.** These royalties **may likely total** tens or even **hundreds of billions of dollars.** The Authority may then distribute those funds to developing and landlocked nations, including some that are corrupt, undemocratic, or even state sponsors of terrorism. Instead of diverting U.S. revenues to such dubious purposes, the U.S. government should retain any wealth derived from the U.S. extended continental shelf for the benefit of the American people.

**UNCLOS is silent on how** UNCLOS **nations that receive** Article 82 **royalty revenue should spend it.** UNCLOS does not require recipient nations to spend the revenue on anything related to the oceans or the maritime environment. Nor does it require them to spend the revenue on humanitarian or development projects, even though most, if not all, of the eligible recipients are supposed to be poor, developing countries. Recipients are apparently free to spend the funds on military expenditures or simply deposit them into the personal bank accounts of national leaders.

<https://books.google.com/books?id=pBaFj26hjkEC&pg=PA111&lpg=PA111&dq=unclos+choosing+where+to+send+royalties&source=bl&ots=zWY6_PZTCL&sig=lpsqVtELkWgaHZPdHEveDl-Avy8&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjE0ZzerJbcAhUBmeAKHVwDB6oQ6AEIfjAJ#v=twopage&q&f=false>

This 15 our property, not yours, and it IS not a united Nations commission that will have ?Not to say about the extent of our continental shelf or whether any revenues that are generated from our continental shelf. would be distributed. It should only be us — our President, Congress and most importantly' the American people — where sovereignty truly resides. Now accession to UNCLOS will Change the status quo and that is an important note to make. Accession would place conditions as to how the United States may use its own continental shelf because it places certain commercial conditions on certain commercial activities on the continental shelf beyond the 200 nautical mile mark, also known as the extended continental shelf, the ECS. Specically, Article 82 would require the United States to make royalty payments For the exploitation of mineral resources on the ECS, up to seven percent of **the value of the production of resources such as oil and natural gas would he paid by the United States to the International Seabed Authority, which would then redistribute the Funds** to other members of UNCLOS, particularly to developing countries and land- locked nations. Because, as we know, land—locked nations have a great deal to say about how the ocean should be regulated. Essentially, the United States is transferring a portion of its wealth on its own continental shelf in the form of royalty payments to an international body, and power to redistribute it to a developing world. The first question that occurs to me is who is going to be paying these royalties? I am sure some or the oil and gas people in the audience have thought about this question too, because as it is written the treaty places the responsibility for payments of these royalties squarely on the States parties. Article 82, Section 1, species that the coastal

**There are two ways in which royalties are distributed as aid.**

**First is to corrupt regimes. Rumsfeld for The Foreign Relations Committee in 2012 explains that these royalties could go to corrupt dictatorships and state sponsors of terrorism. This has happened historically, as he furthers that the UN Oil-for-Food program in Iraq resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in corruption that directly benefited Saddam Hussein and nations friendly to Iraq. Tennant of the J.B.S furthers that UNCLOS is silent on how nations that receive royalty revenue should spend it. The impact is preventing peace. Anthony of The Guardian in 2010 explains that aid has rewarded the perpetrators of ethnic cleansing and genocide rather than the victims. Thus, Nunn of Harvard quantifies that increasing aid by just 10 percent increases the incidence of conflict by 4 percent. Second is entrenching poverty. Leeson of The Independent Institute in 2007 articulates that development aid is likely to keep poor societies in a vicious cycle of poverty.**

**Rumsfeld**, Donald. "Testimony of Former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld ." Testimony before the Senate **Foreign Relations Committee**, June 14, **2012**. <https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Rumsfeld_Testimony.pdf>

**Worse still, these sizable "royalties"** could **go to corrupt dictatorships and state sponsors of terrorism.** For example, as a Treaty signatory and a member of the "Authority's" executive council, the government of Sudan which has harbored terrorists and conducted a mass extermination campaign against its own people -- would have just as much say as the United States on issues to be decided by the "Authority." Disagreements among Treaty signatories are to be decided through mandatory dispute resolution processes of uncertain integrity. Americans should be uncomfortable with unelected and unaccountable tribunals appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations serving as the final arbiter of such disagreements. Even if one were to agree with the principle of global wealth redistribution from the United States to other nations, other **UN bodies have proven notably unskilled at financial management. The UN Oil-for-Food program in Iraq**, for instance, **resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in corruption** and graft **that directly benefited Saddam Hussein and** those **nations friendly to Iraq.** The Law of the Sea treaty is another grand opportunity for scandal on an even larger scale

**Swanson**, Ana. “Why Trying to Help Poor Countries Might Actually Hurt Them.” **The Washington Post**, WP Company, 13 Oct. **2015**, [www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/10/13/why-trying-to-help-poor-countries-might-actually-hurt-them/?noredirect=on](http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/10/13/why-trying-to-help-poor-countries-might-actually-hurt-them/?noredirect=on)

**Deaton, an economist at Princeton University** who studied poverty in India and South Africa and spent decades working at the World Bank, won his prize for studying how the poor decide to save or spend money. But his ideas about foreign aid are particularly provocative.Deaton **argues that, by trying to help poor people in developing countries, the rich world may actually be corrupting those nations' governments and slowing their growth.** According to Deaton, and the economists who agree with him, much of the $135 billion that the world’s most developed countries spent on official aid in 2014 may not have ended up helping the poor.

**Anthony**, Andrew. “Does Humanitarian Aid Prolong Wars?” The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 24 Apr. **2010**, [www.theguardian.com/society/2010/apr/25/humanitarian-aid-war-linda-polman](http://www.theguardian.com/society/2010/apr/25/humanitarian-aid-war-linda-polman)

All too frequently, according to Polman, the result is not what it says in the charity brochures. She cites a damning catalogue of examples from Biafra to Darfur, and including the Ethiopian famine, in **which humanitarian aid has helped prolong wars, or rewarded the perpetrators of ethnic cleansing and genocide rather than the victims.** Perhaps the most striking case in the book deals with the aftermath of the genocide in Rwanda in which the Hutu killers fled en masse across the border to what was then Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo). There, in Goma, huge refugee camps were assembled and served by an enormous array of international agencies, while back in Rwanda, where Tutsi corpses filled rivers and lakes, aid was not so focused. The world was looking for refugees, the symbol of human catastrophe, and the refugees were Hutus. This meant the militias that had committed the atrocities received food, shelter and support, courtesy of international appeals, while their surviving victims were left destitute.

<https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/nunn/files/faidconf_20130806_final_0.pdf>

For a country that receives the sample mean quantity of US food aid of approximately 27,610 MT **($7.6 million in 2008**) and experiences the mean incidence of conflict (17.6 percentage points), **our estimates imply that increasing** food **aid by 10 percent increases** the incidence of conflict by approximately 0.70 percentage points. This increase equals approximately **4 percent of the** mean **incidence of conflict.**

As noted above, Bauer answered his own question by pointing to the wisdom of Smith. But he went further. Not only is aid unnecessary for development; he argued; it may very well depress economic development in the countries it is designed to help. As Bauer put it, “**Development aid, far from being necessary to rescue poor societies from a vicious circle of poverty, is far more likely to keep them in that state.”**

<http://cpag.org.uk/content/impact-poverty>

**Poverty is also associated with a higher risk of both illness and premature death**.3 Children born in the poorest areas of the UK weigh, on average, 200 grams less at birth than those born in the richest areas. Children from low income families are more likely to die at birth or in infancy than children born into richer families. They are more likely to suffer chronic illness during childhood or to have a disability. Poorer health over the course of a lifetime has an impact on life expectancy: professionals live, on average, 8 years longer than unskilled wor

**Second is to rising nations. Groves notes that the authority may distribute royalties to developing, landlocked nations. The impact is two-fold. First preventing growth. Tirmizi of The Express Tribune in 2010 contextualizes that regardless of how efficiently money is utilized, it causes massive long term damage for minimal short-term gains. He concludes that no country in the world that has successfully made the leap from being an underdeveloped to a developed economy has relied heavily on foreign aid. Ear of The World Economic Forum in 2012 thus quantifies that for every dollar the government spent, it receives almost one dollar, meaning the motivation to independently develop is lost. Second is fueling corruption. Ear continues that aid sends a signal to the government that borrowed money need not be repaid, which instills a sense of lethargy amongst government officials that promotes corrupt or inefficient uses of money. Beeson of The NCBI writes that corruption causes increased poverty, due to losses of public money, health, and sanitation.**

**Groves**, Steven. “U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea Erodes U.S. Sovereignty over U.S. Extended Continental Shelf.” The Heritage Foundation, 7 June **2011**, www.heritage.org/report/un-convention-the-law-the-sea-erodes-us-sovereignty-over-us-extended-continental-shelf

If the U.S. becomes a member of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it will be required to transfer a large portion of the royalties generated on the U.S. extended continental shelf to the International Seabed Authority. These royalties may likely total tens or even hundreds of billions of dollars. **The Authority may then distribute those funds to developing and landlocked nation**s, including some that are corrupt, undemocratic, or even state sponsors of terrorism. Instead of diverting U.S. revenues to such dubious purposes, the U.S. government should retain any wealth derived from the U.S. extended continental shelf for the benefit of the American people.

**Tirmizi**, Farooq. “Why Foreign Aid Does Not Help.” **The Express Tribune**, The Express Tribune, 4 Oct. **2010**, [tribune.com.pk/story/58059/why-foreign-aid-does-not-help/](http://tribune.com.pk/story/58059/why-foreign-aid-does-not-help/)

It can be argued, however, that foreign aid – **regardless of how efficiently it is utilised – causes massive long-term damage for minimal short-term gains. No country in the world that has successfully made the leap from being an underdeveloped to a developed economy has relied heavily on foreign aid.** Indeed, one of the hallmarks of being a dynamic emerging economy is the lack of reliance on charity from the developed world.

**Ear**, Sophal. “Does Foreign Aid Fuel Corruption?” **World Economic Forum**, 3 Dec. **2012**, [www.weforum.org/agenda/2012/12/does-foreign-aid-fuel-corruption/](http://www.weforum.org/agenda/2012/12/does-foreign-aid-fuel-corruption/)

Even debt forgiveness is bad for the economy in the long run since **it [aid] sends a signal to the government that borrowed money need not be repaid. This in turn inculcates a sense of lethargy amongst government officials that promotes corrupt or inefficient uses of money.** If loans have to be paid back, donors are likely to ask for a clear plan to raise the money for repayments. Such a plan is likely to benefit the long-term fiscal health of the country.

On the other hand, if one combined both current domestic revenues and estimates of corruption, Cambodia would have the required resources to develop on its own. However, it is likely that the steady influx of aid is disrupting the relationship between citizens and the administration. Using 2002-2010 data from the WDI, for every dollar spent by the central government, more than 94 cents of net foreign aid was received. **Essentially, for every dollar the government spent, it received almost one dollar. The motivation to independently develop is lost.**

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3206868/>

By its simplistic nature, the model constructed here, has probably a non negligible tendency to underestimate the effects of corruption on children deaths. **As shown elsewhere, across different country contexts, corruption has been a cause** and consequence **of poverty** and so could possibly directly impacts the others significant parameters retrieved by the analysis, especially the percentage of population with adequate access to sanitation [35] and the public health expenditure [36]. **Growing evidence from around the world indicates that corruption, fraud, and abuse are also resulting in significant losses of public money and denial of good quality health and sanitation services to millions of people** [1], [2], [4], [7]. The diversity of health and water/sanitation systems worldwide, the multiplicity and complexity of parties involved make it difficult to determine the overall impacts of corruption in children deaths around the globe. Local studies have to be made to elucidate the underground complexity of the relation between child health, socio-economic conditions, and corruption.

[https://sci-hub.tw/https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5305/procannmeetasil.104.0246?seq=1#](https://sci-hub.tw/https:/www.jstor.org/stable/10.5305/procannmeetasil.104.0246?seq=1)

As my colleague on the panel has ably pointed out, it is easy to sketch out the negative relationship between corruption and human rights: One can say: corruption is inversely related to human rights. **The higher levels of corruption, the lesser degree of human rights protection one is likely to find in a given country.** There has been a realization of this, if not an explicit link, for some time. One can think of the corruption-human rights relationship along two axes: governmental corruption and business corruption—both with human rights consequences: On the government side, corruption affects human rights in at least four ways: # Corruption reduces the capacity of the government to respect, protect, and fulfill its human rights obligations. For example, a government with a corrupt court system cannot ensure access to justice to all. A corrupt police force cannot ensure security of person and so forth.

**Luckily, the status quo will solve the problem. Harris of Foreign Policy in 2017 writes that America plans to cut development assistance by over one third, and Gill of Brookings this year explains that that as a share of developing country GDP, aid flows have fallen to 0.15 percent since peaking at 0.43 percent. If foreign aid decreases now, it is key stop any marginal change.**

**Harris**, Bryant, et al. “The End of Foreign Aid As We Know It**.” Foreign Policy**, Foreign Policy, 24 Apr. **2017**, [foreignpolicy.com/2017/04/24/u-s-agency-for-international-development-foreign-aid-state-department-trump-slash-foreign-funding/](http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/04/24/u-s-agency-for-international-development-foreign-aid-state-department-trump-slash-foreign-funding/)

**President Donald Trump’s vow to put “America first” includes a plan to drastically cut assistance to developing countries and merge the State Department with USAID, according to an internal budget document and sources.** The administration’s March budget proposal vowed to slash aid to developing countries **by over one-third**, but contained few details. According to a detailed 15-page State Department budget document obtained by Foreign Policy, the overhaul also includes rechanneling funding from development assistance into a program that is tied closely to national security objectives.

**Gill**, Indermit. “The End of Aid.” **Brookings**, Brookings, 23 Jan. **2018**, [www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2018/01/19/the-end-of-aid/](http://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2018/01/19/the-end-of-aid/)

The figure shows that, as a **share of developing country GDP, multilateral aid flows peaked at 0.43 percent in 1992 and fell to 0.15 percent since then**. Bilateral flows bounce around more, but the trend since the 1990s is the same: **the ratio has fallen from 1.25 in 1990 percent to 0.43 percent in 2016.** I won’t be encouraging my children to go into the aid industry. The next decade may be its last.

**Thus, preserve the future and negate.**

# F/2 PRO

## F/2: Piracy

### F/2: Pullout Inevitable

1. **Urban for US Naval Forces Central Command reports that the U.S. Navy has no plans to pull out of the counterpiracy task force it set up seven years ago.**

**Luce**, Dan De. “Why Is It So Hard to Stop West Africa's Vicious Pirates?” **Foreign Policy**, Foreign Policy, 26 Sept. **2016**, [foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/23/the-world-beat-somali-pirates-why-cant-it-stop-west-african-piracy/](http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/23/the-world-beat-somali-pirates-why-cant-it-stop-west-african-piracy/)

**The U.S. Navy has no plans to pull out of the 31-nation counterpiracy task force it set up seven years ago, despite the sharp drop in hijackings off the Horn of Africa, said Cmdr. Bill Urban, spokesman for U.S. Naval Forces Central Command.** Maintaining current U.S. and international community anti-piracy efforts is a proven and effective way to ensure the incidence of piracy in the region remains low,” Urban told FP. There is so much interest in understanding what overcame Somali piracy because high-seas larceny and kidnapping are spiking in other parts of the world, especially West Africa. The Gulf of Guinea, stretching from Senegal to Angola, represents a crucial gateway for oil shipments from Nigeria and Angola, two major oil exporters. But it’s increasingly a prized hunting ground for pirates looking to kidnap captains and crew from oil-industry vessels working close to shore.

### F/2: UNCLOS Solves

1. **This ignores the JCPA evidence which says that it only allows for high seas patrol, which means pirates make choke points at territorial seas of weak nations. This is why before nations like the US independently interfered, there was rampant piracy in areas like The Horn of Africa.**
2. **Empirically false. Pike of Global Security writes that 80 percent of all reported piracy incidents occurring in territorial waters.**

**Pike**, John. “Military.” Vietnam War - American Return to Dog Fighting, 20 Jan. **2017**, [www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/pirates.htm](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/pirates.htm)

The concentration of piracy incidents continues to be located in areas with little or no maritime law enforcement, political and economic stability, and a high volume of commercial activity. Incidents of piracy tend to occur in four regional areas: Southeast Asia, Africa, South America, and Central America. **Furthermore, most incidents of maritime crime occur in coastal waters with nearly 80 percent of all reported piracy incidents occurring in territorial waters.**

### F/2: Attacks Increasing

1. **A couple of attacks in the last few years doesn’t really have a major impact, especially at the point where we’re telling you that piracy runs rampant without the US.**
2. **It was because of NATO pullout.**

### F/2: Terrorist Built Contradiction

1. **We can’t really stop communication of terrorists- that’s a completely different issue, and even if piracy is low, we live in the era of communication where even criminals can get in touch. We just say you stop the negative effects of this relationship.**

## F/2: Funding

### F/2: Contextualizing Aid Failure

1. **Long term trend empirically proves economic failure of foreign aid.** 
   1. **Easterly of New York University writes that as foreign aid in Africa soared over the 1900s, African economies were doing worse than ever.**
   2. **Rajan of The NBER in a 40 year statistical analysis of aid finds that countries that receive less aid have higher growth and vice versa.**

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/10/13/why-trying-to-help-poor-countries-might-actually-hurt-them/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.3b13d9115396>

The data suggested that the claims of the aid community were sometimes not borne out. Even as the **level of foreign aid into Africa soared through the 1980s and 1990s, African economies were doing worse than ever**, as the chart below, from a paper by economist Bill Easterly of New York University, shows. The effect wasn't limited to Africa. Many economists were noticing that an influx of foreign aid did not seem to produce economic growth in countries around the world. Rather, lots of foreign aid flowing into a country tended to be correlated with lower economic growth, as this chart from a paper by Arvind Subramanian and Raghuram **Rajan shows. The countries that receive less aid, those on the left-hand side of the chart, tend to have higher growth -- while those that receive more aid, on the right-hand side, have lower growth.**

### F/2: 6 Years Drilling

1. **They try to push us into a corner by saying the royalties are only paid through the Arctic. However, Groves indicates that we could pay royalties through The Gulf Continental Shelf, Deep Seabed Mining, Cables- pretty much anything on the outer US coast. This is why we read you Groves who comes to the conclusion of paying 90 billion in royalties.**
2. **The Houck evidence is from 2013 and super outdated. The Arctic Energy Center in 2016 estimates that there are 90 billion barrels of oil, much greater than the early 2000 study Houck cites which estimates at 73 billion. Prefer this.** 
   1. **It’s a more recent analysis**
   2. **It’s more comprehensive and indicative of Arctic resources.**
3. **Both Houck and they fail to account for the mining time and royalties paid for the excavation 1669 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Arctic.**

<http://arcticenergycenter.com/how-do-arctic-reserves-stack-up/>

The Arctic Energy Center has spoken numerous times about the resource potential of the far North. **The estimates for U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) are staggering for both oil and natural gas, with upwards of 90 billion barrels of oil and 1,669 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.** But because sometimes it can be difficult to grasp the full magnitude of these numbers , the infographics below show how the Arctic’s resource potential stacks up against the known reserves in top oil and gas producers around the world.

### F/2: Already Fund

1. **We’re going to give so much money, there’s a change to the status quo.**
2. **Rutsch of NPR writes that less than 1 percent of the budget goes to foreign aid from the US.**
3. **Thompson of CNN writes that 75 percent of aid goes to 2 countries, Israel and Egypt, still unique.**

**Rutsch,** Poncie. “Guess How Much Of Uncle Sam's Money Goes To Foreign Aid. Guess Again!” NPR, **NPR**, 10 Feb. **2015**, [www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2015/02/10/383875581/guess-how-much-of-uncle-sams-money-goes-to-foreign-aid-guess-again](http://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2015/02/10/383875581/guess-how-much-of-uncle-sams-money-goes-to-foreign-aid-guess-again)

In December, the Kaiser Family Foundation polled 1,505 people. Only 1 in 20 knew the right answer: **less than 1 percent of the** $4 trillion **federal budget goes to foreign aid.** The average respondent estimated that 26 percent went toward assisting other countries. What's more, our ignorance colors the way we think about foreign spending. Fifty-six percent of the poll respondents thought the U.S. spends too much on foreign aid. Once they were told that the U.S. spends less than 1 percent of the federal budget on foreign aid, only 28 percent still thought the nation was overspending**.**

**Thompson**, Nick. “U.S. Foreign Military Aid: 75% Goes to Two Countries - **CNNPolitics**.” CNN, Cable News Network, 11 Nov. **2015**, [www.cnn.com/2015/11/11/politics/us-foreign-aid-report/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/2015/11/11/politics/us-foreign-aid-report/index.html)

American taxpayers doled out $5.9 billion in foreign military financing in 2014, according to the government's Foreign Assistance report -- that's roughly the GDP of Somalia. But where did the money go? To the usual suspects, mostly **-- Israel ($3.1B) and Egypt ($1.3B) received roughly 75% of all foreign military aid money handed out by the U.S. last year.**

### F/2: Veto Power

1. **Two general things- It goes to the ISA who sends, and even if we have a say, 13 out of 20 of the most corrupt nations are on the UNCLOS board which means they outweigh the US decision. Last, the money has to go to landlocked, developing nations, which are mostly corrupt, the impact is still accessed.**

**The new International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea is supposed to offer dispassionate adjudication of disputes. Yet membership is decided by quota: Each “geographical group” is to have at least three representatives.8 In its early days the Tribunal served as a dumping ground for frustrated LOST politicos such as Cameroon’s Paul Engo and Tanzania’s Joseph Warioba, both of whom once had hoped to become the Authority’s Secretary-General. Many of the specific “fixes,” such as to the voting system, are inadequate. According to the revised treaty, the United States would be guaranteed a seat on the Council but no veto. The Council would consist of four chambers, any one of which could block action if a majority of its members voted no. Although the U.S. might be able to round up the necessary votes to form a majority in its chamber, it could not prevent other nations from blocking required ISA business in the other chambers on such matters as approval of rules for mining applications.**

### F/2: UNCLOS Funds

1. **No, Harrison at World Energy Law explains that to date, Article 82, which mandates UNCLOS funding, is not triggered. This is because no country has exploited the resources, but we tell you the United States would.**

**Harrison**, and Rowland J. “Article 82 of UNCLOS: The Day of Reckoning Approaches | **The Journal of World Energy Law & Business** | Oxford Academic.” OUP Academic, Oxford University Press, 2 Aug. **2017**, [academic.oup.com/jwelb/article-abstract/10/6/488/4060652](http://academic.oup.com/jwelb/article-abstract/10/6/488/4060652)

Article 82 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) obligates coastal states to make payments to the international community in respect of the exploitation of non-living resources of the extended continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles. Payments are to begin at the rate of 1 per cent in the sixth year of production, increasing by 1 per cent per year to a maximum of 7 per cent in the twelfth year. The payments are to be made through the International Seabed Authority to parties identified by the Authority “on the basis of equitable sharing criteria, taking into account the interests and needs of developing States, particularly the least developed and land-locked among them.” **To date, Article 82 has not been triggered.**

### F/2: Too Many Countries

1. **Empirically false. Baez of the UN writes that there are 22 landlocked countries that would receive aid. Doing the division, that’s around 4.1 billion dollars a country, even assuming no veto.**

<http://unohrlls.org/UserFiles/File/LLDC%20Documents/UNCLOS%20June%202012/UNCLOS%20Panel%20Summary%20Report%20FINAL.pdf>

Mr. Baez’s presentation provided a detailed overview of the relevant UNCLOS provisions for landlocked developing countries. He noted that **there were currently twenty-two landlocked States Parties (both developed and developing): Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Czech Republic, Hungary, Laos, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Mali, Moldova, Mongolia, Nepal, Paraguay, Serbia, Slovakia, Switzerland, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.** Mr Baez stated that the Preamble of the Convention recognized the necessity to take into account the interests and needs of mankind as a whole and, in particular, the special interests and needs of developing countries, whether coastal or landlocked. He highlighted the UNCLOS articles regarding the LLDCs listed under Innocent Passage, Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ), and High Sea. For instance, he noted that under article 62(2) costal states were to determine their capacity to harvest the living resources of the EEZ and where they did not have the capacity to harvest the entire allowable catch of a fishery, they were to give other states access to the surplus, having particular regard to landlocked states. As for the freedom of the high seas, he referred to article 87 affirming that the high seas were open to all States, whether coastal or landlocked and all enjoyed exactly the same rights.