# Roshni and I affirm.

# Contention One is Reassuring Our Allies.

#### Cardin of Foreign Policy writes in 2016 not ratifying UNCLOS “undermines our ability to work with our allies in the South China Sea” on legal entitlements and navigational rights.

#### Roughneen of the Nikkei Asian Review confirms that these “uneven aspects of American policy have left [allies] questioning the reliability of the U.S. as a partner.”

### Moreover, right now is a crucial time to affirm and revive U.S.–East Asian alliances.

#### Kim of Reuters reports in June that Trump has halted U.S.–South Korea military exercises, a pillar of the alliance since 1997. She furthers that this “rattle[s] close allies[,] South Korea and Japan.”

#### This is detrimental as Ferguson of the Council on Foreign Relations writes in 2015 that if South Korea and Japan perceive the U.S. response to China as weak, they would want to militarize, and eventually, nuclearize.

### Fortunately, ratifying UNCLOS reaffirms the U.S. commitment.

#### Professor Moore of the Center for National Security explains in 2004 that U.S. allies view ratification as a sign of more effective U.S. foreign policy.

## The impact is preventing an East Asian arms race.

**Dr. Kang of the Natural Resources Defense Council writes in 2016 that South Korean nuclearization would provoke a nuclear arms race between China, Japan, and the two Koreas.**

#### This is disastrous as Diehl of the Journal of Peace Research writes in 2011 that an arms race increases the probability of war by 331 percent.

# Contention Two is Arctic Oil.

## U.S. energy independence is looming.

#### DiChristopher of CNBC reports in August that the U.S. has been moving towards energy independence, with a 95 percent drop in net energy imports since just 2008.

## However, the trend is reversing for two reasons.

### First, environmental deregulation.

#### Neuhauser of U.S. News explains in July that Trump has rolled back Obama-era fuel efficiency standards, increasing the U.S. demand for oil. Domestic supply cannot keep up, forcing international imports.

### Second, oil discoveries.

#### Rystad Energy finds in December that 2017 had the fewest oil discoveries since the 1940s. Even worse, the oil deposits are 33 percent smaller and the replacement ratio is 11 percent, meaning for every 100 barrels of oil removed, only 11 new barrels are found. As a result, experts predict massive oil shortages within the next decade.

## Arctic drilling is the only solution.

#### The National Petroleum Council reports in 2015 that the U.S. Arctic continental shelf holds 30 billion barrels of oil.

#### Gardener of the American Security Project furthers in 2012 that acquiring these resources would allow the U.S. to substantially increase domestic oil production.

## Unfortunately, there are two reasons we cannot currently develop these resources.

### First, maritime property rights.

#### Gardener continues that without signing UNCLOS, the U.S. cannot make claims to the Arctic seabed more than 200 miles from its coastline. However, predictions estimate the oil-rich U.S. continental shelf extends 600 miles off the coastline.

### Second, legal risk aversion.

#### Gardener continues that U.S. companies won’t invest in the Arctic without the legal certainty that UNCLOS provides.

## Thus, affirming and acceding to UNCLOS is the only way to develop Arctic resources.

## There are three impacts.

### First, international leverage.

#### Sands of Johns Hopkins explains in March that energy dominance would allow the U.S. to influence the global oil price to benefit allies and gain leverage over rivals.

### Second, avoiding energy dependence.

#### Ebinger of the Brookings Institute writes in 2015 that failing to develop Arctic resources risks renewed reliance on overseas energy.

#### This is problematic as Professor Colgan of Harvard University writes in 2013 that resource wars over oil market domination have instigated 50% of interstate wars since 1973.

#### For example, The Center for Research on Globalization reports in March that U.S. intervention in the 1990 Gulf War, 2003 Iraq War, and 2014 Syrian conflict were motivated by the desire to access Middle Eastern oil.

### Third, economic protection.

#### Fouquet of the London School of Economics writes in 2016 that countries dependent on globally traded energy suffer when oil shocks drive up energy prices.

#### Indeed, Mullaney of CNBC furthers in July that the last five U.S. recessions were preceded by increased oil prices.

### Fortunately, affirming and gaining energy independence solves.

#### Fouquet continues that countries that depend on domestic production are resilient to oil shocks.

#### Neuhauser confirms that if the U.S. were energy independent, the economy would benefit, rather than suffer, from the imminent oil shock.

#### U.S. Energy Secretary Rick Perry agrees in March, “energy security is a road map to economic prosperity.”

# Thus, we affirm.