

Wayland negates; Resolved: The United Nations should grant India permanent membership on the Security Council.

Our sole contention concerns conflict in South Asian.

[Guy '19 of CNN](#) contextualizes that "India and Pakistan have been locked in a struggle over Kashmir for more than 70 years... [leading to] wars in 1947 and 1965... and [unrelenting] violence [that] has killed more than 47,000 people since 1989."

As it stands right now, diplomatic intervention through the United Nations is the best chance for peace. [UN News '19](#) explains that "the UN has long maintained an institutional presence in the contested area [as per] the Security Council mandate [from] resolution 307." [Rajan '05 of Michigan State University](#) concludes that "[where bilateral negotiations have failed], third party mediation [through U.N initiatives and international pressure] will provide for comprehensive... conflict resolution... [action] that can be a path to durable peace in [between India and Pakistan over Kashmir]."

There are two reasons why permanent Indian membership would reignite the Indo-Pak conflict.

First, breaking shackles.

[Hundley '18 of Vox](#) explains that "the nuclearization of the Indian Ocean has begun... [as] both [India and Pakistan] have [started arming nuclear submarines]." She concludes that "when it comes to India and Pakistan... nuclear submarines could increase the risk of a devastating war [not the other way around]." [Clary '12 of MIT](#) furthers that "as [India] enhances its ability to [respond to] Pakistan... India [is more likely to] employ force to achieve political ends," such as claiming Kashmir.

Unfortunately, [Volk '94 of the BIC](#) explains that "[the] UN... [plays a major role in] preventing... full military confrontation [in Kashmir]," meaning that with India as a permanent member, the UN would be paralyzed in the face of conflict, as [Jabeen '10 of the University of Sargodha](#) concludes that "[with permanent] status in UNSC, India would be in a position to block any undesired policy on Kashmir," which have previously included the deployment of peacekeepers, negotiation of ceasefires, and facilitation of troop withdrawals.

Second, forcing Pakistani action.

[Russel '19 of Express](#) explains that "China is... [a critical] ally of Pakistan... [in battling] India's growth as a powerful Asian nation." Unfortunately, [Rajagopalan '17 of Carnegie India](#) explains that "[as a permanent member] India could... use multilateral institutions such as the United Nations to undermine the legitimacy of and constrain any aggressive Chinese behavior in the international arena... [and force China to] pay a diplomatic cost for [vetoing Indian goals]."

Consequently, [Harder '15 of the Wilson Center](#) writes that "Pakistan would... [feel] alienated... if... [India assumed] a permanent seat at the Security Council... [as it would grant India] significant [diplomatic] advantages in the Kashmir issue." Historically, Pakistan has become aggressive when it feels alienated from the international community. [Tellis '01 of RAND](#) confirms that, "[a primary Pakistani goal in igniting the 1999 Kargil War was] reminding the international community that Kashmir is a potential nuclear flashpoint... [rousing]... nations... [like] the United States... to force a peace process."

There are two impacts to hampering peace efforts.

First is regional conflict.

Clary explains that "India's conventional edge [against Pakistan] is substantial and growing, increasing the likelihood that India would use military options in response to [Pakistani aggression]." Conventional conflict would put at risk over 14 million lives in Kashmir.

Outside conventional war, India's advantage over Pakistan would cause the conflict to go nuclear, as [Pakistani General Kidwai '02](#) explains that "nuclear weapons will be used... if India attacks Pakistan and conquers a large part of its territory... [or if] India destroys a large part either of [Pakistan's military] forces."

A nuclear war would be devastating, as [Wilson '19 of the National Interests](#) quantifies that a "regional nuclear war... between India and Pakistan... could lead to the deaths of... 2 billion people."

Second is water wars.

[Johnson '19 of Foreign Policy](#) explains that "in the wake of a deadly terrorist attack... that killed [over] 40 Indian police officers... [India] has [threatened] to retaliate in part by... [damming rivers that partially flow through Pakistan]."

Critically, **Johnson** continues that "Pakistan is one of the most water-stressed countries in the world... [and is facing] a shortage of 31 million acre-feet of water by 2025... [meaning that] any

diminution in water flow will have serious consequences." [Gettleman '19](#) of the **New York Times** concludes that "A full-blown water war could be catastrophic to the... millions of people in... Pakistan who depend on river water."

Thus, we are proud to negate.