

Pranav and I affirm.

Our First Contention is a Pivot East.

Despite being home to over 1 billion people, [Freeland of Cambridge](#) explains that India rarely serves on the Security Council.

However, whenever it is on the council, [Ma 18'](#) quantifies that Asia-Pacific countries like India receive roughly 75% more Chinese Foreign Direct Investment, or FDI, which is an investment made by a Chinese firm into businesses located in India.

[Wagner of the World Trade Institute](#) clarifies why, writing that China uses FDI to influence voting on the security council.

This explains why [Marri of the Diplomat](#) writes that India, despite having differing geopolitical interests, often votes together with China.

However, India can never secure a constant flow of Chinese FDI as the benefits of vote-buying are limited to its 2 year term on the council.

Fortunately, affirming will give India a permanent seat at the council, thus ensuring a steady flow of Chinese FDI into India. On top of that, affirming also gives India a veto power, thereby making its support for resolutions critical. Thus, the incentive for China to increase FDI into India also grows dramatically.

This FDI will help alleviate poverty.

[King of International Policy](#) confirms that for every million dollars in FDI, 30,000 [high paying](#) jobs are created. [Wieser of Vienna University](#) furthers that for every 1 percent increase in FDI, poverty is reduced by .76 percent. In fact, in a 30 year analysis of India, [Basu 18'](#) finds that FDI has been the catalyst for significantly poverty reduction.

This will save hundreds of thousands of lives as [Polya of Asia-Pacific](#) writes that 4.5 million Indians die of poverty every single year.

Our Second Contention is Peace.

[Sever of Foreign Affairs](#) writes that from Haiti to Mali, UN peacekeepers are charged with maintaining peace by disarming militia and holding elections.

Fortunately, affirming will bolster peacekeeping operations, or PKOs, in 2 ways.

1. First, by setting Precedent.

The G4 nations are 4 countries that desperately long for a permanent seat. These four countries include Japan, Brazil, Germany, and India.

[Well of the GPF](#) explains that G4 nations consider themselves natural candidates for permanent status as they are all regionally representative.

In that sense, the G4 countries are quite similar to each other. However, [The Brooking Institute](#) explains that one major distinction that distinguishes India from the G4 is its peacekeeping contributions. While the other G4 countries all [rank below 20](#) in troop contributions, India is the [2nd largest troop contributor](#).

Furthermore, [Mukherjee of Brookings](#) explains that because India constantly plays up its PKO contributions, it reinforces the narrative that their troops contributions would be the primary justification for a permanent seat.

Thus, affirming would incentivize G4 countries to contribute more peacekeepers as they will see it as vital to obtaining permanent membership.

2. **Second, by increasing representation.**

As a consequence of static permanent membership, [Louis 19'](#) writes that the UNSC remains locked into the archaic interests of the P5, losing legitimacy from the rest of the world.

As a result, many nations feel that their interests are underrepresented and thus have taken appropriate action. For example, [Beehner of World Policy in 2012](#) explains that many countries absent representation, may move towards other regional organizations such as APSA, potentially spawning massive harms to PKOs.

[Krishnam of UWestern](#) confirms that the current lack of UNSC representation will have a substantial impact on the future troop contributions from developing nations.

A shift to regional peacekeeping organizations is bad for 2 reasons.

First, is bias.

[Dorn '98](#) writes that regional peacekeeping organizations usually have close economic, political and military connections with the conflicting parties. Thus, they are less able and likely to conduct impartial peacekeeping.

Second, is funding.

[Indiana University](#) ¹⁷ finds that many regional peacekeeping organizations lack sufficient funding, especially in comparison to the UN.

Fortunately, India's membership on the Security Council would dramatically shift the trend in the sqo, thereby encouraging more countries to contribute to UN peacekeeping instead of regional. Indeed, [Shenk of International Relations](#) explains that India not only wants to

expand the size of the council, but also is one of [the strongest advocates](#) for policy regarding developing countries.

The impact to sustained PKOs is less international conflict.

[Hultman of Peace and Development](#) finds in a meta-analysis that PKOs historically reduce the severity and duration of conflict, and the chance of conflict restarting by [80%](#). He quantifies that without PKOs, 4 more major conflicts would have taken place, impacting millions.

However, [Lan of the Economic Times](#) writes in 2018 that current missions have been failing due to a lack of troops.

If nothing is done, this problem will only get worse.

[Rachman of the Financial Times](#) writes that as more conflicts erupt over the world, the demand for peacekeepers will rise significantly.

If this shortage continues, the UN will be forced to downsize the number of peacekeepers per mission, crippling their efficacy.

Fortunately, [Miller 19'](#) quantifies that for every 1,000 peacekeepers, the probability of conflict is reduced by 19%.

Thus, we affirm.

770 words