#### We Affirm

## Contention 1: Representation

#### There’s an ethical obligation to increase the diversity of the council to better represent the developing world. Including India in the permanent UNSC signifies the first step into including historically oppressed countries into the world stage and gives them a powerful voice to influence global policies. This is incredibly important, as India was once subjected to the harsh colonization that many countries also excluded from the global stage today were oppressed by. Moreover, adding India could have extreme spillover benefits to increasing representation on the council, as the JPPI explains in 2019 that

Jewish People Policy Institue [The Jewish People Policy Institute (JPPI) is an independent professional policy planning think tank incorporated as a private non-profit company in Israel], 2016, "India’s Quest for Global Power Status," http://jppi.org.il/new/en/article/english-india-israel-and-the-jewish-people/english-table-of-contents/english-part-3-chapters/english-chapter-2-india-marches-west-fast-growing-links-with-the-middle-east/english-indias-quest-for-global-power-status/#.XJZiw5hKg2w, 3-23-2019, DJK

Beyond doubts about India’s economic capabilities, the main question marks over India’s power aspirations are diplomatic and political. India’s ability to project the image of a great power to the wider world (and the country’s willingness and capacity to help shape global policies) is not yet guaranteed. Harsh Pant, a leading Indian expert, argued before the 2014 BJP election victory that Indian leaders do not even have a consistent or long-term-oriented foreign policy or strategy: “[t]here’s an intellectual vacuum at the heart of Indian foreign policy (…) India has little to offer except some platitudinous rhetoric, which only shows the hollowness of India’s rising global stature.”66 India’s Foreign Service remains underfunded and small, as do its think tanks and university programs dealing with international affairs and foreign policy. Furthermore, India’s participation in global governance remains limited. To date, its bid to gain a permanent seat on the UN Security Council has not succeeded. This is partly due to the key global players’ perception that India is not yet a credible great power. In addition, granting a permanent seat to India would open a Pandora’s Box, with an inevitable escalation of pressure from other major or growing powers, notably Brazil, Germany, South Africa and Japan, to also secure permanent membership on the Security Council. In 2010, President Obama’s dramatic announcement of support for India’s candidacy for a permanent seat on a potentially reconfigured UN Security Council made headlines in Indian and international media. Some thought that India’s two-year term (starting in January 2011) as a non-permanent Security Council member would be a stepping-stone to a permanent status. But this did not materialize. For many, India’s passivity showed its “distaste, and perhaps inability, to take a clear position on international issues.”67 India has generally not known how to wield its power on the international scene. There have been early signs that this may be changing in the wake of the 2014 BJP victory.

#### You shouldn’t evaluate contrived impacts with nebulous link chains that stem from excluding underrepresented countries. An affirmative ballot signifies that ethics and morality matter irrespective of external impacts — and thus, they are an impact in and of itself.

## Contention 2: Perks of the Job

#### Security Council votes are incredibly powerful. A negation can derail any resolution, and an abstention shows a lack of support that can ripple across the world. Because of this, countries use behind the scene efforts to influence votes. This attempted influences manifests in two ways.

### Subpoint A is USAID

#### Gulabozoi of SAIS Review in 2019 explains that

Najibullah Gulabzoi 19, SAIS Review of International Affairs, https://www.saisreview.org/2019/01/10/us-foreign-aid-unga-voting/#\_edn8, 1-10-2019, JR

Conventional knowledge has it that aid has been used as a strategic instrument to induce support and favorable policy stances from the recipient countries in the UNGA. During the Cold War, the United States provided aid to less developed countries to reward their accordance with U.S. policy positions when they voted in the UNGA.[4] The Soviet Union also used aid to garner political support in the UN and to buy off uncommitted countries—leading to what some scholars described as a major conflict between the East and West in the UNGA.[5] Shortly after the end of the Cold War, a period that Samuel P. Huntington called the “unipolar moment,”[6] the United States provided aid to countries that had previously voted against the United States in the UNGA and their elites had largely contested U.S. foreign policy interests and values.[7]

#### This is why Werker of Harvard concludes in his 2006 empirical analysis that

Ilyana Kuziemko and Eric Werker 06, Harvard University, [https://sci-hub.tw/https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/507155?journalCode=jpe](https://sci-hub.tw/https%3A//www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/507155?journalCode=jpe), JR

Ten of the 15 seats on the U.N. Security Council are held by rotating members serving two-year terms. We find that a country’s U.S. aid increases by 59 percent and its U.N. aid by 8 percent when it rotates onto the council. This effect increases during years in which key diplomatic events take place (when members’ votes should be especially valuable), and the timing of the effect closely tracks a country’s election to, and exit from, the council. Finally, the U.N. results appear to be driven by UNICEF, an organization over which the United States has historically exerted great control.

#### This aid isn’t unconditional. When aid increased while India served on the 2011 to 2012 security council, Piccio of Devex in 2013 explains that

Lorenzo Piccio 13, Devex, https://www.devex.com/news/leading-donors-to-india-80663, 4-1-2013, JR

United States: Among its peer donors in India, the U.S. Agency for International Development stands out for its emphasis on robust engagement with India as a strategic partner in global development, rather than an aid recipient. USAID programming in India has been increasingly focused on catalyzing innovative interventions that could have a significant development impact in the South Asian country and beyond. “In India in particular, we [they] focused on an effort to turn our traditional program there into an innovation laboratory that can help address the effort to end extreme poverty inside of India, but also bring Indian resources and talent and entrepreneurship to Africa, Burma, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and a number of other settings,” said USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah in remarks upon returning from a visit to Mumbai last month. Shah added that USAID has identified health, agriculture and energy as priority sectors for its funding of innovative development interventions in India. He has also indicated that the Obama administration will continue to allocate roughly $100 million in foreign assistance to India each year. In November 2010, U.S. President Barack Obama and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh launched the Partnership for an Evergreen Revolution, which aims to leverage U.S. and Indian agricultural expertise towards global food security efforts. The initiative has financed the studies of 200 agricultural fellows from Africa at Indian universities. USAID is currently soliciting proposals for its $6 million India-Africa Agriculture Innovation Bridge Program. The program will share Indian agricultural innovations in the U.S. Feed the Future initiative focus countries of Kenya, Liberia, and Malawi.

#### Increasing the amount of USAID is absolutely critical, as USAID reports that

USAID, <https://www.usaid.gov/india/health>

Preventing Child and Maternal Deaths: Since 1990, USAID has helped save the lives of 2.1 million children in India. Despite this progress, 1.2 million children under five still die every year —almost 780,000 of them on their first day of life. More than 30 million women in India want to avoid pregnancy but do not have access to modern family planning methods. Enabling couples and individuals to determine when and how often to have children is vital to safe motherhood, healthy families and prosperous communities. USAID [by] partner[ing]s with the Government of India, the private sector and civil society to demonstrate how high-impact solutions can put India on a path to save the lives of mothers and children. USAID [to] strengthens access to community and district-level health services,

#### While this work is impressive, there is still more to be done as they report that

USAID, <https://www.usaid.gov/india/health>

Preventing Child and Maternal Deaths: Since 1990, USAID has helped save the lives of 2.1 million children in India. Despite this progress, 1.2 million children under five still die every year —almost 780,000 of them on their first day of life. More than 30 million women in India want to avoid pregnancy but do not have access to modern family planning methods. Enabling couples and individuals to determine when and how often to have children is vital to safe motherhood, healthy families and prosperous communities. USAID partners with the Government of India, the private sector and civil society to demonstrate how high-impact solutions can put India on a path to save the lives of mothers and children. USAID strengthens access to community and district-level health services,

### Subpoint B is World Bank Loans

#### Allen of Foreign Policy in 2017 explains that

Bethany Allen-Ebrahimian 17, Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/10/05/un-security-council-members-are-more-likely-to-receive-world-bank-loans-united-states-mexico/, 9-4-2017, JR

The World Bank is supposed to distribute loans based on the needs of developing countries. But a recent study has found that countries with seats on the United Nations Security Council receive a disproportionate amount of [World Bank] loans, indicating the World Bank can be a tool for donor countries, particularly the United States, to wield geopolitical influence. Traditional World Bank loans typically take two to three years to disburse. But after 2007, in response to criticism of its bureaucratic snail’s pace and as the world faced a food and energy crisis, the bank implemented a change that dramatically increased the amount and frequency of supplemental loans. These loans can now be approved in as little as 100 days. Since then, supplemental loans have accounted for up to 30 percent of all World Bank loans, up from as low as 1 or 2 percent in earlier decades. That makes these loans potential tools of influence on U.N. Security Council non-permanent member countries, which are elected for two-year terms. That’s too short a period for a traditional loan to be disbursed but plenty of time for supplemental loans to come through, potentially allowing World Bank donor countries to wield loans as geopolitical carrots (or sticks). And indeed, Christopher Kilby and Erasmus Kersting, both professors at Villanova University in Pennsylvania who study international aid and organizations, found evidence of such correlation in a 2016 paper and subsequent research. They analyzed World Bank loan data and found a clear correlation between U.N. Security Council membership and the disbursement of these supplemental loans. In fact, Kilby and Kersting’s analysis of 2015 data revealed that a full 10 percent of all supplemental lending was related to Security Council membership.

#### Kersting of Villanova confirms this in 2016, finding that

Erasmus Kersting 16, Villanova University, <http://wp.peio.me/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/PEIO10_paper_17.pdf>, 8-20-2016, JR

Using all available data at the country-year level (1947-2015), a country’s odds of receiving a supplemental loan in years where it does not hold a non-permanent seat on the UNSC were 11.9%; in years when it does, the odds were 12.0%. But restricting attention to [from]2000-2015, these figures were [was] 24.3% for non-members [of UNSC]and 34.3% for members [of the UNSC].3 Given this dramatic difference in both the frequency of supplemental loans and the UNSC differential, we focus on this more recent period.

#### This means that the probability of a country receiving supplemental World Bank loans increases 10% when on UNSC as a nonpermanent member. Kersting explains that these

Erasmus Kersting 16, Villanova University, <http://wp.peio.me/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/PEIO10_paper_17.pdf>, 8-20-2016, JR

World Bank development finance has evolved substantially in recent years. One important change is a dramatic upswing in the use of supplemental loans that add resources to existing projects months or years after initial approval. Also called additional financing, [and] these loans can be substantial in absolute terms (historically as large as US$1.25 billion) and on average add 84% to the initial loan amount (since the year 2000). Supplemental lending also has become quite large in aggregate.

#### For context, Allen highlights that

Bethany Allen-Ebrahimian 17, Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/10/05/un-security-council-members-are-more-likely-to-receive-world-bank-loans-united-states-mexico/, 9-4-2017, JR

Mexico, for example, has sat on the Security Council for 8.5 percent of its total time in the U.N., but during its tenure as a council member received 67.9 percent of the total amount of supplemental loans it has ever received from the World Bank, according to data provided by Kersting. If Security Council membership were unrelated to the disbursement of supplemental loans, those two numbers should be similar. Mexico served as a non-permanent member of the Security Council from 2009 to 2010. In 2010, it received a massive supplemental loan of $1.25 billion. Numerous other countries display the same pattern. [including] Jordan has also sat on the Security Council for 8.5 percent of its total time in the U.N., but it received 60.2 percent of its supplemental loans during this period. For Uruguay, the numbers are 5.6 percent and 58.1 percent; for Rwanda, 5.6 percent and 41 percent. Other countries that show a similar correlation include Brazil, Senegal, Bolivia, Nigeria, Vietnam, Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Togo.

#### For India specifically, this is historically proven. Prior to India serving on the 2011 to 2012 security council, the World Bank reports in 2011 they

World Bank 10, http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2010/04/06/india-country-strategy, 4-6-2010, JR

The World Bank’s Country Strategy (CAS) for India for 2009-2012 focuses on helping the country to fast-track the development of much-needed infrastructure and to support the seven poorest states achieve higher standards of living for their people. The strategy envisages a total proposed [a] lending program of US$14 billion, for the next three years, of which US$9.6 billion is from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and US$4.4 billion (SDR 2.982 billion equivalent at the current exchange rate) from the International Development Association (IDA).

#### It makes sense that India received these loans as the world’s most populous country with the fastest growing economy. Having such a powerhouse behind resolutions immediately brought more legitimacy to them. Moreover, in an affirmative world, India would be a permanent member, making a negation from them on a resolution incredibly impactful. Overall, these loans are incredibly helpful. For example, the World Bank reports in 2010 that in India

World Bank ’10, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/73153-1285271432420/IDA_AT_WORK_India.pdf>, 9-1-2010, JR

So far the Bank has provided more than US$1 billion in IDA support for rural water supply and sanitation over fifteen years, benefiting about 25 million rural people. The results have changed lives on a large scale. For example, in rural Kerala, about 1.2 million people now have access to safe water supply through taps in their homes, and more than 90,000 households have access to safe household sanitation facilities; in rural northern Karnataka, about 5.1 million people have benefitted from safe water supply, with 50 percent of households connected at home; and in Maharashtra, about 6.7 million rural people have benefited from safe water supply and 61 percent of project villages have achieved the ‘open defecation free’ status.