

We affirm.

Our sole contention is the Divided Nations.

[Deo in 2015](#) writes that the UN is losing credibility. The Security Council remains trapped in Cold War-era East-West rivalries which do not encapsulate the needs of developing countries. He continues that Security Council reform is now more urgent than ever, in the face of grave challenges such as climate change and sustainable development.

As such, [Singh in 2018](#) finds that absent comprehensive reform, the UN's authority for most of the world will soon diminish to dangerous levels.

Granting India permanent membership solves this problem in three ways.

First, by setting an example.

[Weiss in 2003](#) finds that substantive reform has proved virtually impossible, with only one Security Council reform passing in almost 60 years.

India's permanent membership would be groundbreaking, as according to [Stuenkel in 2010](#), India aims to increase the representation of the "global South", which would increase the UN's legitimacy, as nations of the world must feel that their stakes are factored into the UN's decision making.

Moreover, an Indian permanent membership would send the message that the Security Council is open to future improvement. Developing countries may view the P5's decision to expand as a sign that further changes are forthcoming, and take it as an opportunity to lobby for their own preferred reforms.

Second, by initiating reforms.

[Banerjee in 2018](#) reports that India has spoken out against the declining legitimacy of the UN and offered a set of concrete solutions and possible reforms.

The [Global Policy Forum](#) reports that India has already discussed potential improvements to the UN with other nations, such as Security Council expansion, timely enforcement of Member State payments, and increased transparency.

India can use its veto to further its agenda. [Eldar in 2008](#) finds that countries often “vote-trade”, to facilitate collective action. For example, the US promised support for Russia’s peacekeeping operations in Georgia in exchange for Russia’s approval of the US Mission in Haiti. India may do the same to get meaningful reforms passed.

Additionally, a [UN Press Release](#) explains that the UN has had difficulty passing reforms in the past because of a misalignment of interests between developing and developed countries. While developing countries focus on economic concerns such as reducing poverty, developed countries care more about modern problems such as nuclear proliferation and human rights.

India is in a unique position to bridge this gap. [Mohan in 2013](#) writes that India has spearheaded discussions in the L69, a group of 40 developing countries seeking increased representation in UN decision-making, and [Mao in 2018](#) explains that the L69 bridges the interests of the G4 and African Union.

Third, by defending sovereignty.

India has been actively against self-interested intervention. According to [Pimpale in 2017](#), India has actively criticized the “responsibility to protect”, or R2P, because of concerns over the violation of sovereignty and the fear of being the target of an intervention itself.

[Malone in 2013](#) finds that India abstained on two crucial votes – on Libya in March 2011 and Syria in October 2011 – while repeatedly sounding alarm bells on sovereignty and the need for domestic resolution of domestic conflicts.

[Makhija in 2017](#) adds that India opposed the intervention in Libya as it was clearly driven by NATO’s interest in regime change rather than protection of civilians which sowed the seed for future instability and conflict in the region.

India can use its veto power upon receiving a permanent seat to oppose such reckless and imperialist interventions, bolstering the UN’s legitimacy. [Charbonneau in 2009](#) indicates that developing countries have intensely opposed R2P missions unless tightly controlled, due to fears of future Iraq-style invasions of countries that have angered the big powers.

Putting India on the Council would introduce a dissenting opinion to the P5 consensus of constant interventionism, signaling openness to discourse.

The impact is securing contributions.

[Zhao in 2018](#) explains that if smaller states do not see a good-faith effort to internally reform the Security Council, they will be less willing to contribute to UN initiatives. Indeed, [Gardiner in 2007](#) explains that, absent steps to improve the Security Council's legitimacy, America would respond by implementing major budget cuts.

Already, [Busby in 2018](#) reports that the core UN budget is facing a massive deficit because member states are failing to pay their dues.

Life-saving efforts such as the World Food Program and UNICEF will be cut first, because [Shendruk in 2018](#) finds that unlike many of the UN's compulsory contributions, the WFP is funded solely by optional payments. Indeed, [NPR in 2019](#) confirms the WFP can't provide aid to 1.7 million people because it lacks funding.

These cuts would be devastating, as the [UN](#) reports that the WFP has regularly delivered two thirds of the world's emergency food assistance, 90% of which goes to developing countries, saving millions of lives.

Please affirm.