

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

Contention one is keeping the peace.

India becoming a permanent member of the Security Council improves peacekeeping operations in two ways.

First, through contributions.

[The Economic Times '18](#) explains that "India reiterated its readiness to... assume financial responsibilities arising out from its permanent membership of the [UNSC]," adding that "India has [already] paid in full its [share] for... 2019 in advance."

Second, through reform.

Current peacekeeping efforts are failing, as [Lowell '05 of the University of Maine](#) explains that "as long as... [peacekeeping relies] on force to achieve peace, the inevitable result will be more violence." [Brosig '18 of the CSG](#) quantifies that "[the number of] government or rebel forces... involved in conflict events... almost doubles in five years [of violent peacekeeping operations]."

Fortunately, [Singh '18 of PTI](#) finds that "[India stresses] increased... conflict prevention and mediation [in peacekeeping over violent intervention.]" However, [Mukherjee '13 of Princeton](#) explains that "[India's reform efforts]... take more than a two year term to see to fruition," making permanent membership necessary.

The impact of effective peacekeeping is aid distribution.

[Guterres '18 of Foreign Policy](#) explains that "[peacekeepers are key in supporting] the delivery of humanitarian aid." Critically, [the UN](#) estimates that "the World Food Programme... [assists approximately] 80 million people in... 80 countries," Thus, it is critical that UN peacekeeping operations remain properly supported.

Contention two is a brave new world.

[The Brookings Institution '15](#) explains that "changes in the international power structure [mean that]... significant security business... will start to be transacted elsewhere, as it will require... leading powers such as India, that are not in the Security Council." They conclude

that "the longer it takes to reform the Security Council, the greater the danger of it becoming irrelevant."

Luckily, giving India permanent membership restores the relevance of the council in two ways.

First, by increasing representation.

[Quarterman '10 of the CSIS](#) explains that "[despite its] essential role... in global governance... [the UN] is weakened by its lack of representativeness... [since it leaves] significant voices out [of discussions which] lessens their legitimacy... [and thus] reduces compliance with their decisions." Luckily, [Dabhade '17 of the ORF](#) finds that "India [is] a champion [of]... developing states... [and] has forcefully argued for an equitable geographical representation," meaning that it can increase their compliance to UN resolutions.

Second, by building consensus.

[Deo '14 of the Diplomat](#) writes that "repeated unilateral actions [have raised] questions about the UNSC's relevance." Indeed, cooperation has come to a standstill, as the [UN '18](#) finds that "the Council [has shown that it] cannot reconcile the interests of its five permanent members."

Fortunately, the addition of India would bring about improved multilateralism, as **Dabhade** explains that "[India is] a constructive... [and] democratic majority building state in a global, multilateral setting." For instance, [Chaudhury '19 of the Economic Times](#) finds that "India is [currently] working to build a... consensus among UN member states... on the issue of international terror," giving it the multilateral skill to restore faith in the council.

Deo concludes that "a... UNSC... [with] countries like India [would]... enable a wiser response to ... political crises," restoring faith in the council's ability to maintain order.

The impact is twofold.

First, maintaining global order.

Dabhade concludes that "if [there is no] change [to] the council... the primacy of the council may be challenged by... new emerging countries." This has already begun happening, as [Farley '02 of the LA Times](#) finds that "nearly 100 U.N. resolutions are being [internationally] violated."

Unfortunately, [Malley '18 of Foreign Policy](#) explains that "[as] multilateralism... [comes] under siege... [and] the United Nations Security Council... [becomes] paralyzed ... overreach by one leader convinced of his immunity may prompt an unexpected reaction by another [and conflict] ... could escalate without the presence of... outside powers able to play the role of arbiter."

Second, preventing militarism.

India has expressed severe opposition to military intervention. For example, [Burke '11 of the Guardian](#) finds that "[India called] the use of force [in Libya]... totally unacceptable." However, [Gunatilleke '16 of EIR](#) writes that "the UNSC is empowered to authorise military intervention... [but cannot] should any of the P5 choose to exercise its veto," preventing such actions. This is crucial, as [Kuperman '13 of Harvard](#) finds that "the conflict [in Libya] was about to end... [but intervention] prolonged the war for... seven months and caused at least 7,000 more deaths."

Thus, we affirm.

Currently, [Dabhade '17 of the ORF](#) finds that "India [is] a champion [of]... developing states... [and] has forcefully argued for an equitable geographical representation." However this attitude would change if India was granted permanent membership of the UNSC, as [Stuenkel '10 of Carta International](#) explains that "[India's] effort to become [a] permanent member... is likely to turn them into status quo powers, and it is unclear in how far they would continue to support the voice of the poor."

Contention one is making bank.

[Ebrahimian '17](#) of **Foreign Policy** finds that “[since] World Bank aid is vulnerable to geopolitical influence... countries with seats on the... Security Council receive a disproportionate amount of [World Bank] loans.” [Dreher '06](#) of **ETH Zurich** adds that “countries signing IMF arrangements during their UNSC tenure receive nearly 20 percent fewer conditions.” Thus, he concludes that “council membership increases the probability of receiving IMF programs by about 20 percent.”

There is historical precedent, as **Ebrahimian** furthers that “Mexico... 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... loans it has ever received from the World Bank.”

The impact is a plummet in poverty.

[Water.org](#) explains that “29% of... [Indian] people live below the poverty line, and 77 million do not have access to safe water at home.” [Slater '18 of the Washington Post](#) adds that “nearly 40 percent of Indian children under 5 are... [experiencing] chronic undernutrition.” Luckily, [Driscoll '96 of the IMF](#) finds that “[loans from] The [World] Bank... [provide] access to such necessities as safe water and waste-disposal facilities, health care... nutrition, education, and housing.”

Contention one is abandoning allies.