

C1: Foreign Aid

In the United Nations security council, larger developed nations often trade foreign aid, investment and economic support to developing nations in exchange for their support on key issues. In fact, **Dreher 06** of the Karls University writes that when a country gets a permanent Security Council seat, average US aid increases by 54 percent. The incentive to contribute aid exists to a higher degree when India is a permanent member of the security council, as **Werker 05** of the Journal of Political Economy finds that the incentive to bribe permanent security council members is higher, as they have a higher concentration of power due to their respective vetoes.

Aid is beneficial because it increases Indian access to healthcare. **Ayres 17** for CFR writes that the Trump administration has focused its aid initiatives in India around healthcare. Healthcare aid is critical to preventing loss of life. A report from [USAID](#) found in **2018** reports that aid saves 2 million total lives every year.

C2: Chinese Opposition

In the status quo, China opposes India on the international stage, blocking India's entry to critical multilateral institutions and countering India's interests in the UN. Fortunately, a permanent Indian seat on the security council would check back Chinese opposition in two ways.

The first is by increasing the cost of opposition.

Rajagopalan '17 of Carnegie India finds that India could use its permanent seat on the security council to garner support from its allies in the council, thereby increasing the diplomatic cost of opposing India internationally. Thus, **Rajagopalan** concludes that this increased diplomatic cost would deter China from acting against India's interests and constrain its capacity to oppose India.

The second is countering China's influence.

Krauthammer 10 of the National Review finds that because India and the United States share common strategic imperatives and are committed to the same international outcomes, India serves as the most natural anchor for a US partnership to counterbalance China. **Dabhade 17** of Nehru University School of International Studies finds that a seat on the council would allow India to expand its global geopolitical clout, serving as the ultimate equaliser to Chinese expansion. **Rajagopalan '17** of Carnegie India furthers that China's capacity to block India's access to international organizations will only grow as its power increases, making checking China's expansion critical to protecting India's international interests.

Chinese opposition prevents access to the Nuclear Suppliers Group. The Nuclear Suppliers Group is a group of 48 nuclear supplier countries that seek to facilitate the trade of nuclear materials for peaceful and non-proliferation purposes in a manner consistent with international

nuclear nonproliferation norms. India is on the brink of gaining access to this elite group in the status quo, as the **Times of India '18** reports that India meets all the criteria for NSG membership, but is unable to join solely because China continues to veto its access. Luckily, **Hibbs 18** writes for Carnegie India that Chinese opposition to an Indian permanent security council seat stands in India's way of full access to the NSG.

The impacts are two fold:

- a. Clean Air. **Singh 18** for GRI writes that Indian membership in the NSG would make it possible for India, the third largest emitter of greenhouse gasses, to switch away from coal plants and towards cleaner nuclear energy by increasing the amount of fissile nuclear material India can access to increase its nuclear power production. Switching away from coal plants is key, as **Vidal 13** of Greenpeace finds that pollution created by coal plants cause 120 thousand premature deaths in India every year.
- a. Climate Change. **Roche '16** finds that Indian can only satisfy its Paris Accord agreements of transferring 40% of power generation from non-fossil fuels sources if it gains membership to the NSG. India is critical to combating the effects of climate change, as **Allison '11** of the Harvard Belfer Center finds that India's status as a fast-growing economy and and a leader of the developing world makes Indian cooperation on climate change a necessary prerequisite for the success of any prospective international climate solvency. Stopping climate change is critical for two reasons.
 - i. **First, ocean acidification.** Matt **Huelsenbeck** at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography found in 2013 that the ocean absorbs carbon dioxide, leading it to become increasingly acidic and harming marine ecosystems. Ultimately, he writes that millions depend on marine life for food, and many more would be put at-risk if the ecosystem was in danger.
 - ii. **Second, resource wars.** Michael **Klare** at Hampshire College wrote in 2008 that as the sea level rises and land becomes dryer, a reduction in arable land will lead to political strife and ultimately conflict over increasingly scarce resources like food, water, and energy. Moreover, as national governments exceed their capacity to deal with climate migrants, their leaders will become increasingly desperate, eventually forcing international conflicts over valuable and limited resources.

Walter '18 (Barbara F. Walter, Barbara Walter is Professor of Political Science at the School of Global Policy and Strategy at the University of California San Diego. She is an expert on international security, with an emphasis on political violence, civil wars, and unconventional violence. 5-2-2018 "Most people think peacekeeping doesn't work. They're wrong.", The World Bank Group, <http://blogs.worldbank.org/dev4peace/most-people-think-peacekeeping-doesn-t-work-they-re-wrong>) //PSR 4-17-2019

Since 2016, the United States budget for United Nations peacekeeping has been reduced by 40 percent. This is a reflection of how many view the United Nations and its record on peacekeeping. Data on the effectiveness of UN peacekeepers, however, don't support this perception. In fact, they find that the opposite is true. Numerous statistical studies have explored the role of third-party peacekeeping in reducing violence around the world. They all come to the same conclusion: **Peacekeeping works better than almost anything else we know.** Using different datasets and statistical models, leveraging slightly different time periods, and measuring peacekeeping in somewhat different ways, the most rigorous studies have all found that peacekeeping has a large, positive, and statistically significant effect on containing the spread of civil war, increasing the success of negotiated settlements to civil wars, and increasing the duration of peace once a civil war has ended (see here, here, here, and here). More recent statistical studies have found an equally strong relationship between large-scale peace operations and the spread of civil wars, within and between states (see here, here, and here). **Not only that, but every study that looked at diverse types of peacekeeping missions found that the UN was more effective in preventing and reducing violence than non-UN missions, and that stronger mandates and larger missions increased the likelihood of any mission's success.** This was the case whether a mission was designed to prevent the spread of civil war, the killing of civilians, or increase the duration of peace once a ceasefire or settlement had been reached. **The more soldiers the UN was willing to send and the stronger the mandate it was willing to provide, the more the UN was able to reduce violence.** Still, we have strong empirical evidence for what works and what doesn't. **Historically, peacekeeping missions have failed wherever the five permanent members of the UN Security Council tried to do peacekeeping half-heartedly: when peacekeepers were sent late** (as they were in Rwanda); **with too few soldiers**; or with no mandate to use force. **Member nations' reluctance to avoid the costs and risks of intervention** created the conditions for failure. If done correctly, however, peacekeeping can be the best bargain in town, and is certainly more cost-effective than continued war or conventional military intervention.

Rajagopalan 17 (Rajesh Rajagopalan, 9-14-2017 "India's Strategic Choices: China and the Balance of Power in Asia", Carnegie India, <https://carnegieindia.org/2017/09/14/india-s-strategic-choices-china-and-balance-of-power-in-asia-pub-73108>) //PSR 4-19-2019

Second, **China's power** in international institutions ranging from the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to the Nuclear Suppliers' Group (NSG) has at times **proved to be an obstacle to Indian foreign policy ambitions.** Most recently, in 2016, China thwarted India's efforts to join the NSG. **China is likely to continue to obstruct India in this manner, and its capacity**

to do so will only grow as its power increases. Moreover, as its power grows, China has also started establishing international institutions like the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and has also been shaping other multilateral organizations to promote Chinese interests, such as the BRICS (a group consisting of Brazil, China, India, Russia, and South Africa) and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

Sharma and Pandey 16 (Loveleena Sharma and Ananya Pandey, Sharma is a post-graduate student in International Relations from South Asian University and Pandey is a post-graduate student in International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science, 6/21/16, International Policy Digest, "Should India be a Member of the NSG?," <http://intpolicydigest.org/2016/06/21/should-india-be-a-member-of-the-nsg/> // PSR

Significance of India's inclusion to the NSG Symbolism holds value for everyone. It is not just India which needs the NSG, the vice versa is true as well, though not to the same degree. The aim of the NSG guidelines is to ensure that nuclear trade for peaceful purposes does not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Granting membership to India would be an achievement on part of the NSG as the nation which was thought to support proliferation its nuclear weapons now wants to be a part of the same group which was created to keep a check on it. India's inclusion would also symbolize an evolution from merely restrictive regimes to inclusive and development-oriented regimes. On a larger scale, it can also help build trust in transnational and international organizations if it includes more nations of the so-called 'third world.' Nuclear energy for civilian purposes, especially electricity can be a boon for India. **The energy usage of India makes a difference to the world as it has the potential to have an impact on our environment, owing to its 1.2 billion mark.** This might be a long term process but membership to the NSG has the capacity to push India and the world closer to climate change control and other developmental goals. So, our verdict is a yes to India's membership in the NSG. It is time we move past restricted definitions of inclusivity and expand and grow together. India has proved itself to be a responsible nuclear state and this should be appreciated so that other nations, which are not members of the NSG feel the urge to evolve in the same manner.

Allison 2011, (the director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, served as a special adviser to the secretary of defense under President Reagan, twice received the highest civilian honor awarded by the Department of Defense) "The United States and India, A Shared Strategic Future"

India-U.S. cooperation is critical to global action against climate change. According to the International Energy Agency, India is already the fourth-largest aggregate producer of carbon dioxide from energy use, behind China, the United States, and Russia. India's high ranking as a greenhouse gas producer has mostly to do with its sheer size; India produces dramatically fewer greenhouse gases than industrialized or other developing nations on a per capita basis and is below the global average in terms of greenhouse gas emissions per unit of gross domestic product. Even so, because of India's aggressive economic growth profile combined

with higher than average population growth, its share of global greenhouse gas production will rise substantially between now and 2050. India has shown itself to be keenly interested in cooperation on renewable energy technology and efficiency standards that would allow it to retain its growth and still reduce its emissions intensity over time. **India's role**, both as a fast-growing large economy and as a leader of the developing world, **makes Indian agreement a necessary condition for the success of any prospective international climate change accord**.

Vidal 13 [John Vidal is the Guardian's environment editor, March 10 2013, "Indian coal power plants kill 120,000 people a year, says Greenpeace", <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/mar/10/india-coal-plants-emissions-greenpeace> //SD]

India's breakneck pace of industrialisation is causing a public health crisis with 80-120,000 premature deaths and 20m new asthma cases a year due to air pollution from coal power plants, a Greenpeace report warns. The first study of the health impact of India's dash for coal, conducted by a former World Bank head of pollution, says the plants cost hospitals \$3.3-\$4.6bn (£2.2-£3.1bn) a year — a figure certain to rise as the coal industry struggles to keep up with demand for electricity. The Delhi and Kolkata regions were found to be the most polluted but Mumbai, western Maharashtra, Eastern Andhra Pradesh and the Chandrapur- Nagpur region in Vidarbha were all affected. The study, which took data from 111 major power plants, says there is barely any regulation or inspection of pollution. "Hundreds of thousands of lives could be saved, and millions of asthma attacks, heart attacks, hospitalisations, lost workdays and associated costs to society could be avoided, with the use of cleaner fuels, [and] stricter emission standards and the installation and use of the technologies required to achieve substantial reductions in these pollutants," said the report. "There is a conspicuous lack of regulations for power plant stack emissions. Enforcement of what standards [which] do exist, is nearly non-existent," it says. India is the world's second largest coal burner after China, generating 210 GW of electricity a year, mostly from coal. But it is likely to become the largest if plans to generate a further 160 GW annually are approved.

Ayres 17 (Alyssa Ayres is senior fellow for India, Pakistan, and South Asia at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). At CFR her work focuses on India's role in the world and on U.S. relations with South Asia. In 2015, she served as the project director for the [CFR-sponsored Independent Task Force on U.S.-India Relations](#), and from 2014 to 2016, as the project director for an initiative on the [new geopolitics of China, India, and Pakistan](#). She directs the U.S. Relations with South Asia Roundtable series, blogs regularly for [Asia Unbound](#), and is a contributor to Forbes.com. Her book about India's rise on the world stage, [Our Time Has Come: How India is Making Its Place in the World](#), was published by Oxford University Press in January 2018, May 5th, 2017. "Trump to Cut Foreign Aid Budgets, Opening South and Central Asia's Door to Chinese Influence". <https://www.cfr.org/blog/trump-cut-foreign-aid-budgets-opening-south-and-central-asias-door-chinese-influence>)

This means that the Trump administration plans for U.S. assistance to India to continue solely in the health field.

The tradeoff here will be significant: in recent years, in light of India's rapid economic growth and its emergence as a major donor itself, U.S. foreign aid budgets had been designed to provide a basis for which Washington and New Delhi could partner, such as with shared innovation initiatives, or shared development projects with third countries. Biswal comments that India has become a "development lab" with innovative approaches to corporate social responsibility and impact investing, and the loss of the funding lines that had enabled U.S.-India development cooperation will "close ourselves to the collaboration and the learning that is going on there."

US AID +54%, UN AID +7 percent

Dreher 06, (Axel is a Chair of International and Development Politics, Ruprecht-Karls-University Heidelberg, Germany) Does Membership on the Un Security Council Influence IMF Decisions? Evidence from Panel Data (September 2006). CESifo Working Paper Series No. 1808. https://www.cesifo-group.de/DocDL/cesifo1_wp1808.pdf // PSR 3-17-2019

According to Kuziemko and Werker (2005), there is extensive competition for the temporary seats on the Security Council as countries might expect to receive net rewards during their tenure. **Kuziemko and Werker (2005) find, for example, that average US aid increases by 54 percent and average UN development aid by 7 percent when a country is elected to the Security Council.** Another possible benefit of serving on the Council is the likelihood of receiving greater support from international organizations like the IMF.

Kuziemko, Ilyana and Eric Werker, 2005, How much is a Seat on the Security Council Worth? Foreign Aid and Bribery at the United Nations, Journal of Political Economy, forthcoming. <http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/06-029.pdf>

Third, **it has been suggested that because non-permanent members of the council do not have veto power, they may not be worth bribing at all.** O'Neill (1996) applies the Shapley-Shubik index—which measures the percentage of total power attributed to a member based on voting rules—to the Security Council. He finds that **each of the five permanent members has 19.6 percent of the power**, while each of the ten non-permanent members has less than 0.2 percent.

Times of India, 9-13-2018, "India fulfills all conditions, but out of Nuclear Suppliers Group, due to China's veto," <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/us-india-meets-all-qualifications-to-be-member-of-nsg/articleshow/65792316.cms>, Date Accessed 4-13-2019

India has not been able to secure membership of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) because of China's veto,

a senior Trump Administration official said Thursday asserting that the US will continue to advocate for New Delhi's membership in the elite grouping as it meets all the criteria.

India has been seeking entry into the 48-member elite nuclear club, which controls nuclear trade, but China has repeatedly stonewalled its bid.

Increasing Indian influence allows them to earn membership in the Nuclear Suppliers Group. Mark Hibbs argues in 2018 that:

Mark Hibbs, 2-13-18, "Eyes on the Prize: India's Pursuit of Membership in the Nuclear Suppliers Group," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, <https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/02/13/eyes-on-prize-india-s-pursuit-of-membership-in-nuclear-suppliers-group-pub-75535>, Date Accessed 4-4-2019

When beginning in 2015 New Delhi appeared to be making headway in persuading NSG participants that India should be admitted. **China pushed back, and today Beijing's high political calculus—including its opposition to an Indian permanent Security Council seat—appears to stand in India's way.**

Malvika Singh., 11-29-2018, "India's Bid for the Nuclear Suppliers Group," Global Risk Insights, <https://globalriskinsights.com/2018/11/indias-bid-nuclear-suppliers-group-nsg/>, Date Accessed 4-4-2019

Under the Paris Climate Agreement, India's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) committed to reducing dependence on fossil fuels and ensuring that 40% of energy was sourced from renewable sources. Currently, India is the third-largest emitter of greenhouse gases and relies heavily on coal-fired power plants. **Pollution is a major health and safety risk faced by the country. The most likely and viable source of achieving cleaner and higher energy generation is through nuclear power production. However, current reactors in India do not work at optimal potential given a lack of resources such as uranium. An NSG entry would increase the amount of fissile material India can access and increase its nuclear power production.**

Roche 6/8 (staff reporter for LiveMint, Elizabeth, "Why an NSG membership is important to India," <http://www.livemint.com/Politics/Gglv7xn2DuFpDbmGTcGpK/Why-a-NSG-membership-is-important-to-India.html>, 6/8/16, DD)

Membership of the NSG means: 1. Access to technology for a range of uses from medicine to building nuclear power plants for India from the NSG which is essentially a traders' cartel. India has its own indigenously developed technology but to get its hands on state of the art technology that countries within the NSG possess, it has to become part of the group. 2. With India committed to reducing dependence on fossil fuels and ensuring that 40% of its energy is sourced from renewable and clean sources, there is a pressing need to scale up nuclear power production. This can only happen if India gains access to the NSG. Even if India today can buy power plants from the global market thanks to the one time NSG waiver in 2008, there are still many types of technologies India can be denied as it is outside the NSG. 3. India could sign the Nuclear non proliferation treaty and gain access to all this know how but that would mean giving up its entire nuclear arsenal. Given that it is situated in an unstable and unpredictable neighbourhood India is unlikely to sign the NPT or accede to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) that puts curbs on any further nuclear tests. 4. With access to latest technology, India can commercialize the production of nuclear power equipment. This, in

turn will boost innovation and high tech manufacturing in India and can be leveraged for economic and strategic benefits. For example, India has signed a civil nuclear energy co-operation pact with Sri Lanka. Currently, this entails training people in peaceful uses of nuclear energy, including use of radioisotopes, nuclear safety, radiation safety, nuclear security, radioactive waste management and nuclear and radiological disaster mitigation. Should India get access to advanced nuclear technologies, it can start building updated versions of its own fast breeder reactor and sell it to countries such as Sri Lanka or Bangladesh. Bangladesh is currently looking at buying Russian reactors for power generation. 5. Having the ability to offer its own nuclear power plants to the world means spawning of an entire nuclear industry and related technology development. This could give the Make in India programme a big boost.