# KG April TOC AFF

**We Affirm Resolved: The United Nations should grant India permanent membership on the Security Council.**

## Our Sole Point of Contention is Preserving Peace

**Since the 1950s, the United Nations has used peacekeeping operations, which are military personnel that help war-torn countries end conflict. Unfortunately, these missions have lacked resources to be fully effective. Hart of the University of Colorado writes that since the 1990s, missions have experienced an average shortfall of 21% in total personnel.**

**Fortunately, granting India permanent membership to the United Nations Security Council would solve the peacekeeping crisis in two ways.**

**First is by increasing funding.**

**Current payments for peacekeeping are scarce. Nichols of Reuters reports this year that peacekeeping missions are being cut due to late payments, and the debt is almost 2 billion dollars and growing. Adding India, a seat on the council would directly increase funding, as the United Nations Charter notes that permanent members of the Security Council required to pay a larger share because of their special responsibility. Indeed, India would go above and beyond to fulfill this obligation.**

**Kumar for The Economic Times reports that India has reiterated its readiness to fully assume financial responsibilities arising from permanent membership of the Council. Dabhade of The School of International Studies finds that while there an issue of readiness to fulfill payment obligations, India could emerge as a sizeable contributor to the UN budget.**

**Increasing funding is vital. Crocker of The Brookings Institute writes to accommodate massive cuts in funding, the UN would need to fundamentally revise its missions. Crocker concludes that budget cuts would have a profound impact on peacekeepers’ ability to protect people.**

**Second is by giving a voice to ignored nations.**

**Countries that contribute Peacekeepers, which are primarily from the developing world, have little say in the peacekeeping decision process today. Mukherjee of The Brookings Institute reports that many troop contributing** **countries argue that they are not consulted when peacekeeping missions are being formulated.**

**This is because the power to dictate the direction of new missions is controlled by the Security Council, with no input from the members of the UN who actually contribute resources.**

**Aggarwal of The Observer Research Foundation confirms that the Security Council is accused of using peacekeeping only in areas, which are geopolitically significant to them.**

**In fact, Selway of Global Observatory reports that UN peacekeeping increasingly divides along “troop contributor” and “financial contributor” lines, which polarizes peacekeeping as these groups have different interests.**

**This relationship worries developing countries. Teng of Stanford University writes that UNSC members are industrialized countries while the rest of the world is excluded. Teng continues that without having a voice, countries are unwilling to send troops or aid whenever to the Security Council.**

**For example, Alexandra of the IPI reports that troop contributing countries think that the Security Council wants to expand towards enforcement, something they oppose and have stated they will not contribute troops to places such as Mali or the Congo.**

**Adding India to the council would bridge this gap. Manish for Rising Powers Quarterly reports that India has been one of the most significant enthusiasts of shaping the UN agenda on behalf of developing countries.**

  **More specifically, Kapoor of The Hindu finds that India has sought enhanced role for troops contributing countries in the decision-making process of peacekeeping, stating that the current system of excluding developing countries is not sustainable. With an advocate for their needs, these countries will be more incentivized to send resources for missions.**

**This is crucial to create a stronger force. Shanon of Florida State University finds that an operation’s ability to protect depends upon the number of personnel deployed. As the UN’s force commitment increases, so does its ability to protect.**

**The impact to increasing peacekeeping resources is avoiding conflict.**

**Peacekeeping can be extremely effective. Robert of The International Peace Institute explains that peacekeeping makes peace more valuable and war costlier. The prospects of political and economic gains for rebel and government leaders from peace change the calculus of countries.**

**Empirically, Dayal of the Washington Post finds that when peacekeepers are deployed, warring parties are 20 percent more likely to implement the terms of their peace agreement. This peace is long term. Nygard for The Journal of Politics writes that peacekeeping reduces the risk of another war drops than 85 percent.**

**For these reasons, Herge of Harvard University concludes that in a scenario where the UN is willing to increase mandates on personnel and its budget by 50 percent, the risk of armed conflict in 2035 would be reduced by up to two thirds.**

**In a world, all too often torn by violence that is not responded to, it is time to make a change. It’s time to affirm.**

<https://scholar.colorado.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1035&context=psci_facpapers>

Why do UN peacekeeping operations often fall short of the personnel levels authorized for the mission? **Since 1990, missions have experienced an average monthly shortfall of 21.6% in total personnel**, consisting of troops, military observers, and civilian police.This problem arises as the UN seeks to secure personnel commitments from its 193 member states, each of whom calculate the benefits and risks of what can be long and costly endeavors. The challenge of sufficiently equipping a mission has been compounded by the changing nature of peacekeeping since the end of the Cold War, which has shifted from supporting ongoing conflict resolution efforts to more direct intervention in conflict zones (Fortna & Howard, 2008; Diehl & Druckman, 2010; Hultman, Kathman, & Shannon 2014).

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-un-peacekeepers-usa/u-n-members-owe-2-billion-in-debt-to-peacekeeping-u-s-owes-a-third-idUSKCN1PB2OD>

Active **peacekeeping missions are soon expected to face liquidity gaps due to late payments** and increasing arrears,” Guterres wrote in a Jan. 11 letter to the 193 member states. “Arrears **[debts]** a**re nearing $2 billion and are likely to keep growing.”** Guterres also said that while 152 members had paid in full what they owed for a separate U.N. regular budget in 2018 - a record - more than $528 million was still outstanding

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/how-we-are-funded>

The General Assembly apportions peacekeeping expenses based on a special scale of assessments under a complex formula that Member States themselves have established. This formula takes into account, among other things, the relative economic wealth of Member States, with the five **permanent members of the Security Council required to pay a larger share because of their special responsibility** for the maintenance of international peace and security.

<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/india-concerned-over-proposed-changes-to-formula-for-dividing-un-peacekeeping-bill/articleshow/66161513.cms?from=mdr>

[First Secretary of the Permanent Mission of India to the UN] Kumar further said that India calls for reform in the Security Council, and **reiterated its readiness to fully assume financial responsibilities arising** out **from** India's **permanent membership of the Security Council.**

<http://risingpowersproject.com/quarterly/indias-pursuit-united-nations-security-council-reforms/>

The record of timely payment also should be taken into account.” Adding further, India asserted: “the financial contribution does not remain static forever, and **the crucial issue is the readiness to fulfil** the **obligations** and not the quantum of payment at a particular point in time. The point  **[and before long] India could emerge** before long, if its economy performs well, **as a sizeable contributor to UN budget.”**

<https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-u-n-needs-a-funding-review-but-trump-administration-proposals-go-too-far/>

But **to accommodate** **massive** U.S. **cuts in funding, the U.N. would need to fundamentally revise** the mandates and make-up of **its** larger **missions,** such as in Congo, South Sudan, Darfur, and Mali. Haley’s early attempt to make deep cuts to the mission in Congo ran into stiff resistance from other Security Council members, and ultimately the mission was cut much less dramatically than the United States wanted. **[Thus] Cuts** on the order being discussed **would have [a] profound impact on peacekeepers’ ability to keep** the **peace and protect** civilians in some of the most dangerous and intractable conflicts in the world.

<https://www.brookings.edu/research/at-the-crossroads-india-and-the-future-of-un-peacekeeping-in-africa/>

**Troop contributing** non-Af­rican **countries**, mainly from South Asia and South America, among others, however deny this is the case and instead **argue that they are not adequately consulted when the missions are being formulated.** African countries, which also constitute the bulk manpower, are caught in the middle-financially dependent upon ‘developed countries’ while requiring addi­tional manpower, resources and support from ‘developing countries ‘ to bolster their capabil­ities

<https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/70-years-of-peacekeeping-achievements-challenges-and-need-for-reforms-46135/>

The peacekeepers are demanding more resources, whereas Global South fears that this would divert resources better spent on fighting poverty. **The Security Council is accused of using these operations only in areas, which are geopolitically significant to them**, and ignoring the rest. The Secretary-General of the UN, António Guterres, launched an Action for Peacekeeping (A4P) initiative on 28 March 2018, to renew the individual and collective commitments of Member States to strengthen peacekeeping operations on the ground and resolve these conflicting issues.

<https://theglobalobservatory.org/2013/11/who-pays-for-peace/>

**UN** negotiations on **peacekeeping increasingly divide[s] along “troop contributor” and “financial contributor” lines,** and the two groups have very little overlap – in 2013, not one top 15 financial contributor is also a top 15 troop-and-police contributor. **This** particulardynamic is said to have had a **polariz[es]**ing effect on **peacekeeping** policy negotiations**, as these** two **groups** may **have different interests.** China (19th largest troop-contributor country) and Brazil (20th) may be the member states with some claim to both categories, as they also pay the 6th and 26th highest assessment rates, respectively.

Currently, **four out of five** veto-bearing **[unsc] members are industrialized countries** and the fifth, China, is rapidly approaching industrialized status. Many in **[while] the rest of the world** seethe at their **[is excluded]** exclusion from this elite group**.** Africa, Latin America, and the Islamic world, for example, have no permanent voice on the counc**il. Without a voice, it is understandable why** many **countries** are **unwilling to send troops or aid** whenever **[to] the Security Council** demands it. This imbalance, highlighted by the Iraq war, has made Security Council reform a hot topic of debate.

<https://theglobalobservatory.org/2018/04/peacekeeping-basics-is-not-backwards/>

Thus, when TCCs **[troop contributing countries]** hear the word “doctrine,” they immediately **think** that **the Council and Western countries want to expand** the “traditional principles” of **peacekeeping towards more** “robustness” or **“enforcement.**” **This is** a path that **[something] the[y]** majority of TCCs clearly **do not want** totake, **and some of them have stated they would not contribute to Mali or the Force Intervention Brigade in** the Democratic Republic of **the Congo.** These issues should be talked about during triangular cooperation meetings, which for the time being only happen on a very inconsistent basis, as there is no other venue in New York where these differences between Council members and TCCs could be reconciled.

<http://risingpowersproject.com/quarterly/indias-pursuit-united-nations-security-council-reforms/>

India also always seen itself as a champion, a ‘moralistic force’ of the so called Third World [as], the developing states. Former Secretary General Kofi Annan has been quoted as saying that **India has been one of the most significant** votaries **[enthusiasts] of shaping the UN agenda on behalf of ]developing countries]** the developing world**.** At his speech in New Delhi, Annan stated: “Indians have better understood than many other peoples that the goals of the ‘larger freedom’ that which include development, security and human rights are not alternatives. **They have been single-mindedly pursuing larger freedom through pluralist democracy.”**

<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/india-seeks-greater-role-for-troop-contributing-countries-in-un-peacekeeping-decision-making/article19801241.ece>

**India has sought enhanced role for troops contributing countries in the decision-making process of** UN **peacekeeping** missions**.**The Military Adviser at **[with] India**’s UN Mission [advisor], Colonel Sandeep Kapoor said **[saying] the current system of excluding** thetroop and police-contributing **countries** (T/PCCs) from the process of framing themandates **is not sustainable**.“The UN Security Council needs to revisit the way mandates are designed,” Colonel Kapoor said.India is one of the largest contributors of troops and police to UN peacekeeping missions. In his address to the UN Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Reform, Colonel Kapoor said, “It is a great irony that troops contributing countries which provide their troops to execute the mandates and the troops on ground who lay down their lives to fulfil these mandates have no say in the process of formulation of the mandate.”

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23496662?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents>

The UN’s ability to execute the above functions depends upon the size and personnel composition of the force deployment. The size of the UN’s commitment is critical, as **an operation’s ability** to separate combatants and impose barriers to civilian targeting **depends upon the number of personnel deployed. As the UN’s force commitment increases, so does its ability to protect** civilians

<https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/publications/ipi_e_pub_peacekeeping_int_l_expert_forum_3.pdf>

Given that peacekeeping extends peace, a critical question is why is this so. One reason, the speakers suggested, is that **peacekeeping makes peace more valuable and war more costly. The prospects of political and economic gains for rebel and government leaders from** the so-called “peacekept,” **[peace] together with international aid and** trust **funds, are seen to change the calculus** of prospective spoilers. The speakers also stressed that deterrence by peacekeepers requires the capability and use of force to be considered credible. Second, it was suggested that peacekeeping alleviates mistrust and builds confidence by monitoring behavior and allowing parties to signal intentions. Third, peacekeeping allows for the control of sensitive territory and processes (e.g., disarmament) in addition to providing critical security and training to buy time.In other words, [Ultimately] peacekeeping takes “risks off the table.”

Peacekeeping operations often operate under suboptimal conditions with voluntary, multilateral troop commitments. Missions tend to be short-staffed and poorly equipped, without unified chains of command or a shared operational language. Missions can have multiple rules of engagement dictated by national capitals. U.N. peacekeepers have had some notable catastrophes, with massive human costs. But **when peacekeepers are deployed,** war-ending peace agreements are more likely to be implemented, and **warring parties are 20 percent more likely to implement the terms of their [peace] agreement** with peacekeepers on the ground.Conflicts are more than 50 percent less likely to reignite.Scholars have found that peacekeeping keeps wars from bleeding across borders. Having more peacekeepers on the ground also seems to correspond with fewer civilians targeted with violence. And peace operations at times have successfully served as transitional authorities, handing power back to local authorities, although this is decreasingly true.

<https://www.pcr.uu.se/digitalAssets/653/c_653796-l_1-k_pko_prediction_preprint_main.pdf>

The hazard ratios for peacekeeping provide clear evidence that this policy tool is effective. The results in Table 3, column 1, show that **when peacekeepers are present, the risk 3**

Our results show that **in a scenario where the UN is willing to issue PKOs with strong mandates and increase its** PKO **budget by 50 percent, the risk of armed conflict in** the world in **2035 would be reduced by** up to **two thirds relative to a scenario without PKOs.** Considering the enormous costs of armed conflict, in terms of both human suffering and foregone economic development, our results suggest that UN peacekeeping is a cost-effective way of increasing global security.