# SV - TOC Neg [Indonesia + Kashmir]

## Contention 1 is Kashmir

#### India and Pakistan are on the brink of war over the disputed Kashmir region. The Strait Times writes this week that

Straits Times, 4-20-19, "India halts Kashmir cross-border trade with Pakistan," https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/south-asia/india-halts-kashmir-cross-border-trade-with-pakistan, Date Accessed 4-25-2019 // WS

India has suspended cross-border trade with Pakistan-controlled Kashmir because it was being used to funnel weapons and drugs, said the government, in a further crackdown in the volatile territory. Trade across the Line of Control, or the heavily militarised de facto border that divides the two parts of Kashmir between India and Pakistan, has served as a confidence-building measure and to help the local population. But tensions between India and Pakistan have run high, ever since a Pakistan-based militant group claimed responsibility for bombing a security convoy in Kashmir.

#### Unfortunately India’s permanent membership on the UNSC would push the two countries past the brink into all-out war for 2 reasons. First is India will use their new found influence on decisions about Kashmir. Aamir Khan explains in 2015 that:

Aamir Hussain Khan, December 2015, “UNSC’s Expansion: Prospects for Change and Implications for the Regions and the World”, <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a632266.pdf>, Date Accessed 4-2-19 // WS

Kashmir is the major dispute between Pakistan and India. Pakistan wants a just resolution of the Kashmir dispute in accordance with the spirit of UNSC resolutions—the UNSC resolution maintained the issue of Jammu and Kashmir be determined through plebiscite as per the wishes of the people of Kashmir. The U.N. HLP report also refers to the Kashmir dispute as one of the “oldest and unresolved disputes on the UNSC agenda.”216 To silence the popular demand of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, India has deployed a huge military contingent, which is involved in the worst kind of human right violations. According to Noorani, “Indian Security Forces have systematically, and with impunity, perpetrated outrageous violations of human rights in the [Kashmir] valley.”217 Today, Pakistan and India are nuclear power; even small conflict may conflagrate to nuclear exchange which will devastate the entire South Asian region. Without settlement of the Kashmir dispute, use of force cannot be ruled out. Noorani contends that, “It is reasonable to conclude that relations between India and Pakistan will never be normal until the Kashmir dispute is settled.”218 Without resolution of the Kashmir dispute, India does not qualify to be a member of the UNSC. India has refused to implement the resolutions of the UNSC over settlement of the Kashmir dispute. It would be unjust to award membership of the council to a country that has violated its resolution. As a permanent member of the UNSC, India can influence favorable decisions at the UNSC over Kashmir. Furthermore, India, due to its strong conventional military, can resort to the use of force on the pretext of pre-emption or hot pursuit to coerce Pakistan to change its stance on Kashmir in favor of India

#### Specifically, Stuenkel writes in 2010 that

Oliver Stuenkel, 2010, “Leading the disenfranchised or joining the establishment? India, Brazil, and the UN Security Council,” https://ri.fgv.br/sites/default/files/publicacoes/10d7bc9faa.pdf, Date Accessed 3-28-2019 // WS

But permanent membership would also help India defend its ever more global interests. According to Kulwant Rai Gupta, there is a sense in India that with regards to security matters, the role of the UNSC is increasing while that of the UN General Assembly is diminishing. Development issues are more and more handled by the IMF and the World Bank, while the UN turns into an institution dealing mostly with security issues. \* is interpretation is thus yet another reason why India should seek to gain admission as a permanent member to an ever more important organ.84 Finally, India is said to eye[s] a permanent seat to assure that the United Nations does not get involved in the conflict in Kashmir, which would, Indians fear, lead to a partition or independence of Kashmir.

#### That’s problematic as only the UN can mediate the conflict as Hannah Haegeland writes in 2018 that:

Hannah Haegeland, 12-4-2018, "Who Will Prevent the Next India-Pakistan War?," Defense One, https://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2018/12/who-will-prevent-next-india-pakistan-war/153236/, Date Accessed 4-26-2019 // JM

U.S. interests in preventing mushroom clouds over the subcontinent would be well served by considering—and engaging in bilateral dialogue to plan—how China might be of use in crisis management in the future. The depleted state of U.S.-Pakistan relations indicates the United States will need China to help bring Pakistan to the table for negotiating de-escalation. India and China’s increasing economic and geopolitical competition in small states, together with the [securitization](https://warontherocks.com/2017/08/southern-asias-escalating-strategic-competition/) of the Indian Ocean Region, will complicate any Chinese efforts at third-party mediation. A future India-Pakistan crisis will therefore likely require both U.S. and Chinese involvement to prevent escalation. Preparing for this multiplayer crisis management scenario requires new research and creative policymaking—both of which could draw useful lessons from and have interesting implications for the nuclear-tinged crisis unfolding on the Korean peninsula today.

#### Second, membership will shift the balance of power in the favor of India as Khan explains:

Aamir Hussain Khan, December 2015, “UNSC’s Expansion: Prospects for Change and Implications for the Regions and the World”, NPS, [https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a632266.pdf.%20DOA:%20March%207th%202019](https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a632266.pdf.%20DOA%3A%20March%207th%202019), Date Accessed 4-1-2019, // SDV

India claims to be the largest democracy in the world. Furthermore, India argues that given its large size, population, and troop contribution to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations (PKO), it deserves a larger role on the world stage.41 The United States, the United Kingdom, and France have supported India for permanent membership in the expanded U.N. Security Council, whereas Pakistan and China are opposed to India’s membership as a permanent member. Pakistan shares border and water disputes with India. According to Sarwar, “Apart from other disputes, Kashmir is a major dispute between the two regional rivals and it is on U.N. agenda too.”42 Both countries have fought three wars over Kashmir. Pakistan further argues that a permanent seat at the UNSC would heavily tilt the balance of power in the region in favor of India.

#### Shamsa Nawaz furthers this in 2017 by explaining that a

Shamsa Nawaz, 2017, "Violation of the UN Resolutions on Kashmir: India’s Quest for UNSC Permanent Membership," No Publication, <http://issi.org.pk/violation-of-the-un-resolutions-on-kashmir-indias-quest-for-unsc-permanent-membership/>, Date Accessed 4-1-19 // MN

The permanent seat in the UNSC will also give India a formal status as a nuclear power with the greater legitimacy of initiatives, whether wrong or right. This would certainly have a potential to destabilize the region by fueling regional confrontation and conflicts. Even the very existence of Pakistan would be endangered since the division of the Subcontinent remains a sore point in the Indian politics. The UNSC still upholds legitimacy for a worldwide action. It is crucial in maintaining the international order while looking after the super powers interests. However, it is difficult to see the role of the UN in such a world order more than a rubber-stamp. For example, the UN was emasculated when Iraq was invaded and Afghanistan was attacked.

#### These two reasons are why Khan concludes that:

Aamir Khan, 2015, “UNSC’S EXPANSION: PROSPECTS FOR CHANGE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE REGIONS AND THE WORLD”, <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a632266.pdf>, Date Accessed 4-13-2019 // JM

India is a big country and has remained relatively democratic since its independence in 1947. It has contributed a large troop commitment toward the U.N. peace efforts in the world. India has provided leaders for both civilian and military leadership to the U.N. India has the third-largest military and is bracing to become a rising economic power in the world. India, along with the other G4 countries, is striving for permanent membership in the UNSC, which will [to] further increase its influence in the world and South Asian region. India, however, has a number of disputes with its small regional countries, especially Pakistan. Interestingly, all South Asian countries border India, but do not have contiguous borders with each other. Therefore, most of the South Asian countries, being India’s neighbor, depend on India’s support for their security and economic assistance. For instance, Nepal and Bhutan are landlocked countries and depend on Indian seaports for their trade. Additionally, Bangladesh has unresolved border and water dispute with India. Similarly, Sri Lanka has suffered from Tamil’s insurgency that was supported by India. Both India and Pakistan have failed to resolve their disputes peacefully and have fought four major wars over these disputes since 1947. As an influential regional state, India has failed to play the required leadership role to amicably solve its problems with its small neighbors. India, however, considers that its neighbours are its enemies and regards them as subordinate states. Thus, India’s permanent membership of the UNSC will have serious implications for the South Asian region. India will pursue its own interest and objectives and will not pay any heed to regional issues, involving smaller regional states. In the past, India has violated UNSC’s resolution and is not likely to respect these resolutions in the future as well. India can isolate and intimidate smaller regional states through economic strangulation and by involving them in political problems and disputes. India can politically and militarily interfere in the internal affairs of smaller regional countries on various pretexts, and at the same time can prevent U.N. intervention through India’s influence as a permanent member. Giving a permanent seat to India at this stage would likely raise the chances of serious armed conflicts in the region.

#### That’s problematic as Toby Dalton writes in 2016 that:

Toby Dalton & George Perkovich, 9-19-2016, "Pakistan and India: The Art of Peace," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, https://carnegieendowment.org/2016/09/19/pakistan-and-india-art-of-peace-pub-64638, Date Accessed 4-19-2019 // JM

The more damage India might inflict on the Pakistani military, the greater the probability that Pakistan would resort to nuclear weapons. India’s primary coercive options could centre on army incursions, or more limited airborne strikes, or covert operations. India’s development of operational military and intelligence capabilities to support these options aims to deter cross-border terrorism through the threat of future punishment. Depending on which of these options India pursues, nuclear strategy and capabilities would play a reinforcing role. For example, if Indian leaders decided to unleash major ground and air operations – as envisioned in ‘Cold Start’ – they would have to anticipate possible Pakistani nuclear responses and deploy more credible nuclear forces and plans to counter Pakistan than the current Indian doctrine of ‘massive retaliation’ implies. Since these are the options most discussed in India, they require deep analysis.

#### This strike would be devastating as The Telegraph explains

The Telegraph­, 12-10-2013, "India-Pakistan nuclear war could 'end human civilisation'," Telegraph.co.uk, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/10507342/India-Pakistan-nuclear-war-could-end-human-civilisation.html, Date Accessed 4-20-2019 // WS

A nuclear war between India and Pakistan would set off a global famine that could kill two billion people and effectively end human civilization, a study said Tuesday. Even if limited in scope, a conflict with nuclear weapons would wreak havoc in the atmosphere and devastate crop yields, with the effects multiplied as global food markets went into turmoil, the report said. The Nobel Peace Prize-winning International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and Physicians for Social Responsibility released an initial peer-reviewed study in April 2012 that predicted a nuclear famine could kill more than a billion people.

## Contention 2 is Security Council Politics

#### Granting permanent membership only creates power struggles in the region for India. In a world where they are named to the UN Security Council, the current Asia-Pacific Security Council member, Indonesia would have their power threatened and decreased. This is because Manish Dabhade indicates that:

Manish S. Dabhade, 12-15-2017, “India’s pursuit of United Nations Security Council Reforms”, Observer Research Foundation, <https://www.orfonline.org/research/india-pursuit-united-nations-security-council-reforms/>, Date Accessed 4-3-2019, // SDV

India sees itself carrying the necessary abilities, actual and potential, which entitles it to a permanent seat at the Council. Further, the seat on the high table, at the UN’s premier, powerful body would provide [India] it the much needed leverage to expand its global geo-political and geo-economic clout. It would serve as an equaliser to China, its rival and an emerging hegemon in Asia, and an ever increasing strategic and security concern in its immediate neighbourhood and beyond. India has always seen itself as a democratic alternative to the authoritarian China. India’s millennia old civilizational existence also demands it to be at the top of the international hierarchy of states. As India’s international profile and capabilities rise due to its ever expanding global and regional footprint in diverse areas such as politics, development, economics, culture and science and technology, India wishes to shift its international position from a rule taker (a constrained role) to a rule maker (a system shaping role). The Indian attempts at joining various regimes like the MTCR and the ongoing, high-pitched campaign to join the NSG amply indicate that India is no more satisfied with being either the target or a mere follower of various international norms and rules, and now wants to shape and align them to suit Indian ideas and interests. In conclusion, and most significantly, Indian hopes significantly rest on an acknowledgement by the UN itself of the need to expand the UNSC. In an interview to The Guardian (2015), former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan said that the Security Council must either reform or risk becoming increasingly irrelevant: “If we don’t change the council, we risk a situation where the primacy of the council may be challenged by some of the new emerging countries.”

#### That’s problematic as Indonesia, the only Muslim-majority democracy on the Security Council, is acting as a buffer for Myanmar to ensure the UN uses the best method to solve for the Rohingya crisis – Amanda Siddharta indicates in 2019 that:

Amanda Siddharta 1-10-2019, “Indonesia to Put Muslim Issues Forward at UN Security Council,” VOA, <https://www.voanews.com/a/indonesia-to-put-muslim-issues-forward-at-un-security-council/4736852.html>, Date Accessed 4-27-2019 // AS

Indonesian can play a part, not only with the Palestine-Israel conflict, in solving the Rohingya crisis in Myanmar, said Hikmahanto Juwana, a professor of International Law at the University of Indonesia. “But that also depends on the U.N.’s intensity in their involvement in the Rohingya issue. We hoped that we could’ve solved it within a regional organization. But ASEAN has already tried and failed, so I think it’s necessary to discuss it in an international forum,” he said. Juwana mentioned that discussion on the Rohingya has started in the U.N. and it has sent a special rapporteur to Myanmar. But he said that bringing up the issue involving a fellow ASEAN member state will also be difficult. “The problem in ASEAN is because the member states must have a consensus in an issue and that they have non-interference principle,” Juwana told VOA. Nevertheless, Marsudi said in a press statement Wednesday that Indonesia will continue to contribute so that the Rohingya issue in Rakhine State will make progress. Timur, of CSIS, said that in this case Indonesia could serve as a buffer for Myanmar when the U.N. decides to intervene in the Rohingya crisis. “In that case, Indonesia can say that intervention must be done through a regional organization within ASEAN. Then Indonesia can create a regional approach through lobbying, to solve the humanitarian conflict the [through] ASEAN way,” she said. And that will put Indonesia in a leadership position in ASEAN. Timur explained that without any Southeast Asian representative in the Security Council, it would be easier for them to make an agreement that might undermine ASEAN. “But now Indonesia is a non-permanent member, they [that] can lobby the UNSC,” she added.

#### Instead in the world of the affirmative, India supercedes Indonesia’s influence as the regional hegemon. Khan argues that:

Aamir Khan, 2015, “UNSC’S EXPANSION: PROSPECTS FOR CHANGE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE REGIONS AND THE WORLD”, <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a632266.pdf>, Date Accessed 4-13-2019 // JM

India is a big country and has remained relatively democratic since its independence in 1947. It has contributed a large troop commitment toward the U.N. peace efforts in the world. India has provided leaders for both civilian and military leadership to the U.N. India has the third-largest military and is bracing to become a rising economic power in the world. India, along with the other G4 countries, is striving for permanent membership in the UNSC, which will further increase its influence in the world and South Asian region. India, however, has a number of disputes with its small regional countries, especially Pakistan. Interestingly, all South Asian countries border India, but do not have contiguous borders with each other. Therefore, most of the South Asian countries, being India’s neighbor, depend on India’s support for their security and economic assistance. For instance, Nepal and Bhutan are landlocked countries and depend on Indian seaports for their trade. Additionally, Bangladesh has unresolved border and water dispute with India. Similarly, Sri Lanka has suffered from Tamil’s insurgency that was supported by India. Both India and Pakistan have failed to resolve their disputes peacefully and have fought four major wars over these disputes since 1947. As an influential regional state, India has failed to play the required leadership role to amicably solve its problems with its small neighbors. India, however, considers that its neighbours are its enemies and regards them as subordinate states. Thus, India’s permanent membership of the UNSC will have serious implications for the South Asian region. India will pursue its own interest and objectives and will not pay any heed to regional issues, involving smaller regional states. In the past, India has violated UNSC’s resolution and is not likely to respect these resolutions in the future as well. India can isolate and intimidate smaller regional states through economic strangulation and by involving them in political problems and disputes. India can politically and militarily interfere in the internal affairs of smaller regional countries on various pretexts, and at the same time can prevent U.N. intervention through India’s influence as a permanent member. Giving a permanent seat to India at this stage would likely raise the chances of serious armed conflicts in the region.

#### That’s problematic because India’s view of a good policy for the Rohingyas is to repatriate them – Ganguly indicated in February that:

Meenakshi Ganguly, 2-2-2019, "Rohingya Refugees Caught Between India and a Hard Place," Human Rights Watch, https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/02/02/rohingya-refugees-caught-between-india-and-hard-place, Date Accessed 4-27-2019 // JM

“India is not a signatory for refugees, we have been soft,” the Home Ministry’s Kiren Rijiju [said](https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/india-should-not-go-soft-on-rohingya-muslims-kiren-rijiju-in-parliament-1301057-2018-07-31) last July. “We [and] will facilitate their return.” When criticized by the opposition, the government went further, claiming without any basis that the Rohingya [“are linked with wrong and illegal activities.”](https://indianexpress.com/article/india/not-refugees-rohingya-involved-in-illegal-acts-kiren-rijiju-5285388/) Alleged BJP supporters have been implicated in [attacks](https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/bjym-leader-admits-to-burning-rohingya-refugee-camp-in-delhi-complaint-filed/articleshow/63840127.cms)on the beleaguered community. In October 2018, Indian authorities [started repatriating Rohingya refugees](https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/10/04/india-7-rohingya-deported-myanmar) to Myanmar, despite [United Nations findings](https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=23575) that Myanmar’s top generals should be should be investigated and prosecuted for genocide. The forcible return of refugees violates the principle of nonrefoulement, the international norm that forbids returning people to a place where they are at real risk of serious abuse. The Indian government has repeatedly claimed that the Rohingya who were deported wanted to return to Myanmar but has [refused access](https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2019/1/5c2f2a374/unhcr-seeking-clarification-india-returns-rohingya.html) to the UN refugee agency to assess these claims independently. Discrimination against the Rohingya refugees could worsen because of recent official policy. The Indian government [has proposed amendments](http://prsindia.org/billtrack/the-citizenship-amendment-bill-2016-4348) to its citizenship laws that would allow certain Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Jain, Parsi and Christian asylum seekers from Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Pakistan to become eligible for citizenship. Muslims are glaringly excluded, placing the Rohingya at risk of detention and deportation. Some have been detained in Indian prisons on charges of illegal entry and are at greatest risk of forced return.

#### Failure to protect the Rohingya ensures instability throughout South Asia. Meredith Arndt argues:

Meredith Arndt, 4-11-2018, “THE ROHINGYA CRISIS: AN HUMANITARIAN AND SECURITY EMERGENCY FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA”, <https://www.cesi-italia.org/en/articoli/833/the-rohingya-crisis-an-humanitarian-and-security-emergency-for-southeast-asia>, Date Accessed 4-13-2019 // JM

The Rohingya crisis is more that just a national security problem as it could become an open window for religious extremism and radicalism to penetrate in the region. Indeed, the condition of Rhoynga community has already become part of the propaganda of the two most international jihadist organization: both Daesh and the al-Qaeda in Indian Subcontinent. The accusation of discrimination and violent treatment that affect the communities are being exploited as recruitment causes by these organizations. ISIS has a history of recruiting persecuted Muslim minorities, and the Rohingya are no different. The jihadist rhetoric, for example, could find consensus among the ARSA, whose militants could start to look at the terrorist organizations as provider of manpower [personnel] and capabilities to combat the Myanmar army. Additionally, the presence of radical Islam may spark a resurgence in Buddhist extremism across Myanmar, with blatant effects on national security for the population and a dangerous spillover effects to other countries. In this framework, the Myanmar government seems currently to have problems in dealing with such an important crisis. Aung Sang Suu Kyi, the de-facto leader of the country, is not reflect the International Community’s expectations. Despite the results of the election held in 2015, won by her party (the national League for Democracy - NLD), the military establishment still have a strong influence inside the institutions. Myanmar was under military dictatorship from 1962 to 2011. A few years prior to the government’s collapse, the Myanmar Army used their executive and legislative powers to prevent democratic transition. One antagonist to the regime was Suu Kyi, whom the Army placed under house arrest for her opposition to totalitarianism in leading the National League for Democracy (NLP) party. Suu Kyi was the recipient of the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize for her non-violent struggle for democracy and human rights. Under house arrest, Suu Kyi had popular support from the Myanmar people for a presidential run. Threatened by this prospect, the army passed a constitutional amendment banning anyone with foreign family members from becoming president. Suu Kyi’s husband was British, and so were her sons. Therefore, despite NLD’s landslide electoral win in 2015, she was unable to hold office on a technicality. As a hybrid regime, the military still holds a quarter of parliament seats, and the Commander in Chief has legislative veto making it impossible to amend the constitution. Since there was no way to change the presidency laws, parliament appointed Suu Kyi to a new Prime Minister-type position created for her, entitled “General Counselor.” As General Counselor, the international community still recognizes Suu Kyi as the de facto leader of Myanmar. However, even with this position, Suu Kyi has no power over the ministries that have a direct impact on the Rohingya persecution. The military still has constitutional jurisdiction over Defense, Borders, and Home Affairs. The most common point of contact is the “General Admissions Department” of Home Affairs, which manages the Myanmar census, marriage licenses, birth and death certificates, and land purchases. This gives the military almost total control in enacting discriminatory policies directly affecting the Rohingya. While Suu Kyi could technically propose constitutional referendums, but as mentioned before, these amendments would be opposed with exorbitant parliamentary aggression from the military. And, not only would Suu Kyi face opposition from the Army, but her voter base would also react negatively to proposals for Rohingya equality. Indeed, Suu Kyi still holds popular support with the Burman Buddhists, a majority group opposed to Rohingya rights. As a delicate nation-state, Suu Kyi may also fear that any response supporting an end to Rohingya discrimination could lead to another military coup or a forced resignation. Moreover, Suu Kyi’s decisions like prohibiting third-party aid in the Rakhine state may be a tactic to maintain her current position, and possibly prevent an even larger outbreak of violence between Muslims, Buddhists, and the military. There have been multiple regional and international responses to the Rohingya crisis. Since nations are barred from sending aid into Myanmar borders, they are finding alternative ways to help. Since 2015, Malaysia has sent aid to Bangladesh to support the construction of temporary housing units, hospitals, schools, and administrative offices throughout south Bangladesh. To minimize violence against the Rohingya, the Thailand government actively arrested refugee traffickers and involved officials after finding a mass grave at a Rohingya refugee site. However, this merely disrupted, rather than halted smuggling activities. Current crackdowns and aid measures are proving insufficient for managing the influx of Rohinga refugees. Thus, regional actors like Thailand are adopting policies that directly violate the “non-refoulement” clause 1951 UN Convention on the Status of Refugees. “Non-refoulement” states that a nation cannot turn away asylum seekers if they still have a well-founded fear of persecution in their country of origin. Thailand adopted “naval push-back” campaigns in September, using military capabilities to reroute migrant boats back to Myanmar, where the Rohingya face the threat of violence and death. UN officials, the United States, and Western European nations are calling the Rohingya crisis “ethnic cleansing,” yet little concrete action has taken place. The UN has failed to secure an agreement with Myanmar to place UN Peacekeepers on the ground, mainly because Suu Kyi believes this may upset the Myanmar Army. Instead, she has advocated for UN “capacity building” initiatives, or infrastructural development projects to increase the number of schools and hospitals in local communities in the Rakhine to reduce inequality. However, this still does not solve neither the question of Rohingya legal status, nor the problem of military persecution against the ethnic minority. Also, Western reporters are prohibited from ground-level observance close to the Rakhine-Bengali borders, where there are claims that the army is conducting systematic genocide. Without official reports, the US and other Western states feel limited to providing aid at refugee camps and mediating negotiations between Myanmar and Bangladesh. The most recent proposal between Bangladesh and Myanmar involves repatriating tens of thousands of Rohingya refugees to the Rakhine, where they still are at risk of organized cleansing. The lack of solutions in the short term of the Rohingya crisis is posing a serious humanitarian and security issues for the region. The inefficacy of the policy adopted by governments and by the International Community so far is affecting the management of an high-sensitive issue, that can have repercussions not just on the reputation of national leaders or international agencies but that can foment hates and sectarian violence among communities all over the region.

#### That goes nuclear – Iqbal argues in 2017 that:

Anwar Iqbal, 1-16-2017, “Use of nuclear weapons in South Asia can’t be ruled out: Biden”, Dawn, <https://www.dawn.com/news/1308760>, Date Accessed 4-13-2019 // JM

South Asia is among a few regions in the world where nuclear weapons could be used in a regional conflict, the outgoing US Vice President Joe Biden warned on Saturday. In a recent speech at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, Mr Biden hoped that the incoming Trump administration would continue America’s leading role in reducing nuclear weapons around the globe. “Not just North Korea, but Russia, Pakistan, and others have made counterproductive moves that only increase the risk that nuclear weapons could be used in a regional conflict in Europe, South Asia, or East Asia,” he said. “Working with Congress, the next administration will have to navigate these dangers and — I hope — continue leading the global consensus to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our world.” Mr Biden urged Republican and Democratic lawmakers in the US Congress to rise above party politics and deal with the nuclear issue with the seriousness it deserves. “Nuclear security is too important to be a party policy, for our nation and for the world. Although we no longer live in the daily dread of nuclear confrontation, the dangers we face today require a bipartisan spirit,” he said. “The challenge is looming on the horizon. While the vast majority of international community understands that the world is more dangerous when more nations and people wield nuclear weapons, there are still those who seek to grow their arsenals and develop new types of nuclear weapons,” he warned before naming Pakistan among the nations that were doing so. Pakistan also has warned against the dangers of a nuclear conflict in South Asia and wants the international community, particularly the United States, to help resolves its tensions with India. Pakistani diplomats in Washington also referred to a recent statement by the Indian army chief, General Bipin Rawat, who publicly confirmed last week that India did have a Cold Start doctrine. Gen Rawat is the first senior Indian official to do so. Previous Indian chiefs avoided using the term Cold Start and preferred calling it a “proactive strategy”. Cold Start is the Indian operational plan for launching ground and air strikes inside Pakistan before its defensive formations launch a counter-offensive. The Indian media described Gen Rawat’s acknowledgment of a Cold Start doctrine, in an interview to India Today, as a radical departure from New Delhi’s previous policy and intended to send a message to Pakistan. Pakistan says it would counter the Indian move by relocating defensive formations close to the Indian border, and warned that it would be forced to use “tactical nuclear weapons” if India ever launched cross-border attacks. Tactical weapons are usually delivered by short-range ballistic missiles and could effectively counter a Cold Start strike. The Pakistanis also welcome international mediation for resolving this and other disputes —particularly Kashmir — with India and warn that ignoring these issues could lead to yet another war between South Asia’s two nuclear-armed nations. The Indians, however, oppose any outside intervention in their disputes with Pakistan, insisting that such disputes should only be discussed in bilateral meetings. But bilateral talks too have failed to produce any results and are rare. India also says that terrorism is a greater threat to peace in South Asia than any other disputes and accuses Pakistan of continuing to encourage cross-border terrorist attacks. Terrorism is one issue in which India welcomes outside intervention and wants the international community to use its influence to stop the alleged cross-border terrorist activities. Pakistan dismisses these charges as part of an Indian propaganda campaign to malign Islamabad.

# Extra Cards

#### Jayadi furthers that:

Anbar Jayadi, 9-24-2018, "With a seat on the UN Security Council, what can key ASEAN member Indonesia do to solve the Rohingya crisis?," Conversation, https://theconversation.com/with-a-seat-on-the-un-security-council-what-can-key-asean-member-indonesia-do-to-solve-the-rohingya-crisis-102915, Date Accessed 4-9-2019 // JM

Senior Indonesian diplomat Abdulkadir Jailani has stated that having a seat on the Security Council, considered the most powerful organ of the UN, is a great opportunity for Indonesia to wield its diplomatic influence in creating peace. One of the most pressing issues in the region that Indonesia must deal with as a non-permanent Security Council member is the Rohingya crisis. Analysts have [suggested](https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/when-indonesia-sits-security-council) Indonesia should take the role of “a mediator and leader” in resolving this crisis. But, given its dual role as ASEAN member state and Security Council non-permanent member, Indonesia will face huge challenges if it wants to act on APHR’s call to bring the Rohingya case to the ICC. For a start, Indonesia’s status as a non-party to the ICC Rome Statute might be problematic.

#### Indonesian influence solves Rohingya crisis

Temp.co 2018 (“Indonesia Urges Myanmar to Apply UN`s Decision on Rohingya,” September https://en.tempo.co/read/921327/indonesia-urges-myanmar-to-apply-uns-decision-on-rohingya)

Deputy Chairperson of the Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Agency at the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR) Rofi Munawar has urged the Myanmar Government to carry out recommendations from the United Nations (UN) fact-finding team regarding the tragedy in Rakhine State over Rohingya ethnicity. He also encouraged the UN and ASEAN to respond to these findings as a basis for bringing criminals to the court. "Reports from the independent UN team should be followed up by the international community to pressure the Myanmar Government regarding crimes against humanity committed over the Rohingyas," Munawar said in a statement, via a short message service received by Antara, here on Monday. Normatively, the UN Charter, especially in Chapters VI and VII, obliges its member states to carry out humanitarian interventions if a group is being threatened by genocide, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing (the Responsibility to Protect). The findings showed that the incidents over the Rohingyas in Myanmar have fulfilled those conditions. "The Indonesian Government, both through ASEAN and the United Nations, can put pressure on the Myanmar Government to urge the criminals who are involved in the Rohingya issue to step down and be tried in the International Criminal Court," he noted. According to him, as a first step, the international community can urge Myanmar military officials to resign from their positions because they had committed humanitarian violations. Ethnic cleansing is a very serious violation of law. Some of the criminals who have been tried by the ICC are Slobodan Milosevic from Yugoslavia and Slobodan Praljak from Bosnia. "Indonesia, as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council, which began to take office in 2019, should also be able to play a greater role in overcoming crimes against humanity over Rohingya ethnic groups," the legislator from the Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) faction stated.

# Weighing NEG – Indonesia

## Summary

#### Our ev indicates that right now Indonesia is trying to take the lead in the rohinga refugee crisis bc they are the only Muslim majority member on the SC. They can solve but unfortunately out Khan Evidence Indicates that if India gets a seat they will become a regional hegemon and take the lead in the crisis bc the they will interfere politically and militarily with regional nations. Thats problematic bc India will exacerbates the crisis. Modi hates the rohinga and wants to deport as many as possible. Modi has literally made 8k disappear. The impact is regional instability caused by mass refugee flows with nowhere to go. Our ev indicates that this instability causes war bc countries begin to blame each other for the crisis.

#### This turns their case bc an instable South Asia makes the economies crash and harms flow of FDI and Aid into the region

## FF

#### Now on Indionesia. Right now our Siddharta ev says Indonesia is trying to take the lead in the rohinga refugee crisis. They can solve the crisis

#### but our Khan Evidence says when India gets a seat they will become a regional hegemon and take the lead in the crisis bc the they will interfere politically and militarily with regional nations.

#### Thats problematic bc India will make the crisis much worse. Modi wants to make the crisis worse and deport as many as possible. The impact is regional instability caused by mass refugee flows with nowhere to go. Our ev indicates that this instability causes war bc countries begin to blame each other for the crisis.