

**Pranav and I negate.**

---

### **Our first contention is Neglecting the West**

[The Guardian in 2017](#) finds that Trump is willing to cut off aid to countries who do not vote in line with US interests.

This is problematic for India, as [Gardiner of the Heritage Foundation](#) explains that India has decided to chart its own path, and as such votes against the US roughly 80% of the time in the General Assembly.

Historically, voting against the United States has resulted in less aid.

[Lang of Cefiso](#) quantifies that when countries vote against the US in 80% of Security Council resolutions, they receive roughly 20% less foreign aid.

Cutting off foreign aid to India would be disastrous, as foreign aid plays an instrumental role in reducing poverty.

[Senbetta in 2007](#) reports that a mere 1 percentage point increase in the amount of foreign aid directed towards a country is enough to decrease poverty by .18% and increase GDP per-capita growth by 1.2%.

Unfortunately, [Polya of Asia-Pacific](#) writes that 4.5 million Indians die of poverty every single year, and voting aff only makes this problem worse by cutting off aid.

---

### **Our second contention is a dangerous buildup.**

Voting pro incites instability in Asia for two reasons.

**Subpoint A** is escalating the India-Pakistan conflict.

As of this month, tensions between the two nuclear-wielding powers in South-Asia have cooled. [Slater of the Washington Post](#) writes that after Pakistan announced the release of an Indian pilot and the reopening of a train service between the two countries, tensions have finally started to subside.

Unfortunately, voting pro changes this.

The [Economic Times](#) reports in 2019 that Pakistan staunchly opposes India's bid for permanent membership on the Security Council. The reason is simple. [SPP in 2018](#) finds that if India were

granted permanent membership, it would directly gain legitimacy and would have significantly more weight behind its actions. The SPP concludes that this increased influence would anger Pakistan and fuel tensions in the region.

Furthermore, granting India a permanent seat legitimizes India's aggression in Kashmir and sends a message that this kind of violence is justified.

Increasing tension between India and Pakistan is disastrous for two reasons.

**First,** is heightening the chance of conflict.

In today's media-saturated world, [Yusef 18](#) writes that even minimal escalation whip up media frenzies, triggering aggressive and militant rhetoric from both sides. These dynamics stoke popular desire for war, raising the political cost of inaction, and increasing the probability of escalation.

Unfortunately, [Keck 19](#) states that even a limited Indian attack could trigger detonation of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal, and [Satish 16](#) writes that scholars say that a conventional war would almost certainly escalate to the nuclear level.

Tragically, [Henderson 19](#) estimates that even small nuke war would cost 100 million lives.

**Second,** is economic downturn.

[The Economic Times in 2019](#) reports that India's economy has slowed considerably every single time there is political tension with neighboring Pakistan, with the potential to sour business sentiment and hurt foreign investment.

Problematically, this investment is uniquely key. [Bloomberg 19](#) writes that if there is no increase in the investment rate, then the jobs on offer are not going to increase. This is especially bad, as India's unemployment rate was at a 45 year high in 2018.

Even worse, [Brooks in 2011](#) finds that unemployment increases the risk of premature mortality by 63%.

**Subpoint B** is encouraging Pakistani militarization.

For India to become a permanent member of the Security Council, every P5 member, including allies of Pakistan such as China, would have to agree.

Unfortunately, [Harder 15](#) writes that since permanent council membership gives India an advantage over the Kashmir territorial dispute, Pakistan would immediately be isolated from its most important allies.

[Kaura of the Diplomat corroborates](#) that a shift in China's position towards supporting India's bid for permanent membership would likely destroy Pakistan's ties with China.

Problematically, the [ORF 18](#) writes that Pakistan currently sees its friendship with China as its own security blanket. Absent this security blanket, Pakistan will be left with no choice but to militarize, as if it feels that other countries won't protect it, it will have to find ways to protect itself on its own.

Empirically this is true. [Stephens of Al Jazeera in 2015](#) reports that after the US began distancing from the Middle East, the Saudis decided to assume a much more aggressive foreign policy posture.

The impact of increased militarization is decreased social spending.

[Zhang of Southeast University finds in 2016](#) that increased militarization negatively affects social welfare spending, as in order to make up for increased military spending, nations have to decrease expenditures in other areas.

Problematically, [Wilson of the EPI discovers in 2018](#) that every 1% decrease in the social spending rate by means of GDP results in roughly a 1% increase in the poverty rate.

Even worse, [the Borgen Project 17](#) finds that each day, around 1,100 Pakistani children under five years old die from poverty-related causes, and voting aff worsens this issue.

Thus, we negate.

