

We negate that the United Nations should grant India permanent membership on the Security Council.

### **Our sole contention is regional tensions.**

Regional tensions between India and Pakistan are at a high. [Mussarat '10](#) explains that since independence, both countries have fought three major wars and one minor. The epicenter of the rivalry is the territorial dispute of the Kashmir region, which is intimately related to Islam and Hindu nationalism.

[Domínguez '14](#) contextualizes, the political relationship between India and Pakistan has recently become dangerously toxic. In Pakistan, the civilian government has been weakened by an anti-government movement, and the anti-India military has been strengthened. Meanwhile, the new nationalist government in India is susceptible to taking orders from civilian leaders to return fire with great intensity.

Granting India a permanent seat will skyrocket tensions for three reasons.

### **First, by provoking Pakistan.**

[Hanif '11](#) reports, gaining permanent membership on the Security Council boosts India's power on the world stage, which threatens Pakistan and its interests.

According to [The Express Tribune in 2010](#), Pakistan said that any endorsement of the Indian bid for a permanent seat in the Security Council will have serious implications resulting in a negative impact on peace and security in South Asia.

Historically, Pakistan responds to growing Indian influence with aggression. For [instance](#), when India regained control over a Muslim-majority region in the state of Gujarat in 1968, Pakistan responded with a full-scale invasion starting the second war between the nations.

### **Second, by emboldening India.**

Recognizing India as one of the world's major powers signals to their leaders that the country can get away with more aggressive behavior. [Nawas '18](#) writes, the permanent seat in the Security Council will give India formal status as a nuclear power and legitimize its initiatives, whether wrong or right. This could destabilise the region by fueling regional confrontation and conflicts.

This is proven historically, as the [Kamal '98](#) reports that the Security Council's failure to condemn proliferation emboldened India to take aggressive actions in the 1998 Kargil War.

### **Third, by preventing UN intervention.**

[Stuenkel '10](#) explains that India is said to eye a permanent seat to assure that the UN does not intervene in the conflict in Kashmir, due to fears of Kashmir's independence. [Mussarat '10](#) furthers that permanent membership would put India in a position to block any undesired policy.

UN mediation would be key, and is potentially forthcoming. [Domínguez '14](#) argues that the UN could play the role of a truly neutral mediator. Unilateral approaches haven't worked, as there are few countries with deep, trusted relationships with both India and Pakistan.

Even without the direct use of the veto, India can prevent any discussion over Kashmir, turning it into a "forgotten conflict." [Celine '04](#) documents, the mere threat of the veto determines Council decisions. That's why the Council never discusses crises that a P5 member considers to be within its own exclusive sphere of interest. Chechnya and Tibet figure among the forgotten conflicts that the Council ignores.

For these three reasons, India's permanent membership would cause tensions to erupt at the worst possible time. According to [Clara '12](#), any act of aggression on either side risks counter-escalation. Therefore, India may have to fight a full-scale war that could destroy large segments of Pakistan's army to achieve its political aims, which would approach Pakistan's stated nuclear redlines.

The impacts are two-fold.

### **First, poverty.**

Military buildups trade off with poverty alleviation efforts. [Zuck '17](#) explains that Pakistan already spends 25% of its budget on defence, making it unable to provide adequate services to its citizens.

That's a big reason why [Dunlap '17](#) then reports that 40% of all Pakistanis are without the basic needs of life, which include food, shelter, education and healthcare.

[Hussain '14](#) ultimately finds that a 1% increase in Pakistani defense expenditures increases poverty by 58%.

**Second, civilian lives.**

[Pillalamarri '15](#) finds that the nuclear rivalry in South Asia has reached an especially dangerous phase as Pakistan can now reach all of India and deploy battlefield nukes.

Rather than a no-first-strike policy, [Keck '19](#) explains that Islamabad has adopted a nuclear doctrine of using tactical nuclear weapons against Indian forces.

Even if Pakistan starts off only using short range tactical nukes, [Roblin '17](#) reports that tactical-nuclear-weapon usage rapidly escalates to strategic weapons, which would kill billions of people.

**Please negate.**