

We affirm

**Our Sole Contention is Unity.**

In today's conflict-ridden global climate, the UNSC has served little more than an archaic reminder of the past.

**Molly '15 of Brookings** finds that while UN Security Council reforms have been called for by many nations, the structure of the UNSC has remained the exact same since the 1960s. This is problematic as “the longer it takes to reform the Security Council, the greater the danger of it becoming irrelevant.”

**Quarterman 2010 of the Center for Strategic and International Studies** explains that leaving significant voices out of international organizations lessens their legitimacy, which can reduce compliance with their decisions.

**Beehner of the Council on Foreign Relations in 2012 finds** that without meaningful reform, the body will be seen as neither legitimate nor effective in enforcing international law, and issues of international importance will shift to other institutional forums and regional frameworks.

Poppy of the Commission on Global Security '15 contextualizes that without reform, more and more security issues will be taken by temporary coalitions of states. African nations have created their own security apparatus, the APSA, to intervene without Security Council authorization, Arab states have formed a union to address conflict in Yemen without UN approval.

Indeed, after a long time of being underrepresented in the council, African nations are turning away from the UNSC as **Einsiedel '15 of UN University** finds that the Council has lost significant ground to African regional and subregional organizations in the area of conflict management. This development was underpinned by the fact that African countries with powerful militaries were willing to deploy their troops to places where there was no peace to keep.

However, adding India to the UNSC would renew confidence to both of these regional groups.

First is Bringing Back the Middle East.

**Gupta '14 of the Diplomat** reports that the Arab League stated that India can use “its weight in the international community” to advance Middle East peace.” [and] expressed support for India's bid for a permanent seat at the UNSC.

The Middle East would be especially thrilled about India's addition due to their bilateral ties. Gupta continues to explain that India voted in favor of the Arab League peace plan underscoring the rising importance of its relations with the Gulf petrol-monarchies. The League has sought a larger role for India in the peace and stability of the region.

Second is Africa

The **Economic Times '11** report that African countries support India becoming a permanent member of the UN security council and appreciate its unstinted assistance towards their all-round development programmes.

India, in turn, has historically supported increased African representation.

**The Gulf News '19** reports that India vociferously supports the call for the reflection of the Common African Position which would be adding two permanent seats and two non-permanent seats to the two Africa now have in the Council

Thus, by acting as a sharp turn towards reform, and by representing the interest of developing nations, India would renew confidence in the UNSC.

There are two main impacts

First, humanitarian assistance.

McDonald of the Council on Foreign '10 relations writes that frustrated member states react to a lack of representation by reducing investments and diplomatic support for the institution, with the WFMC '18 confirming that funding has already been withdrawn from important agencies dealing with climate change, migration, etc.

Fortunately, Mollenkamp of International Policy Digest '18 writes that adding India to the security council would be able to prevent the upcoming collapse of our most valued institutions, with Collins of **Brookings 17'** continuing that just 22 billion of aid would be able to lift 91 million people out of poverty.

Second, promoting global stability.

As Vuong of the Berkeley Journal of International Law '03 explains, multilateral action is superior to regional or unilateral action because it uniquely confers the legitimacy and impartiality necessary to earn the support of all parties involved. As as the UNSC loses legitimacy, the WFMC continues that international prohibitions on intervention and use of weapons of mass destruction are being ignored.

Gartner '11 of Uchicago continues that agreements mediated by regional organizations are over twice as likely to fail as those by international organizations, increasing the frequency and severity of civil wars. **Hultman of Uppassa University** finally concludes that UNSC intervention measures reduce the hazards of major-armed conflict by 85%, compared to no effect by regional organizations.

Thus we Affirm.

All of this leads Kexin of Political Violence '18 to conclude that the UNSC has been largely successful in forcing the cooperation of great military powers all while pushing for diplomacy, but a world without it would be riddled with conflict, lacking an effective institution to take action.

## Frontlines

F2: Regional orgs good

1. They usually look to the UN to set precedents for intervention anyways.

# Cards

Lionel Beehner, Truman National Security Project/Council on Foreign Relations, "The UN's Fossilized Security Council", June 6, 2012, PDF [The-UNs-Fossilized], SP, March 23, 2019

The vote on Syria only underscores the need for change. In the past, the body was unable to intervene in Bosnia to avert the July 1995 Srebrenica massacre, and it was similarly impotent to prevent the genocide in Rwanda. If the Security Council cannot intervene to stop mass killings, then its entire *raison d'être* is called into question. **Unless the Council's membership more fairly reflects the global realities of today without sacrificing its ability or willingness to act, it will lose its legitimacy—as issues of international import shift to other institutional forums and regional frameworks.** In short, the Council risks becoming "neutered," as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton aptly put it in February.

**UN Security Council reforms have been called for by many nations, who argue that the framework** set up after the Second World War **is not relevant today. ...** This category would be different from the non-permanent members, therefore, creating another level of membership. However, once again, neither of these members would have veto powers. Since these recommendations in 2004 nothing more has happened with regards to membership for countries like India. However, with the United States' public support recently there is some hope. It is an important step forward, though not enough to open the way for India to put forth its candidacy for permanent membership status. **The longer it takes to reform the Security Council, the greater the danger of it becoming irrelevant.** With the changes in the international power structure, the significant security business of the world will start to be transacted elsewhere, as it will require the leading powers such as India, that are not in the Security Council. Hence, the longer the reforms take, aspirants will leave and be forced to form their own organisation.<sup>1</sup>

Indeed, Quarterman '10, Center for Strategic and International Studies,

Seen in the context of the upcoming G-20 summit, President Obama's pledge might have been a shot across the bows of those who support the status quo in the international institutions created in the aftermath of the World War II. The Security Council, World Bank, and International Monetary Fund have governance and decision making structures that reflect the global power configuration of the past and do not take into account the changed environment created by emerging powers such as India. The G-20, by contrast, is inclusive and provides a voice for "centers of influence." If the older organizations were merely quaint relics of a bygone era, this would not be an important problem. But, each has an essential role to play in global governance that is weakened by its lack of representativeness. Each organization provides too great a voice to Europe, which is diminishing in clout, in particular in relation to rising Asian powers. **Leaving significant voices out of international organizations lessens their legitimacy, which can reduce compliance with their decisions.**

The five permanent members of the Security Council are China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. There are no African or Latin American countries among them. The membership structure of the council—which was last reformed in 1965 to expand the nonpermanent membership from 6 to 10—is heedless of the changed regional power environment of the early twentyfirst century. States that have a legitimate claim to a larger role in the Security Council by dint of their regional significance, economic clout, and/or military size and prowess include India, Brazil, Germany, Japan, and South Africa<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Molly E., 2-13-2015, "The UN Security Council in an Era of Great Power Rivalry and India's options," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-un-security-council-in-an-era-of-great-power-rivalry-and-indias-options/>

<sup>2</sup> Quarterman '10 Quarterman, Mark (Director of the PostConflict Reconstruction Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies). "Security Council Reform and the G-20." Center for Strategic and International Studies, 9 November 2010, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/security-council-reform-and-g-20>. [Premier]

**UN Security Council reforms have been called for by many nations, who argue that the framework** set up after the Second World War **is not relevant today. ...** This category would be different from the

non-permanent members, therefore, creating another level of membership. However, once again, neither of these members would have veto powers. Since these recommendations in 2004 nothing more has happened with regards to membership for countries like India. However, with the United States' public support recently there is some hope. It is an important step forward, though not enough to open the way for India to put forth its

candidacy for permanent membership status. **The longer it takes to reform the Security Council, the greater**

**the danger of it becoming irrelevant.** With the changes in the international power structure, the significant security business of the world will start to be transacted elsewhere, as it will require the leading powers such as India, that are not in the Security Council. Hence, the longer the reforms take, aspirants will leave and be forced to form their own organisation.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, Quaterman '10 of the Center for Strategic and International Studies continues that

Seen in the context of the upcoming G-20 summit, President Obama's pledge might have been a shot across the bows of those who support the status quo in the international institutions created in the aftermath of the World War II. The Security Council, World Bank, and International Monetary Fund have governance and decision making structures that reflect the global power configuration of the past and do not take into account the changed environment created by emerging powers such as India. The G-20, by contrast, is inclusive and provides a voice for "centers of influence." If the older organizations were merely quaint relics of a bygone era, this would not be an important problem. But, each has an essential role to play in global governance that is weakened by its lack of representativeness. Each organization provides too great a voice to Europe, which is diminishing in clout, in particular in relation to rising Asian powers. **Leaving significant voices out of international organizations**

**lessens their legitimacy, which can reduce compliance with their decisions.** The five permanent members of the Security Council are China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. There are no African or Latin American countries among them. The membership structure of the council—which was last reformed in 1965 to expand the nonpermanent membership from 6 to 10—is heedless of the changed regional power environment of the early twentyfirst century. States that have a legitimate claim to a larger role in the Security Council by dint of their regional significance, economic clout, and/or military size and prowess include India, Brazil, Germany, Japan, and South Africa<sup>4</sup>

Thus, Molly concludes that

The longer it takes to reform the Security Council, the greater the danger of it becoming irrelevant. With the changes in the international power structure, the significant security business of the world will start to be transacted elsewhere, as it will require the leading powers such as India, that are not in the Security Council. Hence, **the longer the reforms take, aspirants will leave and be forced to form their own organisation.**<sup>5</sup>

Indeed, we already see this occurring in two places.

---

<sup>3</sup> Molly E., 2-13-2015, "The UN Security Council in an Era of Great Power Rivalry and India's options," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-un-security-council-in-an-era-of-great-power-rivalry-and-indias-options/>

<sup>4</sup> Quaterman '10 Quaterman, Mark (Director of the PostConflict Reconstruction Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies). "Security Council Reform and the G-20." Center for Strategic and International Studies, 9 November 2010, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/security-council-reform-and-g-20>. [Premier]

<sup>5</sup> Molly E., 2-13-2015, "The UN Security Council in an Era of Great Power Rivalry and India's options," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-un-security-council-in-an-era-of-great-power-rivalry-and-indias-options/>

First, is the Middle East.

Myers '13 of the Atlantic reports that

**In an unprecedented move** last Friday, **Saudi Arabia turned down an offer by the United Nations to sit on the Security Council** for two years as a non-permanent member. No country has ever been offered this opportunity and refused to accept. Why did Saudi Arabia turn down the seat on the Security Council? Saudi Arabia rejected the offer claiming frustration at United Nations' ineffectiveness regarding the Middle East and solving conflicts around the globe. In a revelatory statement released by the Saudi Foreign Ministry, they accused the UN Security Council of "double standards" that "prevent it from carrying out its duties and assuming its responsibilities in keeping world peace." Calling for reform, they highlighted the United Nations' "failure to find a solution" for both the Palestinian cause and the current civil war in Syria. The Saudis had supported the American plan for a retaliatory military strike after the Syrian government's deadly chemical weapons attack on innocent civilians in August. However, the United States opted for a diplomatic option that resulted in a UN Security Council resolution that did not involve military intervention. Saudi Arabia was disappointed and expressed their anger through this denial of Security Council membership. What is the reaction around the world? **Allies of Saudi Arabia in the Middle East have shown support, with the Arab League, Egypt, Qatar, Bahrain, UAE, and Kuwait all publicly backing the move.** The United Nations called the rejection "unexpected." On Monday, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry flew to Paris to meet with Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Saud al-Faisal and discuss a wide range of issues, including their refusal to join the Security Council.<sup>6</sup>

Problematically, the Arab League's dissatisfaction has pushed them towards forming a militarized regional organization.

Jones '19 of the Wall Street Journal finds that

The Arab League on Sunday called for the creation of a joint military force to counter extremism and political instability across the Middle East amid a Saudi Arabia-led operation carrying out airstrikes in Yemen. At a meeting in Sharm El Sheikh chaired by Egyptian President Abdel Fattah Al Sisi, **leaders of the 22 countries of the Arab League agreed in principle to form a joint force that would take military action against threats to the peace and security of another member state**, according to a final declaration closing the two day summit. Participation in such a force would be optional, the declaration said, and such a plan is unlikely to factor into the continuing operation in Yemen. The plan, which is still in its infancy and will take months to formulate, is the first concrete step toward the united military force that Mr. Sisi had sought in early February after a Libyan affiliate of Islamic State beheaded 22 Egyptian migrant workers there—drawing airstrikes from the Egyptian air force against militant sites in the Libyan city of Derna.<sup>7</sup>

Second is Africa

In a UN General Assembly Meeting in 2018, the Representative for Sierra Leone observed that

Sierra Leone's representative, speaking on behalf of the African Group, spotlighted that most issues discussed in the 15-member organ are related to his continent. Its 54 nations must be involved in decisions concerning not only international peace and security, but its own very continent. Africa demands no less than two permanent seats, including the veto power, if it remains, and five non-permanent seats. Widespread support from Member States for this position means that it is time to "redress the historical injustice of not being represented in the permanent category." "We cannot afford to remain indifferent," Algeria's delegate said. **Despite having the largest number of Member States in the**

---

<sup>6</sup> Adam Myers, 10-22-2013, "Why Did Saudi Arabia Refuse to Join the UN Security Council?," Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/10/why-did-saudi-arabia-refuse-to-join-the-un-security-council/280774/>

<sup>7</sup> Rory Jones In Dubai and Tamer El-Ghobashy In Cairo, 4-21-2019, "Arab League Agrees to Create Joint Military Force," WSJ, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/arab-league-agrees-to-create-joint-military-force-1427632123>

**United Nations, Africa continues to be undermined and has no representation in the permanent category, which is the core decision making unit of the Council.**<sup>8</sup>

Indeed, after a long time of being underrepresented in the council, African nations are turning away from the UNSC

Indeed, Einsiedel '15 of UN University finds that

As a result, **the Council [has] lost significant ground to African regional and subregional organizations in the area of conflict management. This development was underpinned by the fact that African countries with powerful militaries were willing to deploy their troops to places where there was no peace to keep.**

Indeed, the AU fielded a Council-mandated peacekeeping operation in Somalia, which has suffered casualty figures that no UN operation would be willing to sustain. This has fueled AU demands that such missions be financed by the UN, which, to the AU's great chagrin, continue to be rejected by the P5. In Darfur, joining forces with the AU in the creation of the first ever hybrid AU-UN peacekeeping operation (UNAMID) was necessary for the Council to overcome the Sudanese government's opposition to the deployment of blue helmets.<sup>51</sup> Yet, the mission's operational limitations and political difficulties have prevented that model from being transferred to other settings<sup>9</sup>

However, adding India to the UNSC would renew confidence to both of these regional groups.

First is Bringing Back the Middle East

Gupta '14 of the Diplomat reports that the Arab League

At the third round of the India-Arab League dialogue in May 2007, visiting envoy Hashem Youssef **stated that India can use "its weight in the international community" and "with other countries to advance Middle East peace."** Youssef also described India as an "emerging power" and **[and] expressed support for India's bid for a permanent seat at the UNSC.** The League has also refrained from adopting a position on the Kashmir dispute, alleviating concerns that it would tow the OIC line.<sup>10</sup>

The Middle East would be especially thrilled about India's addition due to their bilateral ties. Gupta continues to explain that

**India voted in favor of the Arab League peace plan** for Syria at the United Nations in February 2012, despite close relations with the Assad regime. While New Delhi insisted that the draft resolution did not call for regime change in Syria, the vote followed two previous abstentions that condemned Assad and called for him to step down. Given that the Arab League's stance on Syria was to the benefit of Sunni regimes, **India's vote underscore[ing]s the rising importance of its relations with the Gulf petro-monarchies.** In the first high-level Indian visit to the region after the Arab Spring, former External Affairs Minister S.M. Krishna travelled to Cairo in March 2012, to engage with the LAS leadership, representatives

<sup>8</sup> No Author, xx-xx-xxxx, "Member States Call for Removing Veto Power, Expanding Security Council to Include New Permanent Seats, as General Assembly Debates Reform Plans for 15-Member Organ," No Publication, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/ga12091.doc.htm>

<sup>9</sup> United Nations University Working Paper Series Number 04 – February 2015 © 2015 United Nations University. All Rights Reserved. ISBN 978-92-808-9005-1 The UN Security Council in an Age of Great Power Rivalry 1 Sebastian von Einsiedel Director, Centre for Policy Research, United Nations University David M. Malone Rector, United Nations University Bruno Stagno Ugarte Deputy Executive Director for Advocacy, Human Rights Watch <http://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:6112/UNSCAgeofPowerRivalry.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> Kanchi Gupta, *The Diplomat*, 12-21-2014, "India and the Arab League: Walking the Trade Talk," *Diplomat*, <https://thediplomat.com/2014/12/india-and-the-arab-league-walking-the-trade-talk/>



from Qatar, Libya and Iraq, and the transitional Egyptian leadership. With Iran, Syria and Afghanistan as central points of discussion, engagement with the LAS allowed New Delhi to assess the Arab-Persian dynamic as critical to its own interests in the region. **The League has sought a larger role for India in the peace and stability of the region.** India's formal ties with the LAS date back to 2002 wherein both sides inked a MoU, institutionalizing regular Arab-India political consultations. India was the first non-Arab nation to be conferred with Observer Status at the League and is invited to attend LAS summits. At the third round of the India-Arab League dialogue in May 2007, visiting envoy Hashem Youssef stated that India can use "its weight in the international community" and "with other countries to advance Middle East peace." Youssef also described India as an "emerging power" and expressed support for India's bid for a permanent seat at the UNSC. The League has also refrained from adopting a position on the Kashmir dispute, alleviating concerns that it would tow the OIC line.<sup>11</sup>

Second is Africa

The Economic Times '11 report that

**African countries** today came out in **support** of **India becoming a permanent member of the UN security council and appreciate its unstinted assistance towards their all round development programmes**. The backing for India's aspirations for a Security Council permanent seat came during the retreat chaired by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh on the sidelines of the Second Africa India Forum Summit here. The discussions centred on the need to take effective steps to ensure that decisions taken were implemented in an efficient and result-oriented manner, Vivek Katju, Secretary (West) in the External Affairs Minister, told reporters after the retreat which lasted for about two hours over lunch.<sup>12</sup>

India, in turn, has historically supported increased African representation.

The Gulf News '19 reports that India

To emphasise the urgency of reforming the Security Council, Akbaruddin drew attention to the exclusion of African nations from the ranks of the permanent members. "We **vociferously support[s] the call for the reflection of the Common African Position**" in the negotiations, he said. The 55 African nations, which make up the single largest group in the UN, have demanded **[which would be] adding two permanent seats and two non-permanent seats to the two** they **[Africa] now have in the Council** and these have been codified in two documents, the Sirte Declaration going back to 1999 and the Ezulwini Consensus of 2005. "It is a call to address a long-standing injustice. Africa's voice cannot be excluded," said Akbaruddin.<sup>13</sup>

Thus, by acting as a sharp turn towards reform, and by representing the interest of developing nations, India would renew confidence in the UNSC.

Doing this is vital, as the impact of continued regional splintering is increased conflict.

---

<sup>11</sup> **Kanchi Gupta, The Diplomat, 12-21-2014**, "India and the Arab League: Walking the Trade Talk," **Diplomat**, <https://thediplomat.com/2014/12/india-and-the-arab-league-walking-the-trade-talk/>

<sup>12</sup> Prime Minister, 5-24-2011, "African countries support India's bid for permanent UN Security Council seat," Economic Times, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/african-countries-support-indias-bid-for-permanent-un-security-council-seat/articleshow/8558980.cms>

<sup>13</sup> Ians, 1-30-2019, "India urges nations to rethink UN Security Council reform process," No Publication, <https://gulfnews.com/world/asia/india/india-urges-nations-to-rethink-un-security-council-reform-process-1.61765905>

Abrahamov '18 of the UN reports that

**Expressing concern over the growing number of conflicts worldwide, the Security Council** today **underlined an urgent need for redoubled efforts for prevention and resolution.**

In presidential statement S/PRST/2018/1, presented by Kairat Abdrakhmanov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan and Security Council President for January, members underlined a profound need to focus on, among other things, advancing further conflict prevention and preventive diplomacy tools, practices and efforts, and ensure their most effective use. The Council underscored the importance of peacebuilding and emphasized the need for engaging and collaborating with regional actors in policy related and country-specific issues in the advice made by the Peacebuilding Commission. It also acknowledged the significant role of the Commission and United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Offices.<sup>14</sup>

Gartner '11 of UChicago finds that

**Insurgents fear that a regional organization, which includes the government they are fighting, will treat them unfairly.** Governments know that for an insurgency to represent a serious threat, **the insurgents likely have support from neighboring states who are also regional organization members, making the organization a less attractive mediator.**

Regional organizations thus represent additional selection effects beyond those indicated simply by the presence of mediation. Third-party conflict management by regional organizations sends a signal that a civil war is going to be especially hard to resolve and that any resulting outcomes are likely to be highly fragile. **...over 50% of the agreements mediated by regional**

**organizations fail immediately, compared to 16% for international organizations, while 55% of civil war agreements mediated by international organizations last eight weeks or more compared to 32% for regional organizations...**

While regional organizations have attributes that increase their mediation effectiveness, they also include factors that limit their success. The likelihood of regional-based negative externalities resulting from the diffusion of conflict (Kadera 1998) might reduce regional organizations' bargaining space, compared to other third-party managers like the UN. Regional organizations might thus be more likely to be involved in conflicts that have low "versatility," with little chance to transform the conflict into more tractable type (Maoz and Terris 2006). These constraints might make regional organizations less likely to mediate and more likely to fail when they get involved (Beardsley 2009; Gurses, Rost, and McLeod 2008). Future research should explore the relationship between the factors that influence the choice of regional organizations as third party mediators and the determinants of their conflict management effectiveness.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, in order to preserve peace, we are proud to affirm.

---

<sup>14</sup> Kairat Abdrakhmanov,, xx-xx-xxxx, "Amid Rising Number of Conflicts Worldwide, Security Council Presidential Statement Underlines Urgent Need for Advancing Preventive Diplomacy Tools, Practices," No Publication, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/sc13168.doc.htm>

<sup>15</sup> No Author, xx-xx-xxxx, "", No Publication, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/10.1017/s0022381611000090.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Af538f264ca434f254240b2d0e4ae442e>