

Pranav and I negate: Resolved: The United Nations should grant India permanent membership on the Security Council.

Our sole contention is the Indo-pak threat.

An Indian permanent seat on the UNSC has the potential to cause conflict between India and Pakistan by increasing current tensions to a breaking point and not allowing any international institutions to help remediate the issue.

Specifically, the situation in the Kashmir region between India and Pakistan is particularly tense, and is highly susceptible to global conflict. **Roy '19**, writes for the Huffington Post that since Kashmir is the most densely militarized zone in the world, it is a theatre of violence that can literally spin into nuclear war at any moment. With both India and Pakistan armed to the teeth and ready to go to war at any point, it is imperative that the United Nations avoid any action that could potentially destabilize the nuclear neighbors.

Unfortunately, India will weaponize its seat on the security council against Pakistan. **Khan 15** writes for the Monterey Naval Institute that Indian permanent membership would afford India the ability to block resolutions brought before the UNSC by Pakistan. If India were afforded the power of a permanent UNSC seat, it would act quickly to damage Pakistan's economy beyond repair in two ways.

The first way is by blocking Access to Financial Institutions. **Sarwar '11** at the ISSI finds that if India were a permanent member of the UNSC, it would gain massive influence over global financial Institutions like the World Bank and the IMF through increased voting power. Unfortunately, **Khan 15** of the Monterey Naval Institute finds that if India were a permanent member, its power over key financial institutions would allow it to prevent Pakistan's access to these institutions, crippling Pakistan's already weak economy. IMF loans are keeping Pakistan from drowning, **Rensch '19** of Public Finance International finds that Pakistan's economy has been reliant on IMF money using their loans to bail themselves out 13 times since the 1980s.

The second way is by blocking Water Resources. If granted a permanent seat, India could withhold water flow from the Indus River system to Pakistan to damage their agricultural economy. However, their capacity to do so is limited in the status quo, as **Gettleman 19** at the New York Times explains that the current Indus Waters Treaty substantially limits the amount of water that they can withhold from Pakistan. **Tahir 19** at the Daily Times furthers that the primary reason why India adheres to the treaty is to maintain international legitimacy and secure a UNSC seat. The incentive to adhere to the treaty would disappear once they received their seat. Unfortunately, **Raza '18** of the Diplomat explains that 70 percent of Pakistan's jobs are associated with the agricultural sector, which is why **Khan** concludes that pulling out of the IWT would permanently obliterate the agro-based economy of Pakistan.

Pakistani economic collapse is an existential threat and leads to conflict, as **Royal 10** of the U.S. Department of Defense explains that economic collapse increases the probability of war, as leaders lash out to try to secure resources, increasing the probability of full scale escalation. That nuclear war would be devastating, as **Sethi '15** of First Post finds that a nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan would set off a global security crisis, and 21 million lives would be lost immediately.

The only chance of solving this impending crisis is through diplomatic collaboration. **Roy '19** continues, that in order to prevent full scale nuclear escalation, the Kashmir dispute must be resolved diplomatically. Fortunately, the best way for diplomacy to occur is through 3rd party mediation. **Curtiss '02** at the Burke Center For International Relations writes that the Kashmir conflict can only be solved by neutral 3rd party mediation, like the UN. Empirically, **Shannon '10** of the University of Chicago Journal of Politics finds that binding third party arbitration in territorial disputes succeeds in ending tensions 63% of the time.

Problematically, India would block UN mediation in the Kashmir with a permanent seat.

Khan 15 writes for the Monterey Naval Institute that because India believes it can extract a favorable outcome in the Kashmir region unilaterally, it would weaponize a seat on the UNSC to block any attempt at a Kashmir resolution. Ultimately, **Garrie '19** of Eurasia Future concludes that if India were a permanent member of the security council, it would effectively mean that the Kashmir crisis could never be solved.

In the interest of a diplomatic solution to the India-Pakistan conflict, we strongly negate.