



University YK TOC File

Pro	2
Pro Case	3
Weighing	12
Frontlines	13
R2 Indo-Pak War	14
R2 Proliferation	15
Con	16
Con Case	17
Weighing	20
Frontlines	21
NEED EMPIRIC	23
R2 Peacekeepers	24
R2 Representation	25
R2 IMF/FDI/Aid	26

Pro

Pro Case

Daniel and I Negate.

Contention One is Sharing is Caring

Raj '10 of The Hindu explains that water is a major issue that requires cooperation between India and China. Indeed, Vishwanath '18 of Stratfor adds that water management depends on mutual trust and understanding.

This is crucial, as Mastro '17 of Georgetown University writes that the India-China relationship remains tense and prone to military risk, especially since both led by nationalist leaders.

For example, Vishwanath finds that a standoff in 2017 between China and India escalated tensions between the two, jeopardizing their water security. He furthers that unless the countries agree to institute a mechanism for water management, the river systems they both depend on will be at risk.

Fortunately, affirming solves.

After controlling for other factors, Bosco '14 of the GGJ finds that because UNSC members have constant communication and cooperation between high-level diplomats, permanent members see increased cooperation and trust.

Making India a permanent member and improving the relationship between China and India will allow talks to occur, providing a solution to their water crises.

There are two impacts. The first is water shortages.

Oswald '10 of Michigan State University writes that careful cooperation is necessary to prevent China from diverting too much of the water away with its hydropower dam construction. Failure to do so have resulted in widespread shortages.

Indeed, the BBC furthers that 200 thousand people die annually from such water shortages in India alone.

The second impact is water wars.

Palmo '17 of the Tibet Policy Institute explains that if China continues its lack of transparency with water, the mistrust between the countries will escalate to conflict as water becomes even more scarce.

Khan '09 of Newsweek reports that an India-China conflict would involve nukes and will bring the United States and major powers in Europe and Asia. Thus, Cadicott '02 of the FPSR that such a conflict will lead to extinction.

Contention Two is Keeping the Peace

According to the UN '19, peacekeepers provide the security and support to help countries make the difficult transition from conflict to peace.

*Recently, however, peacekeeping has suffered from significant setbacks. Fortunately, affirming revitalizes it in **two ways**.*

First is Increasing Contributions

Autesserre '19 of Foreign Affairs finds that peacekeepers are given few resources with which to accomplish their ambitious mandates.

This lack of funding exists because of the UNSC's lack of legitimacy.

Widark '15 of Delhi Policy Group explains that if the UNSC is seen as non-representative and illegitimate, then the willingness among member states to contribute financially weakens.

However, making India a permanent member on the UNSC solves this.

Grant '15 of the Guardian writes that if we we don't change the makeup of the council, we risk a situation where the legitimacy of it may be challenged by emerging countries. Thus, Mishra '06 of the IPSA concludes that the legitimacy of the UNSC will only increase if Third World interests are represented in the body.

There is no better country than India to fill this role as Dabhade '17 of the ORF observes that India has always been a champion of the Third World and one of the most significant votaries of shaping the UN agenda for the developing world.

As a result, Hurd '08 of the Global Governance Journal writes that a more legitimate council would encourage more states to contribute resources to peacekeeping.

The impact is reducing conflict.

Since it facilitates a move from conflict to discussion, Hegre '18 of the University of Chicago finds that increasing peacekeeping spending would be able to save 150,000 lives over 10 years. Moreover, Fortna '04 of Columbia University finds that peacekeeping reduces the onset of another war by 84%.

Second is Driving Reform

Reese '17 of UNOPS writes that after a UNSC resolution, a peacekeeping mission can take as long as two years to be at full operational capacity – a very long delay when a conflict is raging.

However Agarwal '18 of the ORF finds that India wants to streamline peacekeeping operations within 30 to 90 days of their approval to avoid delays.

This feat is certainly possible as Benson '18 of the OEE finds that the UN could provide non-UN actors with the mandate to undertake rapid intervention and ask more developed countries to provide resources like transportation and expertise.

However, Boulden '18 of the University of Manitoba writes that it is difficult for non-permanent members to push reform since much of the progress will be lost when the member state inevitably leaves the Council.

But if India was a permanent member on the UNSC, it could finally enact reforms to combat these delays.

The impact is faster response times.

Benson furthers that the longer it takes a force to fully deploy, a conflict can intensify and spread, sides may become further entrenched, and political solutions difficult to achieve

Even reducing response times by a year is crucial as Hegre '18 of the Peace Research Institute finds that each year of a major conflict causes 2,500 deaths. Getting peacekeepers in within that time is important as the Peacekeeping and Stability Institute quantifies that peacekeeping missions can reduce civilian deaths by 90 percent.

Thus, we affirm.

We affirm.

Contention One is Vetoing Poverty

Since its inception, The UNSC has included 5 permanent and 10 rotating members.

Mukherjee '13 of Princeton University writes that India has only served seven two-year terms in the council's 74 year history. But if India was a permanent member, it would have a full-time position in the group.

Fortunately, sustained membership on the UNSC has its benefit.

Dreher '06 of Yale University concludes that members of the council use their economic clout to influence other members' decisions and exert political influence.

Namely, members like China use Foreign Direct Investment or FDI to do so.

Amadeo '18 of the Balance writes that FDI is when businesses from one country invest in firms in another.

Ma '18 of Tsinghua University indicates that when a country is on the UNSC, the amount of Chinese FDI it receives increases by 68 percent.

FDI is crucial to alleviate poverty, as Klein '01 of the World Bank reports that it makes businesses more productive through the spread of "best practices," spurring growth and opportunity.

Thus, Wieser '11 of Vienna University quantifies that a 1 percent increase in FDI reduces poverty by .76 percent.

This is especially important since the World Bank '16 reports that there are over 270 million Indians living in poverty.

Contention Two is Keeping the Peace

According to the UN '19, peacekeepers provide the security and support to help countries make the difficult transition from conflict to peace.

*Recently, however, peacekeeping has suffered from significant setbacks. Fortunately, affirming revitalizes it in **two ways**.*

Subpoint A is Increasing Contributions

Autesserre '19 of Foreign Affairs finds that peacekeepers are given few resources with which to accomplish their ambitious mandates.

This lack of funding exists because of the UNSC's lack of legitimacy.

Widark '15 of Delhi Policy Group explains that if the UNSC is seen as non-representative and illegitimate, then the willingness among member states to contribute financially weakens.

However, making India a permanent member on the UNSC solves this.

Grant '15 of the Guardian writes that if we we don't change the makeup of the council, we risk a situation where the legitimacy of it may be challenged by emerging countries. Thus, Mishra '06 of the IPSA concludes that the legitimacy of the UNSC will only increase if Third World interests are represented in the body.

There is no better country than India to fill this role as Dabhade '17 of the ORF observes that India has always been a champion of the Third World and one of the most significant votaries of shaping the UN agenda for the developing world.

As a result, Hurd '08 of the Global Governance Journal writes that a more legitimate council would encourage more states to contribute resources to peacekeeping.

The impact is reducing conflict.

Since it facilitates a move from conflict to discussion, Hegre '18 of the University of Chicago finds that increasing peacekeeping spending would be able to save 150,000 lives over 10 years.

Moreover, Fortna '04 of Columbia University finds that peacekeeping reduces the onset of another war by 84%.

Subpoint B is Driving Reform

Reese '17 of UNOPS writes that after a UNSC resolution, a peacekeeping mission can take as long as two years to be at full operational capacity – a very long delay when a conflict is raging.

However Agarwal '18 of the ORF finds that India wants to streamline peacekeeping operations within 30 to 90 days of their approval to avoid delays.

This feat is certainly possible as Benson '18 of the OEF finds that the UN could provide non-UN actors with the mandate to undertake rapid intervention and ask more developed countries to provide resources like transportation and expertise.

However, Boulden '18 of the University of Manitoba writes that it is difficult for non-permanent members to push reform since much of the progress will be lost when the member state inevitably leaves the Council.

But if India was a permanent member on the UNSC, it could finally enact reforms to combat these delays.

The impact is faster response times.

Benson furthers that the longer it takes a force to fully deploy, a conflict can intensify and spread, sides may become further entrenched, and political solutions difficult to achieve

Even reducing response times by a year is crucial as Hegre '18 of the Peace Research Institute finds that each year of a major conflict causes 2,500 deaths. Getting peacekeepers in within that time is important as the Peacekeeping and Stability Institute quantifies that peacekeeping missions can reduce civilian deaths by 90 percent.

Thus, we affirm.

First, is by increasing India's contribution.

India uses peacekeeping operations to vie for a seat on the Security Council.

Mukherjee '15 of the Brookings Institute writes that a large part of India's claim to a permanent seat on the council rests on its contributions to peacekeeping.

However, Lynch '11 of Foreign Policy finds that Indian officials have bridled at the lack of influence its contributions have been able to purchase at the United Nations, where its bid for a permanent seat on the Security Council appears stalled.

Lynch continues that, as a result, India has threatened to pull out peacekeeping troops. In fact, the UN quantifies that from 2017 to 2018, India reduced its troop contribution by 12%.

Weighing

Frontlines

R2 Indo-Pak War

R2 Proliferation

Con

Con Case

We negate.

Contention One is Conflict in Kashmir

According to Maena '19 of Gulf News, for seven decades, the Kashmir region has been at the heart of hostility between India and Pakistan as both have claim to it.

Despite some escalation, Zutshi '19 of The Conversation confirms that tensions between India and Pakistan have diminished. Indeed, the Associated Press reports in March that India has recently sent diplomats and is actively taking measures to de-escalate tensions with Pakistan.

Thus, Gurung '18 of the India Times finds that the situation in Kashmir is stable but fragile.

However, adding India to the UNSC permanently would derail current progress.

Chan '12 of Hankuk University explains that India is making these diplomatic moves towards Pakistan to reduce its neighbor's continued opposition of India's bid for a permanent seat on the UNSC.

But if India was a permanent member, it would have no incentive to continue doing so.

This is problematic, as Khan '15 of the Naval Postgraduate School writes that India can isolate and intimidate Pakistan by confronting it while simultaneously preventing U.N. intervention through India's influence and veto power as a permanent member. Khan furthers that giving a permanent seat to India would allow it to assert greater diplomatic pressure on Pakistan to solve the issue in a manner that best suits India, causing further disputes in the region between both nations. Thus, he concludes that giving a permanent seat to India at this stage would likely raise the chances of serious armed conflicts in the region.

The impact is war.

Mian '16 of the Bulletin finds that once conflict is initiated, a Pakistan-India conflict may well escalate into a larger war with the use of nuclear weapons. Indeed, Shapoo '15 of the Diplomat explains that Pakistan stations its nukes close to the frontline to legitimize its threats. Problematically, he finds that the decision to launch a tactical nuclear strike now rests with mid-level field commanders, who have limited battlefield vision, instead of the central government.

If conflict escalates nuclearly, Roblin '19 of the National Interest quantifies that nuclear detonations would kill twenty-six million in India, eighteen million in Pakistan, and trigger a refugee crisis.

Contention Two is the Responsibility to Protect

According to the UN '19, the Responsibility to Protect doctrine of the UNSC, or R2P, obligates individual states and the international community to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing.

Gifkins '16 of Manchester University finds that the Security Council has invoked the principle of R2P more often in the years after the 2011 Libya intervention, concluding that the doctrine has become more popular over time.

Thus, Hageboutrous '17 of Swarthmore University finds that, despite the perception that the UNSC is gridlocked, in 90 percent of cases, the council has no trouble agreeing on intervening.

Unfortunately, an Indian permanent seat would halt this.

Jaganathan '14 of the CSD Journal writes that India objects to the principles of R2P because it infringes on its values concerning state's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Thus, Hall '13 of the Australian National University furthers that India's diametrically opposing stance to R2P is unlikely to shift in the future.

If India was a permanent member on the UNSC, it could thus veto resolutions for humanitarian intervention.

There are two impacts.

The first is increased genocide.

Daalder '99 of Brookings finds that the majority of European nations believe that regional organizations like NATO cannot intervene without the approval of the UNSC.

Thus, Hehir '14 of E-IR explains that when the UNSC vetoes an intervention, it becomes *unilateral*, as only a select few number of countries such as the US and Russia are willing to intervene.

Less actors makes an intervention less likely to succeed, as perpetrators can focus on committing human atrocities instead of defending themselves from larger forces. Krain '05 of Wooster quantifies that each additional intervening actor increases the chance that genocide ends by 10 percent.

The second impact is increased civil war recurrence.

Recchia '15 of the University of Cambridge explains that when interventions are approved by the UNSC, there is less international opposition, making it easier for the leaders of third-party states to cooperate actively, which creates effective institutions that foster long-term peace.

Thus, Sambanis '08 of Yale concludes that civil wars with non-UN interventions are two times more likely to recur than with UN interventions.

Thus, we negate.

Weighing

Frontlines

Contention 1: Kashmir

Indo-Pak War Impact

R2 Impact Responses

1. **Card we need: China won't intervene in the Kashmir dispute**
 - a. Misgar '17 of the New Arab: Beijing is unlikely to intervene in Kashmir because it has more pressing issues like the North Korean threat and slowing economy
2. **F2 India only has enough weapons to fight for 10 days**
 - a. If anything, this makes them more prone to nuclear escalation
 - b. Economic Times '18: India is buying more ammo to solve the shortage
3. **Card we need: inherency on India acting with restraint in the squo**
 - a. The Associated Press reports on March 10th that India has actively taken efforts to de-escalate tensions with Pakistan diplomatically and has returned a key diplomat to Pakistan's capital
4. **F2 US can leverage Pakistan to back down because of their aid**
 - a. The BBC '18: Trump cut foreign aid to Pakistan by 300 million dollars; evidently we're losing our leverage against them
 - b. Worst case, China, an ally of Pakistan, can just fill in
5. **F2 MAD**
 - a. The Diplomat '17: Pakistan's nukes are in the hands of military commanders, meaning in a crisis situation, nuclear weapons are vulnerable to rogue elements within its armed forces
 - b. Talmadge '19 of Washington Post: Both sides believe that they can provoke the other side under a certain threshold, but any disagreement on where this threshold is, means nuclear war

Contention 2: R2P

R2 India Never Voted Against R2P

1. Ganguly '16 of Indiana University: India has largely been ambivalent because if it outright voted against these resolutions, it would harm its interests on the UN and its case for reelection.

R2 India Willing to Give Up Veto

R2 Growing Econ Changes Ideology

1. India has been growing for a while; why hasn't its stance on R2P changed?
2. The state of the economy is the largest factor that determines elections. If the economy continues to grow, then social conservatives like Modi can keep pushing the same ideology
 - China has experienced economic dynamism yet it is still very conservative in its own views (SCS, human rights, invading Taiwan)

R2 Indian Politicians More Confident in Order

1. Indian politicians themselves believe in state sovereignty
2. Jaganathan '14: historically, India has always prioritized protecting individual sovereignty which is grounded in cultural beliefs and historical events. Can't just control it now

R2 Rights Organizations Gaining Strength

1. Pimpale '17 of Universiteit Leiden: India has an awful record with human rights. Evidently, India doesn't care about these groups' concerns.

R2 Russia + China Veto Anyway

1. Hageboutrous '17 in case

R2 RWP

R2 India Doesn't Want Veto

1. Ghosh '17: India has offered to forgo the veto in order to get talks on its permanent membership started but still views the veto as important.
2. Sushma Swaraj, the Foreign Minister of India, has openly stated it expects veto power if granted a permanent seat.
3. Melling '18: Russia and US are vehemently opposed tampering with the veto power of permanent members.

R2 Abstention

1. Jaganathan '14: historically, India has always prioritized protecting individual sovereignty which is grounded in cultural beliefs and historical events.
2. Bommakanti '17: Since veto-wielding powers Russia and China abstained, India's choice to abstain shows disapproval

R2 RN2V

R2 Libya Failed

1. Risse '14 of Global Policy Journal: Intervention largely succeeded since it prevented a genocide from happening.
2. Hamid '16: The goal of the intervention was not to build a democracy, it was to protect civilians and prevent a massacre, which it did. Without intervention, Libya would still be under the control of the dictator Muammar Qaddafi.

IMPACT

R2 Intervention Creates Conflict Empirics

1. Intervention non-unique. It's whether it is through UN or not. Sambanis '08 of Yale: civil wars with non-UN interventions are two times more likely to recur than with UN interventions.

R2 Blowback

1. The perception of intervention would exist in either world. Terrorists will use any amount of intervention to support their cause

R2 Moral Hazard

1. Why would they risk their lives on the off-chance that a foreign nation could intervene?

R2 Peacekeepers

R2 Representation

R2 IMF/FDI/Aid