

My partner and I **negate** the resolution: *Resolved: The United Nations should abolish permanent membership on its Security Council.*

**Observation:** [Jones and Adrianna 23](#) write, "Biden initiated... reform at his speech at the General Assembly last year... [and] this year [...] talked again about council reform." Plans for reforming the UN Security Council exist within the status quo; therefore, Con can advocate for adopting reforms while upholding their burden.

**Framework:** The purpose of the UN, per the [UN Charter](#) itself, is to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." Thus, this round must be evaluated under the **framework** of minimizing global conflict.

### **Contention 1) The P-5 prevent conflict and support peacekeeping**

The UNSC, on balance, already works in the status quo. [Brimmer 11](#) notes that "UN peacekeepers help prevent conflict and protect civilians around the globe... hamper... efforts to develop nuclear weapons... isolate... terrorists... strengthen democracy and mediate local conflicts." [Sonnback 20](#) further expands that "UNSC resolutions have been central for tackling conflict situations... such as in... Iraq's occupation of Kuwait... and... Israel-Syria... indicating the success of UN deployment for preventing interstate conflict."

The P-5 are central to this success. Financially, [Hooper 21](#) notes that "P-5 nations rank... in the top six... contributors to the UN... [They] make up forty-three percent of the total budget... with the [US] holding up... twenty-two percent... [T]he UN risks losing a significant amount of funding if it takes away the veto from the P-5, which would reduce their power and influence... It is unlikely these nations would... maintain... large contributions if their power... is overtly taken from them. The power... is a massive incentive to pump money into the [UNSC], which [is] need[ed] to operate effectively." Militarily, [Hooper 21](#) finds that "The UNSC... rely on national militaries... to get the job done... and those militaries must be powerful... [If] the veto did not exist... permanent members [would not] use their own militaries for a cause they do not support... [thus] the... resolution[s are] useless, and nations will view the UNSC as weak and incapable." Past examples confirm this mindset. [Berman 24](#) notes that "Biden paused [peacekeeping] funding... over allegations that some agency employees aided... attacks on Israel... The Trump administration suspended... funding for the UN Population Fund... [for] promot[ing] abortions... [and] In 2020,... the United States [withdrew] from the [World Health Organization] completely." Without permanent membership, UNSC support will follow suit.

**The impact here is death.** In a statistical review, [Hegre et al 19](#) discover that "PKOs... increase the duration of postconflict peace..., reduce the lethality of ongoing conflicts, increase the chances of conflict ending, and prevent contagion to neighboring countries... PKOs... [reduce] major armed conflict by up to two-thirds... and [save] 150,000 lives... over a 13-year period... [A higher] PKO budget... would mean 57.5 [thousand] fewer infant deaths, 900,000

[more] people with... access to... water, and [1.3 million] fewer undernourished people.” Absent the resources of the status quo, however, these reductions disappear.

## **Contention 2) Stripping permanent membership collapses the UN, inciting massive conflict**

[Bosco 09](#) finds that, in the status quo, “The council structure forces the permanent members to engage routinely... [They] treat each other differently because of their shared council privileges. If [they] sit in a forum like the Security Council... [they] are... more cautious... because [they] need each other... [It] affects... the way [they] behave in bilateral relations.” Serving together on the council “adds further impetus to cooperation, [and]... US Secretaries of State have traveled to... nearly twice as many [bilateral meetings with the four other permanent members] as with [the G-4]... [T]he council creates a...meaningful sense of identity and common interest.” However, removing the veto, per [Dayal and Dunton 23](#), is “more likely to kill most existing structures of multilateral cooperation than to produce a more just institution.” [Scharf 23](#) backs this claim with historical analysis, noting that “If the... veto was... necessary... to get major powers to join the [UN,] [...] incapacitating the veto power... risk[s] their withdrawal and even the destruction of the [UN] altogether.” [Collins 22](#) explains why, stating that “If the P5 lose th[e] veto... they... [cannot] prevent threats to their own interests. [...] Losing this... deterr[ence]... provide[s]... pretext... for... forceful manouvres. Other states will challeng[e] the bigger powers... resulting [in] rising anarchic tendencies and a deeper arms race cycle.”

The loss of the UNSC or even just the removal of the P-5 from the UNSC, poses devastating consequences for international security. The loss of engagement produces **three impacts**. **Firstly**, The destruction of the UNSC as an institution, per [Scharf 23](#). **Secondly**, anarchy and a new arms race, alongside expanded use of force, per [Collins 22](#). **Thirdly**, war. [Soltes 23](#) writes, “P5 members are at present nuclear-armed ‘great powers’... [W]ar and conflict between these powers is still a possibility. [...] Abolition of the veto... is highly impractical as it would require the P5 to surrender on issues that may directly affect their national security.” **Terminalize force and war** judge, as [William 22](#) finds that “Conflict... could provoke a famine..., put[ting] 2 billion people at risk.”

Because we urge a world where international conflict is minimized, we urge a neg ballot and stand ready for crossfire.