

The Indian Plea For Permanency At The Security Council.

Saloni Singh Gour

Date of Submission: 12-05-2024

Date of Acceptance: 22-05-2024

An afresh debate that has been circling the Indian political dynamics is all about whether the world's largest democracy be given a permanent stake at the historically prominent UN body or not. Numerous opinions have been extracted on this issue of critical importance to the Indian diaspora across the globe. Before digging into these distinct perspectives, it is crucial to understand the silence of the world body on the same. Is this blackout a sign of a 'NO'? And if not, then does this hushedness indirectly indicate towards the inaction of the world as a conscious preference? Ironic as it is, neither of the conditions seems appealing to the South Asian subcontinent, given its historical backdrop and toil for independence. The concern is not just limited to the Indian attainment of a permanent seat at the security council. Infact, the audacity of the P-5s to reign the day-to-day decisions in the council meetings is unfortunately playing a role in agonizing the Third world. It's no surprise that the P-5s (China, France, Britain, Russia & the United States) have been historically significant powers in the context of world politics and the creation of the UN itself in the year 1945. The heyday global construct is rather a multipolar one which poses a great challenge (if not threat) to the established western hegemony. The rise of India in the Eurasian as well as the Indo-Pacific region is a great example to personify the strength of a developing country on the international diplomatic forum.

As far as the recent developments are concerned, one can trace India's phenomenal blueprint of its emergence as a global power in the advent of New Delhi's G-20 presidency during the three day summit in September 2023. Via this juncture, we were able to conceptualize the idea of *Vasudeva Kutumbakam* (One Earth. One World. One Family) across the global sphere. The concept itself is very promising with regard to the contrasting and unwanted scenarios. The impactful execution of the Indian leadership during the 19th G20 summit is a typology which advocates a fair check and balance of the hegemonic powers.

There are various reasons to justify the Indian presence in the security council as one of its permanent members. Firstly, it will be right to designate a flaw within the structural formation of the security council itself. Ever since its origin in 1945, the council has constantly been overruled, if not dictated, by a cluster of mere five countries. Its extremely absurd to even realize that an overall body of approximately 188 member states has to rely on the decisions taken by a group of five. The world body is akin to a theater with member countries as its actors. Every actor has a significant role to play with regard to their respective sovereignty. However, in no way, the domination of a handful of troupers over the spread of diversity and multi-ethnicity is justified. Global justice is not just about the equal distribution of resources but advocates the process of equal representation as well. Interestingly, the former, in no way can exist before the implementation of latter in the global policies. These five countries are well established and are numbered as the first world nations. On contrary, the third world states (Africa, Asia and Latin America) that have their respective backdrops of colonial history and the further process of decolonization and the fact that they are developing nations with amass of challenging diversity within their territories, are prone to face subordination in the international organizations. We should also not neglect that most of the global challenges like climate change, absolute hunger, education, etc., can majorly be witnessed in the remote regions of Asia and Africa in particular.

These regions and especially the coastal areas within their territories are in the ballpark of being adversely affected by these unavoidable circumstances. The question which arises is that how is this world going to solve such atrocities without any native reform in the representational body itself?

This drives us towards the next statement. The question of Diversity. Every society to exist on this planet has distinct notions of diversity. It is not solely related to the coexistence of diverse groups within a society, but is mainly about the policy making strategies which work in a fair favor of these groups and advocate their equitable representation in societal associations. Same works in terms of the representation of minorities in the international arena. India, apart from being one of the most populated countries, is also a home to distinct diversities in terms of religion, language, caste, region, etc. We are a land of more than 750 linguistic identities. Being a Hindu country, we have followers of more than 8 major religions. The fortunate part is that somehow, there is a community acceptance of this diverse existence in this country. Thus, if given a chance in the council, we might be able to highlight the fruitful aspects of diverse existence on this planet.

India , since the advent of its independence, has believed in the prospect of *Unity In Diversity*.

Thirdly, we believe in the Gandhian morals of peace and pacifism. Sardonicly , Russia, being a permanent stakeholder in the security council, invaded Ukraine a couple of years back which caused merciless destruction and deaths of innocent lives. Is it even justified in normative terms? If the Russian position is reciprocated by India , then New Delhi will make tremendous efforts to prevent any war-like situation to proclaim (given the advantage of Veto power). It's been a wholesome journey for India from non-alignment to all-alignment. India maintains a friendly alliance with America and Russia , thus creating a much needed tactful partnership in the present world. Not to deny, there are critics against what they claim as the 'dual standing' of Indian diplomacy. What they do not understand is the fact that there is no wrong in maintaining friendship or accepting fair choices offered by friend countries, unless there is any essence of brutal motives behind providing or accepting such favors. It is commendable to witness how India presents itself as a mediator between the two victors ever since the onset of the Cold War. Fourth , an impactful leadership is extremely crucial for any nation to determine its' smooth play in global affairs. While the rest of the world was tying alliances with the power blocs , Non Alignment being a brainchild of Pandit Nehru, presented a middle path of neutrality to the then newly decolonized countries and prevented them from turning into mere puppet-dolls controlled by the former wartime allies. India under the leadership of Modi , is following the same footmarks created by Jawaharlal Nehru , but in a matured way which compliments the challenges of the present world. Infact , the Indian position in the diplomatic sphere has only grown immensely since a decade.

Lastly, the Indian permanent position in the council will promote the graved voices of the South. As of now , given the fact that most of the UN bodies' headquarters are bound in New York , the former is prone to be affected by the given American atmosphere. Also , the selfish use of the Veto power to protect the needs of the victors and their respective allies is relentlessly creating a hegemonic sphere of western interests and values. Therefore , a conclusion reflecting the denial of the LDCs and their interests can be drawn. Beijing's permanency in the council only represents the Chinese dream to become a dominant player in Asian affairs & gradually, its aspiration to overtake the US as a global power. China never represents South Asia as a whole , but its dominance in the sub continent. The inaugural of BRI (Belt and Road Initiative) in 2013 & extension of Chinese influence via policies similar to those of CPEC (China Pakistan Economic Corridor) across the region , is a legitimate effort by China to invade the internal dynamics of its neighboring countries by creating its atmosphere of regional dominance. As far as China's record of the last five decades is concerned, the country is known to be in a complicated influx with its border nations (the Tibetan issue for instance). In an all and all spectrum, the Chinese will is solely committed to justify the country's dominance in both regional and world affairs.

India believes in the prospect of mutual respect, equality and practice of non interference in the matters of internal importance in its dealing with other nations , while creating a wide spread of cooperation to deal with mutual challenges. Thus , if Indian diplomacy has a win in becoming a permanent stakeholder in the council , it is arguably going to present a forum for depressed voices of the world and this position will further enhance south-south cooperation , which will appear more as a counterpart to the west.

Above discussed reasons justified the Indian perspective. Not to deny, there are groups who believe as to why there should be no reform in the established framework of the security council. The foremost reason is that if there is an increase in the number of permanent members (say , from p5 to p6) ,then there will be no limit to the further increment of the figures, thus making the council lose its effective functioning.

Another statement justifies the security council's established structure by claiming that these position holders used to be victors during the wartime scenarios and therefore there is nothing wrong in their permanent standing in the United Nations.

A strata also believes that any reform in the matters of security council and specifically about an increase in the number of permanent members, is only going to ruin the established organization by turning it into a herd of sheeps, thus resulting into an unwanted hustle for power, which unfortunately comes even before the need for collective association to deal with varied global challenges.

Reasons can vary upto unassumed parameters. But the question which needs to be answered is whether the world is going to take a stand in or against the favor of India's (or any underrepresented region for that matter) plea for permanency or not. If not then how is the United Nations as a collective organization of countries, going to assure a fair portion of representation of the third world dynamics in its present and existing framework? The quest to get this query answered is much deeper than any other justifications.