

Khushbakht Bibi\* Syed Shahid Hussain Bukhari\*\*

**Indian Quest for UNSC Permanent Membership: Eligibility, Potential & Implication**

**ABSTRACT**

*Today's changing global geo-political shift needs a change in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to become more efficient and neutral in functioning and legitimacy. The purpose of this research is to focus on the facts and rationale behind the need to alter the UNSC and the change brought within it by increasing numbers of permanent members. Also to highlight the repercussions that Pakistan would have to face if India achieves a permanent status. For the last few decades debates continued about increasing the permanent members of UNSC and mainly four countries (India, Germany, Japan, Brazil) creating a Group of 4(G-4) are highly aspirant for a permanent seat. India in this regard being a strong aspirant whether fulfills the anticipated criteria keeping in view the nature of relations with traditional rival neighbor Pakistan. Such rival-natured historical relations of India and Pakistan created a deep sense of insecurity in Pakistan if India is going to have a permanent seat in UNSC. This is because India always remains hostile and aggressive both regionally and globally to harm the image of Pakistan both politically and economically. One of the most important reasons for rivalry is the internationally recognized issue of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) which is yet to be solved but not followed by the Indian side according to the UNSC resolution. So Pakistan would have severe implications in terms of politics, economy and geo-strategic as well if India became a permanent member of the UNSC. Yet, the Indian Strategy for achieving an important position in UNSC has become a question mark in this regard.*

**Keywords:** United Nations Security Council (UNSC), India, Pakistan, Group of 4(G-4), Permanent member, Jammu and Kashmir (J&K)

**Introduction**

The states can be classified based on their capabilities according to their influence in international relations. After World War II, the United States of America and the Soviet Union emerged as superpowers. The United Nations (UN) emerged as an international organization to deal with issues related to international peace and stability. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) as the steering force under the UN charter was exclusively created and empowered to deal with such issues. The structural formation of the UNSC gave veto power to five big states (at that time) in the world which enabled them to exercise their influence supremacy over the rest of the world community. Many UN member states consider themselves being influenced by these five permanent members of the UNSC while considering them biased. Therefore, voices to reform the UN system emerged. There were efforts to reform the UN system in general and UNSC in particular as the five permanent members are considered to be utilizing the veto privilege for their interests. Amongst many

---

\* Khushbakht Bibi\* (PhD Scholar, Department of Political Science, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Email: K.bakht@hotmail.com)

\*\* Dr. Syed Shahid Hussain Bukhari\*\* (Professor, Department of Political Science, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan, Email: shahidbukhari@bzu.edu.pk)

other states, India always remained an active advocate to reform the structure of the UNSC and desired itself to be made a permanent member of the UNSC. Indian advocacy for getting permanent UNSC membership is as old as India itself. In October 1946, when India was known as a British colony, Indian leader Jawaharlal Nehru had the same vision. He while having an address to army officers, said that “India is today among the four great powers of the world: other three being America, Russia, and China. But in point of resources, India has greater potential than china.” (Krishnan, 2017)

India for many years willing for getting a major power status and is supporting this claim with the help of various factors and indicators at multiple international forums. India tried to show its eligibility diplomatically which is until now be fully acquainted with the key actors of the global state system. In this regard, the most important Indian diplomatic campaign was initiated to attain its objective. Mussarat Jabeen provides information that “India joined G-4, (a group of four countries), comprising of Japan, Brazil, Germany, and India itself for the permanent seat in UN Security Council. Except for India, other members did not stress having the veto power.” (Jabeen, 2010, p. 246) Also, it is important to understand the Indian potential and its worth in the current scenario to become a permanent member of the UNSC. This effort leads towards a query that If India is going to take a permanent seat in UNSC then what its impact should be on the South Asian region as India possesses an important position in this region. Also how India influences other states being important geopolitically and geostrategically. Along with that the presence of the two most important nuclear powers in this region, India, and Pakistan being traditional rivals also share their border that is why security is most important in this nuclear-armed strap. Conferring the permanent seat to India entitled with Veto power in the UNSC would enable India to become in a position to impede any undesired policy regarding the disputed state of Jammu and Kashmir. Therefore, Pakistan always stands in opposition to this Indian desire of getting permanent membership of the UNSC. The world power structure and concept of global influential status created a shift in the balance of power from state to state and region to region. For that reason, the ever-changing geopolitical scenario is bringing the Indian quest for permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council into the limelight. This issue has a far-reaching impact not only on Pakistan but on the entire world. It could easily shift the balance of power to the Indian side and trigger a hostile environment in south Asia. The debate over reforming the UNSC is not completed yet but is still under consideration. Indian involvement in Pakistan’s foreign and domestic affairs is of utmost importance. Indian bid for United Nations Security Council’s permanent membership has the potential to alter the domestic and foreign course of action for Pakistan. Along with this one can become able to clearly understand the Indian worth of getting a permanent seat. The ongoing research is focused on a solitary question that “why India is much inclined towards achieving a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council with power to Veto? It escorts further supplementary questions to understand the whole phenomenon. Does this involve the anticipated criteria for obtaining the permanent membership of UNSC with the power to Veto? And Whether Indian fulfills the anticipated criteria to get a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council along with its implications for the world & south Asian region in general and for Pakistan’s security in specific?

### **Reforming UNSC**

The global political and economic shift pushed the United Nation at the edge where it is necessary to mold the structure of the organization in general and UNSC in particular. For this reason “It is generally believed and agreed by the world that the United Nations is still a long way between purpose and fulfillment, between aspiration and accomplishment.”(Lawrence Ziring, Robert Riggs, et al, 2000, p. 477) United Nations in the same way as any organization, experienced organizational and structural problems, the extremely persistent among these included are problems like financing, management, coordination, and structural flaws. Thomas G Weiss in this regard also supported the need in his words “While it represents the world of 1945 not 2020, too much time and effort have been wasted on what is a non-starter: the P5 will never agree to diminish their

power/leverage, and every solution that is proposed raises as many problems as it solves.” (G Weiss, 2019) The need for reform UN is agreed and the call for reforming the UN is well supported by Dr. KhwajaAlqama, in his words,

*“UN has come up with a clear cut objective and that is peace on earth .... to bring about changes and reform in the UN which is very important and particularly UNSC as well because the Veto factor pushed the reform to happen as must for the well-being and better opportunity for world peace.” (Alqama, 2019)*

But also, there are clear disagreements about this issue of reforming UNSC like what sort of reform is required and for what kind of purpose. In the 21st Century, the significant and vital function of the Council is indeed accepted by the global world and the debates over UNSC reform have been continued for the last few decades. “The history of reform efforts geared toward making the Security Council more reflective of growing UN membership and of changing world politics since the organization’s establishment conveys the slim prospects for meaningful change.”(G.Weiss, 2003, p. 148)The UN system has become distorted clearly due to the biased choice of P5 to serve their interests frequently at the cost of the welfare of the world community. “Their domination of the UNSC and their pursuit of national over global interests have led to significant failures. Moreover, the P5 are allowed to use their veto implicitly in many closed-door consultations.”(Mahbubhani, 2013, p. 232) Its practical legitimacy is also alleged based on being deficient in democratic character and transparency in making decisions by P5 members. “This domination is a product of the Security Council's exclusive powers, the self-interest of Council Members, and the absence of Check and Balances to limit the Security Council's power.”(Fitzgerald, Fall 2000, p. 329)The question of lacking neutral representation of the Council through its P5 members that shortly float up and the authenticity of the UNSC was diluted. Unfolding the dilemma Justin Morris comments:

*“The UN was forced to rely on the major Western Powers for political leadership and material help and found itself on the horns of a dilemma...yet where the UNSC became engaged, its actions were often accompanied....by allegations of inappropriate self-interested motives on the part of the United States and, to a lesser extent, the UK and France (so-called P-3).” (Morris, 2000, p. 268)*

Further, “The Security Council is not answerable to either the General Assembly or the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and hence is not seriously accountable.”(Thakur, 2006, p. 302) These are few well-acknowledged reasons for which the five permanent members of the UNSC owing their vetoes together with many special privileges, today facing persistent criticism for the so-called oligarchy. Also keeping in view it would not be justifiable in favor of Europe (8 percent of the world population) to hold on to “40 percent of the permanent seats of the UNSC, in the form of two individual seats out of five for the UK and France, Europe will have to make way for Asia, Africa, and Latin America to be better represented.”(Mahbubhani, 2013, p. 239) Hans Corell who served in the UN (as under-secretary-general) from 1994 to 2004 anticipated a few modest reforms of the Security Council in December 2008 warning members against breaching international law. In this perspective, He explained,

*“My main concerns are that members of the council sometimes violate the UN Charter and the tendency among some of its members to sometimes apply double standards .... This does not meet the standards required by an international system based on the rule of law.” (Corell, 2008)*

In response to such criticism, all states presented multiple reform suggestions to transform the UNSC. Most specifically by taking special initiatives relevant to its membership permanently and the Veto power which they enjoy. In this regard, various member nations by creating different groups offered different plans and proposals. Most well-known works had been made by Kofi Annan and Ismail Razali as a result of which Reform Models for UNSC were presented. Other than this the Prominent Groups and Proposal include 1, The G-4 Proposal 2, The Uniting for Consensus Proposal (UFC) 3, The African Union Proposal (AU). Among these multiple reform efforts, the plan of Group of Four (G-4) came forward is likely to be a good substitute for the present UNSC composition. This proposal was commenced by India, Germany, Japan, and Brazil in 2005 as an official proposal by considering themselves as the most important and chief candidates for the permanent seats in UNSC. It suggests that the membership of the UNSC should expand from 15 to 25 with the addition of new members permanently which should be selected based on geographic regional allocation. (2 from Asia, 2 from Africa, 1 from the Caribbean, and Latin America. The other 1 from Europe (Western) and others). In addition to these 4 new seats (non-permanent) should be produced each of which should be appointed on a regional basis including the above-mentioned regions. According to the G-4 proposal, the right of veto was not approved to be given to the expected members (permanent) of the UNSC but it does have a condition to revise the veto power giving to the new members of the UNSC after 15 years. The G-4 proposal never gained acceptance at the UNGA because many African countries were willing that the Veto power must be absolute to the expected new members (permanent) of the UNSC. Analysts and theorists have given different viewpoints regarding criteria to determine the position and status of states in the global arena. They believe that different categories of states can never fit into a single place. Therefore, In September 2005, specifically discussing criteria of becoming a potential member for the permanent membership of the UNSC US announced at UNGA that it would remain to help in reconstituting the UNSC that “looks like the world of 2005”. Seven basic requirements were listed by the UN as criteria and the US was endorsed to judge the potential members. These basic requirements included: “(i) Commitment to democracy and human rights (ii) Size of the economy (iii) Size of population (iv) Military capacity (v) Financial contributions to the UN (vi) Contribution to UN peacekeeping and (vii) Record on non-proliferation and counter-terrorism.”(Jabeen, 2010, p. 243)Lt. General (R) Khalid Naeem Lodhi regarding the criteria of becoming UNSC permanent members precisely mentioned a few conditions. In his words “peaceful, economically, politically, and strong nation with a good track record of human rights,”(Lodhi, 2020) should be eligible. In the table given below multiple changes that arise from the day of the inception of the United Nations till today are mentioned which made it clear that structural change in the world needs structural change in the UNSC by adding more suitable potential members.

**Table: Facts and Factors pushing for Change in United Nations Security Council at World Stage from 1945-2020**

Influential Facts and Factors	1945	2020
1.Number of Independent states	More than 50 in numbers	More than 190 in numbers
2.World Interdependence	Militarily Interdependence	Economic Interdependence
3.Concept of Power	Hard	Soft
4.Criteria for selecting permanent members of UNSC	The successor of World War II	Still under discussion/ Not yet agreed on any specific criteria
5.States desire for permanent membership	In pursuit of Peace	In pursuit of Power
6.Reason behind creating the UN and its UNSC	To bring peace to the world	Need to get revive to bring peace to the world

7. World communication	World community have Divergent nature of the relationship	The world community is following the path of a Convergent relationship
8. Regional Representation in UNSC	Not all world regions equally represented	All world regions need to get full representation in UNSC
9. World Order	Bilateral	Multilateral

The most anticipated criteria for having a permanent membership in UNSC based on a few sets of principles following the current world scenario and the nature of the relationship the states are following about the ground realities of today need to focus on the following prerequisite.

**Table.2 Prerequisite to becoming a Permanent Member in UNSC**

Prerequisite	Principles to Follow
Huge Democracy	In term of a strong democratic system
Human rights contributor	In term of human right activist and contributor
Huge and potential economy	In term of strong economic status
Huge population	In term of representing a huge number of the world population
Potential military capacity	In term of having up to date and well equipped armed forces
Powerful country	In term of having a soft power practical image and status
Peace-loving and undisputed country	In term of having no dispute and non-violent behavior with other states
Equal regional representation	countries must represent various regions of the world equally
Contribution to the United Nations	In term of finance and multiple Aid needed for human rights
Geographical background	In term of holding a strong and important geographical location
Friendly relations with the rest of the world	In term of enjoying pleasant and responsible behavior
Peaceful neighbor	In term of the passive and submissive bond
Influential regional representation	In term of the significant and central representative
Independent and undisputed Country	In term of having a sovereign status with undisputed nature
Contribution towards peacekeeping and nonproliferation	In term of playing a key role regarding peacekeeping and nonproliferation
Representation of Muslim World	In term of representing a large number of Muslim community of the world

*The expansion of the Security Council, in the category of both permanent and non-permanent members, and the inclusion of countries like India as permanent members, would be a first step in the process of making the United Nations a truly representative body.  
(Manmohan Singh address during the General Debate of the 59th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, 2004:13)*

India is anxiously intended to become one of the influential actors on the world stage and get recognized as one of the major powers on the international scene. For this purpose, India is trying to achieve a permanent seat in the UNSC as that of Socialist China who joined later in 70,s.

*“India’s concerted bid to be admitted as a veto-wielding “P” member of the Security Council is the single most-watched issue within the country when it comes to the United Nations organization.... more powers than any other entity in the International System, The Security Council is a “Bull’s eye” for India to target.” (Yadav, 2014, p. 01)*

Indian political analysts claimed for its permanent membership in UNSC by giving the argument that the country fulfilled the “criteria required for this status due to its geo-strategic location, the huge size of the population, most dynamic economies in the world, and its democratic credentials equal or exceed those of other members and the harmony of interests with the UN objectives.” (P, 2006) In terms of economic growth, India has made an immense contribution to its development and has also become a military might among them. Here two key aspects are considered important upon which India strives for having a permanent seat. The first and foremost argument they give is that they are the leading and huge democracy in the world and in contemporary world politics their influence and contribution cannot be ignored. So they believe that they must be part of the UN decision-making body of the Security Council. Next to the Democratic nature, the Second most important argument is that India being an emerging economy becomes influential in the world economy and trade and playing important role in the economic sector. An additional factor that assists the Indian attempt to get permanent membership of the UNSC is the state of its military. “India has always been one of the countries at the forefront of providing peacekeepers and their peacekeeping forces are often considered among some of the best, but it's a whole different ball game being a permanent member.”(p. 03) Resembling South Africa and Brazil, India leads the region of South Asia where it is started by its huge continental-size along with population, economic repute, and military strength. Jawaharlal Nehru prominent Indian leader had articulated Indian foreign policy goals to deal with “the improvement of the international economic and political order, independence in foreign relations, equal treatment among states, independence of colonies and many others-which placed a premium on the building of peace and co-operation in the world”(Jha, 2002, p. 132) Indian foreign policy goals has set by keeping UNSC permanent seat to achieve as the highest priority. For this reason, India tried to lobby in almost every possible direction and remains one of the key objectives of foreign policy as well. Today the question of the Indian possibility of having a permanent place in UNSC is yet to be answered. It is still a debate what sort of possibility or probability is present for Indian permanent membership in UNSC.

*“UN Security Council Reform has been one of India’s key objectives over the past decade, influencing its policies to some degree. Given its prominence, UN Security Council Reform has traditionally been regarded as a crucial part of any wider UN reform by the Indian government. Several of India’s strategies can be better understood in the context of the UN Security Council.” (Stuenkel, 2010, p. 59)*

Through “any objective criteria, population, territorial size, GDP, economic potential, civilizational legacy, cultural diversity, political system, and past and ongoing contributions to the UN-especially UN

peacekeeping operations, India is eminently qualified for the permanent membership of an expanded UN Security Council.”(Puri, 2014, p. 39) Talking about Indian contribution to UN peacekeeping S.M Krishna Indian External Affairs Minister In his speech at the Security Council has said “No country has contributed as many peacekeepers to as many peacekeeping operations as India.”(Statement of S.M Krishna Minister for External Affairs UNSC Reforms and India, 2011) India more than once has acknowledged its willingness and motivation by applying its capacity and competence to accept the responsibilities and commitments of permanent membership in the UNSC. The expansion of UNSC must indeed have to be followed but the formula is still doubtful and it is important not “to create “Big Bosses” by giving them Veto power to the expected new permanent members of UNSC instead it is important to reform such a way that the UNSC become more representative instead of increasing the numbers of “Big Bosses”.”(Rizwi, 2019) Few aspirant countries specifically (G4) and most prominently the state of India consider itself the most important and valid country in this regard. As they believe that we are powerful in our right to the permanent members must be given to us with full Veto power. Regarding nonpermanent membership, it is an understanding between the member countries to give on the base of the region and for membership permanently in UNSC is yet not agreed because a more important thing which is not yet getting decided is the i.e. Power of Veto and Permanent status. These are the two main things that are still under debate whether to be given or -not. Another important argument is that the countries with sharp conflicts will not be given such powerful status because in that case the issues or conflicts between the countries will not get resolve in any case and if it becomes a permanent member with veto power India will never make it possible to resolve conflicts with Pakistan especially the issues placed in front of UN platform like Kashmir that will never get resolve because of Indian hard policy towards the conflict and will not play its role of being a responsible state /member of UNSC. India considers it a responsible country but the definition of India is responsible for the Kashmir issue that does not exist. Along with this, it is important for a country to ever remain a more influential human rights contributor, and India in this sense does not enjoy a positive status. Despite having a huge population, strong military and economic capability, and being an influential country in the region, there is a question mark on the Indian aspiration of being an aspirant for permanent membership in UNSC. In the words of Lt. General Khalid Naeem Lodhi it is important for India that it should “resolve major issues with her neighbors, implement UN Resolutions and improve its attitude towards minorities.”(Lodhi, 2020) And more specifically for Pakistan otherwise India “will interfere in internal affairs. Help political elements in building pro India narratives; pressurize neighboring countries to isolate Pakistan.”(Lodhi, 2020) Indian Leadership in this regard raised voice more than once and at different forums like once Prime Minister Narendra Modi strongly raised voice in support of the UNSC to reformat the forum of United Nations by addressing in the words that

*“We must reform the United Nations, including the Security Council, and make it more democratic and participative. Institutions that reflect the imperatives of the 20th century won't be effective in the 21st. It would face the risk of irrelevance, and we will face the risk of continuing turbulence with no one capable of addressing it.” (2014, p. 03)*

Indian leadership always remains a strong proponent of reforming and restructuring the UN in general and UNSC in specific and regarding this always remains on the frontline as India always remains focused to show desire at multiple forums to achieve a permanent membership in UNSC but with authoritative Veto power. Mussarat Jabeen quoted a statement of Indian Prime Minister Manmohan presented to his parliament that

*“India would accept the Security Council seat with full veto power only. Non-veto membership would mean that India was low in capability than China .... It was further expressed by Natwar Singh that his country would not accept any discrimination between the old P-5 and new members.” (Jabeen, Indian Aspiration of Permanent*

*Membership in the UN Security Council and American Stance, 2010, p. 246)*

New Delhi viewing terms of relations with the US anticipated that it would support its move for the permanent membership of UNSC but, Washington did not give any idea about assisting Indian candidacy along with the rest of the three members of G-4 (Japan, Brazil, and Germany) unless they abstain from the right to veto. It is doubtless that India aimed for having such power for its objectives to get achieved which is hegemonic. Moreover Mussarat Jabeen highlighted that “New Delhi wants Washington support as it perceives no clash of interests with it. This expectation was not only due to the diplomatic and strategic compensations but also for increasing economic and social ties linking the two countries.” (Jabeen, *Indian Aspiration of Permanent Membership in the UN Security Council and American Stance, 2010, p. 246*)

### **Implications**

Security is considered along with other problems which are being faced by humankind a very well-known and one of the most imperative problems. The Oxford Dictionary defines security as “security means, simply, the absence of threats.” Here the word absence indicates the possibility of being safe from danger as well as conveying psychological feelings of safety.” (Hussain, 2012, p. 75) Amitai Etzioni relating the concept of security to the foreign policy of any country put forward his idea in the words as

*“Foreign policy, drawing on the principle of the primary life, is pragmatic. Its core value is the recognition that all people have the right to security. The concept includes freedom from deadly violence and torture. This right is more fundamental than all the other rights.” (Etzioni, 2007, p. 01)*

the core concept of security revolves around the whole range of experiences which are generally studied individually and gives arguments which relatively covers multiple aspects of study such as working of foreign policy, dynamics of the state system and its sovereignty, arms race and the industry, global trade and investment, as it is emphasized by him that the military approaches with the sole purpose cannot resolve the issue for the reason that they do not cover the security issue comprehensively. Indian ambition to achieve the permanent status of the UNSC has become its foreign policy focus and India is trying to do so to become a real major power in the region that’s why while analyzing Indian foreign policy objectives in South Asia, it becomes obvious that Indian strategy and approach are to turn out to be a real hegemon in the region and it has transformed its guiding principle efforts to get soft power image more than hard power. India is trying to attain hegemonic status, particularly in the south Asian region based on some perspectives which are believed to provide a strong base for this purpose. India on the base of providing leaders for both civilian as well as military leadership to the UN and becoming a growing economic power in the world regard itself as a real candidate that’s why India, is determined for having a permanent membership in the UNSC along with the other G4 countries, which will further enhance its influence in the world in general and in South Asian region in particular. Indian historical facts provide us information of various events of interfering in the domestic affairs of its neighboring states which consequently troubled their relationship. All that was pursued to establish and create hegemony in Indian Ocean Region and South Asia and for this purpose, India has adopted a strategy that mainly focuses centrality of India itself and can be known as Indian-centric. For this reason, from the start of 1950s plus 1960s, “India indulged in conflicts with China (1962 war), Pakistan (three wars), Nepal (India interfered in the internal affairs of the royal family) and Sri Lanka (India supported the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam (LTTE) in the Sri Lankan civil war).” (Khetran, pp. 120-121) Even though India has not become successful in the achievement of destructive ambitions yet hegemonic ambitions lead India to constantly promote and support the secessionist movements, sub-nationalism, uprisings, and insurgencies, which intended to demoralize and destabilize regional harmony and stability. In addition to this India is generally considered to be an aggressive power that has remained indulged in various rebellion moves



in various countries. “However, suspicions about India’s intentions in the minds of neighboring countries. Given Indira Gandhi’s pursuit of the Indian version of the “Monroe doctrine”, called the Indira Doctrine, in the 1970s, many neighboring countries considered India to be harboring hegemonic intentions.”(Cheema, 2007) The Indian version of the “Monroe doctrine” famously known as “Indira doctrine” always remains influential in the policymaking of Indian leadership because “Indira doctrine” always focused on India as “India First”. This main core agenda of the policymaking agenda to see India as “First” clearly regarding its dominating role in the south Asian region and ultimately dominating regional affairs. The same notion is also well described by George Tanham in the words,

*“(New Delhi wants) the role as the guarantor of regional security and stability, the neighboring states must coordinate their foreign policy with the imperatives of India’s centrality and security, they reject any outside power supplying weaponry to or establishing a military presence in any neighboring state.” (Tanham, 1992)*

The rivalry and contentious nature of Pakistan and Indian relations have continued for more than half a century and it demonstrates no signs of resolution shortly. In case of having a permanent seat in the UNSC, Indian policies ultimately get develop to marginalize Pakistan’s International posture that would ultimately exploit Pakistan’s interests specifically through the power to veto. Victoria Schofield has very precisely and briefly explained the real nature of these two neighboring countries and stated that “The political history of Pakistan and India is a study into rivalry and unmitigated confrontation — a kind of zero-sum game. To date, the relations have not fully recovered from the first conflict over the Himalayan region of Kashmir.”(Schofield, 2000, p. 22)In this regard, once General Retired Talat Masood supporting this view states that “Pakistan has been using the valid argument that India is a gross violator of the UN resolutions and Human Rights in Kashmir.”(Masood, 2020)The burning issue of Kashmir has expanded significance both regionally and internationally. That’s why the geo-strategic and geo-political significance of Kashmir has prepared both Pakistan and India to believe in the reality that the control over Kashmir is so imperative, thereby it becomes difficult rather unfeasible for both neighbors to come together on resolving the issue which has cost thousands of lives. The state of Jammu and Kashmir is considered a vital window for India being located on its northernmost side. The strategic importance of taking control over Kashmir same notion becomes strong from the Indian point of view which can be revealed from the statement of Jawaharlal Nehru Indian first Prime Minister when he asserted that

*“India without Kashmir would cease to occupy a pivotal position on the political map of Central Asia. Its northern frontiers...are connected with three important countries, Afghanistan, the USSR, and China. Thus, strategically, Kashmir is vital to the security of India. It has been so since the dawn of history.” ( Sanjay Kumar, Anurag Jaiswal, et al, 2016, p. viii)*

Kashmir is being seen in such a situation, as the decider factor in Pak-India relations. International organizations like UN has the worth to play its crucial role in this regard to take step involving the major powers which are its permanent members of UNSC to decide Kashmir conflict by implementing its resolution which was passed before on its table with the consensus of both countries. This uncertainty only intensifies the conflict which is a common feature in Kashmir territory that exaggerates tensions by increasing the figure of casualties and refugees. General Retired Asad Durrani (former Ambassador of Pakistan) believes that

*“If India did become a permanent member of the UNSC – of course, it would enjoy more prestige and clout, besides the power to Veto any resolution it did not like ( on Kashmir, for example), but as we must*

*have noticed it can refuse to budge on this issue even without a Veto power.” (Durrani, 2020)*

“Geographically being the closest, Pakistan has remained in the strained relations with India over borders, distribution of land, distribution of water, ocean ways, etc. and these issues continue to be a permanent irritant.”(K.R. Gupta, 2009, p. 505) Michael Brecher observed that “India and Pakistan have been in a state of undeclared war with varying degrees of intensity throughout their brief history as independent states.”(Brecher, 1959, p. 576) Other than Kashmir two most important boundary disputes which created tension between Pakistan and India are known as Sir Creek and Siachen. The importance for both countries can be best understood by making an observation involving the china factor as if Pakistan and China were permitted to link up their militaries at Siachen then from the Indian perspective its national security would be greatly undermined specifically over the entire northern front line. For this reason, Pakistan, as well as India, is not willing to leave this significant territorial area, and for this purpose since 1984 spends considerable financial resources on the forces deployed in Siachen. Sir Creek is known as a 60-mile long fluctuate tidal channel in the marsh of the Rann of Kutch. After the war of 1965, Pakistan declares that half of the Rann beside the 24th parallel was part of Pakistan’s territory.

*“After serious skirmishes in 1965, India and Pakistan set up a special tribunal. The tribunal was strongly criticized by India but the government carried out all its obligations. .... The successful conclusion of the dispute demonstrates that when the two governments decide that cooperation is in their interest, they can overcome obstacles to achieve their common goals.” (Krishna Nand Pandey and Amit Kumar Shukla, 2016, pp. 267-268)*

It is also noteworthy that in recent years both countries have shown sincerity in resolving the matters and get involved in the United Nations Convention on the Laws of the Sea (UNCLOS) which would declare the area as international waters should the two sides fail to determine their claims for respective maritime zones by 2009. The only progress was that the two sides decided to hold further talks to settle down their differences. Along with this Cross-border water conflict and differences occurred on almost all tributaries of the Indus River before the signing of the Indus Water Treaty by Pakistan and India under the auspices of the World Bank in 1960. According to The Treaty, three western rivers (the Indus, Chenab, and Jhelum) were allocated to Pakistan with limited water sharing to India and recommended India having special rights to the three eastern rivers (Ravi, Beas, and Sutlej). It is important to note that Indian rights to build up hydropower systems on the western rivers are expressed in the Treaty. “In Pakistan’s view, this has affected its access to western waters and has resulted in different interpretations of the Treaty’s detailed provisions. Treaty provisions that remain open for interpretation have resulted in cross-border disputes.” (Shahid, 2012, p. 02)The economic development experts are of the view that the current scenario of water conflict between the two countries brings Pakistan to the stage where Pakistan needs to resolve the water dispute with India because it has become a permanent threat to major water bodies of Pakistan. On the other hand, it is important to note that hydropower plants have become very important for both countries having the utmost value in running such a system. India is trying to strengthen its ties with Afghanistan to have safe and sound access to the energy reservoirs of the Central Asian countries which are considered very important for the economic growth of India. Moreover, the Indo-US nuclear deal for civilian purposes has distorted the South Asian strategic equilibrium. India has currently enjoyed a dominant influence in Afghanistan as its security agencies are enthusiastically playing their role in the Baluchistan insurgency via Afghanistan.

*“Indians are supporting terrorist groups targeting the unionists in Baluchistan. The Pakistanis periodically pay courtesy calls on Indian foreign ministry officials and the Pakistani prime minister and the*

*president often invites the Indian prime minister.” (Syed Hussain Shaheed Soherwordi, Reena Abbasi, et all, 2015, pp. 32-33)*

Pakistan is not feeling comfortable with the rising nexus between India and Afghanistan. It has strong reservations and doubts about the opening of new consulates close to the city of Quetta. Each kind of Indian activity is seen with doubt and mistrust by Pakistan's intelligentsia. As stated by USA journalist Robert Kaplan in an article, “In the mind of the ISI, India uses its consulates in Afghanistan to back rebels in Pakistan’s southwestern province of Baluchistan, whose capital, Quetta, is only a few hour drives from Kandahar”(Kaplan, 2008). Keeping in view all these ground realities such Indian move of pursuing permanent status in UNSC creates a sense of insecurity in Pakistan.

### **Conclusion**

The current challenges required a change in the structure of the UN in general and UNSC in specific for its effective working and influential representation towards world order. After more than seventy years of its establishment, many other states becoming more active and powerful in status aspire to have the same status that permanent members are enjoying having a strong power of veto which they use for their interests and desired to achieve. Today many states desire a change in the structure of the UNSC and this based on their strong position in terms of economic, military, and political influence want to become its permanent member. Among these aspirants the most important are Brazil, Germany, Japan, and India. It is important to focus that only India stresses the Veto power to be given in case of becoming a permanent member who depicts Indian hegemonic intentions of ruling the world and following multiple interests. Other than this India from the time of its creations, many times clearly expressed its hegemonic desires and ambitions not just to become a regional power but to achieve a status of world power from which India is pursuing having a permanent membership in UNSC. For this purpose, India is diplomatically using multiple forums to take advantage and gain support from permanent members of the UNSC and for this various military agreements and economic settlements have been followed to make a strong link between them. India occasionally tries to use the vague impression of Pakistani internationally and use other countries to bring any geopolitical and geostrategic damage to the status of Pakistan. For this reason, Pakistan has faced severe internal and external scratches which increase its apprehensions with special reference to its security. Such Indian moves going to damage Pakistan’s economy as well. The economy of any country is considered the backbone of any country and provides solid grounds for survival internationally. If Indian going to have a permanent status then obviously it would harm the socio-economic status of Pakistan.

### **Bibliography**

Sanjay Kumar, Anurag Jaiswal, et all. (2016). *Indo-Pak Tension: Solution for Conflict or Cooperation?* India: G.B. Books Publishers.

Alqama, D. K. (2019, December 08). Researcher personal Interview with Dr. Khwaja Alqama.

Brecher, M. (1959). *Nehru: A Political Biography*. London: Oxford university press.

Cheema, P. I. (2007, June 17 ). “*What is the Indira Doctrine?*”. Retrieved 08 16, 2018, from The Post: <http://ipripak.org/articles/newspapers/indira.shtml>

Corell, H. (2008, December 10). Security Council Reform: Rule of Law more important than Additional members, Letter to the Governments of the Members of the United Nations, Retrieved 4 24, 2017, from <http://www.havc.se/res/Selected Material/20081210corelllettertounmembers>

Durrani, G. R. (2020). (R. P. interview, Interviewer)

Etzioni, A. (2007). *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*. New York: Yale University Press.

Fitzgerald, A. ( Fall 2000). Security Council Reform: Creating a More Representative Body of the Entire U.N. Membership. *Pace International Law Review, Volume 12( Issue 2)*.

G.Weiss, T. ( 2003, September). The Illusion of UN Security Council Reform. *The Washington Quarterly*.

GWeiss, T. (2019, December 06). Researcher interview with Thomas G Weiss.

Hussain, Z. (2012). *Defining National And Economic Security of Pakistan Post 9/11 Era*. Retrieved 03 15, 2015, from NDU Journal: <https://www.ndu.edu.pk> › issra › articles › ndu-journal › NDU-Journal-2012

*India and UNSC Reforms, VISION IAS.* (n.d.). Retrieved from [visionias.in/beta/sites/all/themes/momentum/files/.../India\\_and\\_UNSC\\_reforms.pdf](http://visionias.in/beta/sites/all/themes/momentum/files/.../India_and_UNSC_reforms.pdf)

Jabeen, M. (2010). Indian Aspiration of Permanent Membership in the UN Security Council and American Stance. *A Research Journal of South Asian Studies, 25, 237-253*.

Jabeen, M. (2010). Indian Aspiration of Permanent Membership in the UN Security Council and American Stance. *A Research Journal of South Asian Studies, Vol. 25*.

Jabeen, M. (2010). Indian Aspiration of Permanent Membership in the UN Security Council and American Stance. *A Research Journal of South Asian Studie, Vol. 25*.

Jha, K. N. ( 2002). *Domestic Imperatives in India's Foreign Policy*. New Delhi: South Asian Publishers.

K.R. Gupta, V. S. ( 2009). *Foreign Policy of India*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.

Kaplan, R. D. (2008, August 1). *Behind the Indian Embassy Bombing*. Retrieved 03 20, 2016, from The Atlantic: <https://www.theatlantic.com> › magazine › archive › 2008/08 › behind-the-..

Khetran, M. S. (n.d.). *Indian Interference in Balochistan: Analysing the Evidence and Implications for Pakistan*. Retrieved 07 28, 2019, from [issi.org.pk](http://issi.org.pk) › uploads › 2017/10 › 7-SS\_Mir\_sherbaz\_Khetran\_No-3\_2017

Krishna Nand Pandey and Amit Kumar Shukla. (2016). *Indo-Pak Relations: Historic Perspective to New Curvature*. India: G.B. Books Publishers.

Krishnan, D. S. (2017). Is UN Security Council Seat Worth the Effort? *Journal of The United Service Institution of India, CXLVII*.

Lawrence Ziring, Robert Riggs, et all. (2000). *The United Nations, International Organization and World Politics*. USA: Wadsworth, Thomson Learning.

Lodhi, L. G. (2020, March). (R. p. interview, Interviewer)

**Indian Quest for UNSC Permanent Membership: JRSP, Vol. 58, No. 3 (July-Sept 2021)**

Lodhi, L. G. (2020, 03 18). (R. p. interview, Interviewer)

Mahbubhani, K. (2013). *The Great Convergence*. New York: US public affairs.

Masood, G. R. (2020, 03 20). (R. P. Interview, Interviewer)

Morris, J. (2000). UN Security Council Reform: A Counsel for the 21 Century. *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 31.

P, C. S. (2006, February 28). A Deal Too Far? New Delhi: Observer Research Foundation-Brookings Paper.

Paul, T. V. (2006). Why has the India-Pakistan Rivalry Been so Enduring? Power Asymmetry and an Intractable Conflict. *Security Studies*, 15.

Puri, H. S. (2014, June). Security Council Reform: The Time Is Now. New Delhi: Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, IDSA Monograph series.

Rizwi, D. H. (2019, 12 16). (R. P. interview, Interviewer)

Schofield, V. (2000). *Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan, and the Unending War*. London: IB Tauris.

Shahid, A. (2012, September). *Water Insecurity: A Threat for Pakistan and India*. Retrieved 10 18, 2017, from Issue brief, South Asia Center, Atlantic council: [https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/Ahmad\\_Indus](https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/Ahmad_Indus)

Statement by H.E. Narendra Modi, Prime Minister Of India, General Debate Of The 69th session of the United Nations General Assembly. (2014, SEPTEMBER 27). New York.

*Statement of S.M Krishna Minister for External Affairs UNSC Reforms and India*. (2011, FEBRUARY 18). Retrieved from <https://www.orfonline.org/research/unsc-reforms-and-india/>

Stuenkel, O. (2010). *Leading the disenfranchised or joining the establishment? India, Brazil, and the UN Security Council*. Retrieved 09 15, 2015, from Carta Internacional: <https://ri.fgv.br/sites/default/files/publicacoes/10d7bc9faa.pdf>

Syed Hussain Shaheed Soherwordi, Reena Abbasi, et all. ( 2015). Structuralism and the Indo-Pak Rivalry: Responsible Politico-Economic Factors and Policy Analysis. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 30.

Tanham, G. (1992). Indian Strategic Culture. *Washington Quarterly* 15, 129-142.

Thakur, R. (2006). *The United Nations Peace and Security: From Collective Security to the Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yadav, M. K. (2014). India's Quest for United Nations Security Council Permanent Seat with Special Reference to its Peace Keeping Credentials. *Global Journal of Political Science*, Volume 2.