

[HMDC Forensics] Arguments & Rebuttals for Debate  
Topic: Abolishing P5 Status (April 2024)

- Arguments (Both Sides).....2**
  - PRO-01: UN Legitimacy (aka Effectiveness).....2
    - 1. First... Veto Prevents Meaningful Solutions .....2
    - 2. Also... Preventing Selfish Use of the VETO .....2
  - PRO-02: Reducing Violence.....3
    - 1. First... Reducing Violence in Palestine .....3
    - 2. Also... Ending the War in Ukraine.....3
  - CON-01: Reducing UN Legitimacy (aka Effectiveness) .....4
    - 1. First... Veto Encourages Compromise .....4
    - 2. Also... Losing Access to Crucial Resources.....4
  - CON-02: Increasing Violence .....5
    - 1. First... Insufficient Resources .....5
    - 2. Also... Member States Will Leave .....5
- 4-Step Refutation as Rebuttals (Both Sides).....6**
  - PRO-01: Rebuttal vs. Reducing UN Legitimacy .....6
    - 1. First... Veto Prevents Meaningful Solutions .....6
    - 2. Also... Preventing Selfish Use of the VETO .....6
  - PRO-02: Rebuttal vs. Increasing Violence .....7
    - 1. First... Reducing Violence in Palestine .....7
    - 2. Also... Ending the War in Ukraine.....7
  - CON-01: Rebuttal vs. Increasing UN Legitimacy .....8
    - 1. First... Veto Encourages Compromise .....8
    - 2. Also... Losing Access to Crucial Resources.....8
  - CON-02: Rebuttal vs. Reducing Violence .....9
    - 1. First... Insufficient Resources .....9
    - 2. Also... Member States Will Leave .....9
- 4-Step Refutation as Rejoinders (Both Sides) .....10**
  - PRO-01: Rejoinder for Increasing UN Legitimacy .....10
    - 1. Promotion of Equality .....10
    - 2. Adaptation to Changes.....10
  - PRO-02: Rejoinder for Reducing Violence .....11
    - 1. Abundant Resources Available .....11
    - 2. Collaboration Between Members .....11
  - CON-01: Rejoinder for Reducing UN Legitimacy .....12
    - 1. Prioritizing Important Factors .....12
    - 2. Responsible Veto Decisions.....12
  - CON-02: Rejoinder for Increasing Violence .....13
    - 1. Losing Influence Without the Veto.....13
    - 2. Losing Access to Major Donors.....13
- Final Focus: Voting Issues (for Both Sides) .....14**
  - PRO-01: Increasing UN Legitimacy.....14
  - PRO-02: Reducing Violence.....14
  - CON-01: Reducing UN Legitimacy.....15
  - CON-02: Increasing Violence .....15

## ARGUMENTS (BOTH SIDES)

### INTRODUCTION (PRO)

Hello, my name is... [Full Name].

Today, we will discuss... Abolishing "P5 Status" in the United Nations.

My partner and I believe... this would be desirable.

To begin, let's discuss... Increasing UN Legitimacy.

### PRO-01: UN Legitimacy (aka Effectiveness)

Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will... increase UN Legitimacy.

*Because...* the veto prevents meaningful solutions to serious problems and the P5 countries abuse their power when they use the veto so selfishly. By removing P5 status we also remove their veto power.

*For Example...*

#### **1. First... Veto Prevents Meaningful Solutions**

*According to...* AP News, December 21, 2023

<https://apnews.com/article/us-gaza-humanitarian-un-resolution-security-council-0a490667ff6ae96a299c9133aa2b054b>

*It states...*

The veto power held by permanent members in the UN Security Council often results in resolutions that are not effective because these countries can block strong decisions made by the Security Council.

*This means...*

Abolishing P5 status will make millions of people safer because we can create a more fair and effective Security Council that makes decisions based on what's best for everyone, not just a few powerful countries.

#### **2. Also... Preventing Selfish Use of the VETO**

*According to...* The Conversation, March 26, 2015

<https://theconversation.com/the-campaign-to-restrain-the-un-security-councils-veto-is-wrongheaded-and-pointless-38875>

*It states...*

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council sometimes use their veto power to protect themselves and allies, even if doing so makes it worse for everyone else. This allows the P5 members to avoid getting punished for breaking the rules.

*This means...*

Getting rid of the P5 status will make millions of people safer. It would help the UN Security Council to make decisions for the common good instead of a few powerful countries' interests. A fairer council could act quickly to stop conflicts, protect people, and hold wrongdoers accountable.

*Therefore...* Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will increase UN Legitimacy.

*The next argument I will present is...* reducing violence.

## **PRO-02: Reducing Violence**

Abolishing P5 status will reduce violence.

*Because...* The P5 members are using their veto to block solutions to ongoing conflicts around the world. Without the veto, we could act swiftly with better solutions.

*For Example...*

### **1. First... Reducing Violence in Palestine**

*According to...* *The Carnegie Endowment for Peace, June 28, 2023*

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/06/28/un-security-council-reform-what-world-thinks-pub-90032>

*It states...*

The United States, a permanent member of the UN Security Council, is using its veto power to block resolutions asking for a break in fighting between Israel, a US ally, and the people of Palestine. This is not the first time; the US has used its veto in similar situations in the past to protect its interests and those of its allies.

*This means...*

By abolishing P5 status, it will allow for peace in that area. This change could help millions of people suffering from food shortages and prevent further human rights abuses in the conflict between Israel and Palestine.

### **2. Also... Ending the War in Ukraine**

*According to...* *the Conversation, September 20, 2023*

<https://theconversation.com/stripping-russias-veto-power-on-the-security-council-is-all-but-impossible-perhaps-we-should-expect-less-from-the-un-instead-213985>

*It states...*

Russia is one of the P5 member in the UN Security Council, and it has been using its veto power to block important decisions that would help end the fighting in Ukraine, a nation it invaded several years ago. By using the veto power, Russia avoids facing consequences from other countries.

*This means...*

By abolishing P5 status, it could make it much easier for countries worldwide to work together to find solutions for peace in Ukraine. Without the threat of the veto, countries might be more willing to agree on actions to help the millions of people suffering from the conflict in Ukraine.

Therefore... abolishing P5 status will reduce violence.

*So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO. Thank you.*

## INTRODUCTION (CON)

Hello, my name is... [Full Name].

Today, we will discuss... Abolishing "P5 Status" in the United Nations.

My partner and I believe... this would be undesirable.

To begin, let's discuss... reducing UN Legitimacy.

### CON-01: Reducing UN Legitimacy (aka Effectiveness)

Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will... reduce UN Legitimacy.

*Because...* without the veto we lose motivation to compromise and lose critical resources.

*For Example...*

#### 1. **First... Veto Encourages Compromise**

*According to...* the United Nations, November 17, 2023

<https://press.un.org/en/2023/ga12563.doc.htm>

*It states...*

The veto power held by the P5 members of the UN Security Council can help countries come to agreements and find solutions to serious problems together. When a permanent member threatens to use the veto, it encourages others to find a compromise that everyone can agree on. This helps prevent arguments and keeps the process of solving global issues moving forward.

*This means...*

Removing the veto could make the UN Security Council less effective, as countries might care about their own interests over the interests of the world. Without the need to compromise, nations could stick to their positions, making it harder for the council to address urgent international concerns.

#### 2. **Also... Losing Access to Crucial Resources**

*According to...* the United Nations, November 20, 2018

<https://press.un.org/en/2018/ga12091.doc.htm>

*It states...*

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council have a lot of power and resources that help make the council's decisions effective. Without their support, the Security Council might have trouble dealing with threats to global security because it wouldn't have enough diplomatic, economic, and military help to make sure countries follow its rules.

*This means...*

If we took away the permanent status of these five members, it would only worsen the situation and weaken the Security Council's ability to act quickly in crises. This could lead to more disagreements between the countries, and some may start frequently disobeying the law. The council might lose its reputation for effectiveness and trust, leading to more conflicts and threats to peace and security, which could harm hundreds of millions of people.

Therefore... Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will reduce UN Legitimacy.

*The next argument I will present is...* increasing violence.

## CON-02: Increasing Violence

Abolishing P5 status will increase violence.

*Because...* Without the support of the P5 members regardless of their veto there will be more conflicts around the world as the UN will lack the ability to prevent these outbreaks.

*For Example...*

### 1. **First... Insufficient Resources**

*According to...* *the Foreign Policy*, September 17, 2020

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/09/17/decolonizing-united-nations-means-abolish-permanent-five-security-council/>

*It states...*

The P5 members of the UN Security Council are unlikely to provide resources for solutions they did not propose. Their reluctance is due to a desire to maintain control over decisions and ensure their interests are prioritized. Consequently, they may withhold support for choices that do not align with their desires.

*This means...*

Without adequate resources, solutions proposed by new security council members may be ineffective. The lack of support could hinder the process, potentially worsening conflicts. Furthermore, the council's inability to provide effective solutions could undermine its global credibility.

### 2. **Also... Member States Will Leave**

*According to...* *The Carnegie Endowment for Peace*, June 28, 2023

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/06/28/un-security-council-reform-what-world-thinks-pub-90032>

*It states...*

Countries may leave the UN due to a lack of confidence in their ability to effectively resolve global issues. This opinion may be caused by inefficiencies, political biases, or the UN's inability to adapt to constantly changing dynamics. The departure of permanent members could worsen the situation and raise questions about its relevance.

*This means...*

Instead of reducing conflicts, it could instead lead to increased hostilities as countries feel unsupported by the international community. The lack of a cohesive international group to stop conflicts could make the world more divided, with more chances of armed violence from the increased tensions.

Therefore... abolishing P5 status will increase violence.

*So, for all these reasons, please vote for the CON. Thank you.*

## 4-STEP REFUTATION AS REBUTTALS (BOTH SIDES)

### INTRODUCTION (PRO)

Hello, my name is... [Full Name].

In this speech, I will refute each of my opponent's arguments.

The first argument I will refute is about... UN Legitimacy.

### PRO-01: Rebuttal vs. Reducing UN Legitimacy

*They said...* Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will reduce UN Legitimacy.

*We say...* it will not reduce legitimacy.

*Because...*

#### **1. First... Veto Prevents Meaningful Solutions**

*According to...* AP News, December 21, 2023

<https://apnews.com/article/us-gaza-humanitarian-un-resolution-security-council-0a490667ff6ae96a299c9133aa2b054b>

*It states...*

The veto power held by permanent members in the UN Security Council often results in resolutions that are not effective because these countries can block strong decisions made by the Security Council.

*This means...*

Abolishing P5 status will make millions of people safer because we can create a more fair and effective Security Council that makes decisions based on what's best for everyone, not just a few powerful countries.

#### **2. Also... Preventing Selfish Use of the VETO**

*According to...* The Conversation, March 26, 2015

<https://theconversation.com/the-campaign-to-restrain-the-un-security-councils-veto-is-wrongheaded-and-pointless-38875>

*It states...*

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council sometimes use their veto power to protect themselves and allies, even if doing so makes it worse for everyone else. This allows the P5 members to avoid getting punished for breaking the rules.

*This means...*

Getting rid of the P5 status will make millions of people safer. It would help the UN Security Council to make decisions for the common good instead of a few powerful countries' interests. A fairer council could act quickly to stop conflicts, protect people, and hold wrongdoers accountable.

*Therefore...* Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will not reduce UN Legitimacy.

*The next argument I will refute is...* increasing violence.

## **PRO-02: Rebuttal vs. Increasing Violence**

*They said...* Abolishing “P5 status” from the U.N. Security Council will increase violence.

*We say...* it will not increase violence.

*Because...*

### **1. First... Reducing Violence in Palestine**

*According to...* *The Carnegie Endowment for Peace, June 28, 2023*

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/06/28/un-security-council-reform-what-world-thinks-pub-90032>

*It states...*

The United States, a permanent member of the UN Security Council, is using its veto power to block resolutions asking for a break in fighting between Israel, a US ally, and the people of Palestine. This is not the first time; the US has used its veto in similar situations in the past to protect its interests and those of its allies.

*This means...*

By abolishing P5 status, it will allow for peace in that area. This change could help millions of people suffering from food shortages and prevent further human rights abuses in the conflict between Israel and Palestine.

### **2. Also... Ending the War in Ukraine**

*According to...* *the Conversation, September 20, 2023*

<https://theconversation.com/stripping-russias-veto-power-on-the-security-council-is-all-but-impossible-perhaps-we-should-expect-less-from-the-un-instead-213985>

*It states...*

Russia is one of the P5 member in the UN Security Council, and it has been using its veto power to block important decisions that would help end the fighting in Ukraine, a nation it invaded several years ago. By using the veto power, Russia avoids facing consequences from other countries.

*This means...*

By abolishing P5 status, it could make it much easier for countries worldwide to work together to find solutions for peace in Ukraine. Without the threat of the veto, countries might be more willing to agree on actions to help the millions of people suffering from the conflict in Ukraine.

*Therefore...* Abolishing “P5 status” from the U.N. Security Council will not increase violence.

*So, for all these reasons please vote for the PRO. Thank you.*

## INTRODUCTION (CON)

Hello, my name is... [Full Name].

In this speech, I will refute each of my opponent's arguments.

The first argument I will refute is about... UN Legitimacy.

### CON-01: Rebuttal vs. Increasing UN Legitimacy

*They said...* Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will increase UN Legitimacy.

*We say...* it will not increase legitimacy.

*Because...*

#### 1. **First... Veto Encourages Compromise**

*According to...* the United Nations, November 17, 2023

<https://press.un.org/en/2023/ga12563.doc.htm>

*It states...*

The veto power held by the P5 members of the UN Security Council can help countries come to agreements and find solutions to serious problems together. When a permanent member threatens to use the veto, it encourages others to find a compromise that everyone can agree on. This helps prevent arguments and keeps the process of solving global issues moving forward.

*This means...*

Removing the veto could make the UN Security Council less effective, as countries might care about their own interests over the interests of the world. Without the need to compromise, nations could stick to their positions, making it harder for the council to address urgent international concerns.

#### 2. **Also... Losing Access to Crucial Resources**

*According to...* the United Nations, November 20, 2018

<https://press.un.org/en/2018/ga12091.doc.htm>

*It states...*

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council have a lot of power and resources that help make the council's decisions effective. Without their support, the Security Council might have trouble dealing with threats to global security because it wouldn't have enough diplomatic, economic, and military help to make sure countries follow its rules.

*This means...*

If we took away the permanent status of these five members, it would only worsen the situation and weaken the Security Council's ability to act quickly in crises. This could lead to more disagreements between the countries, and some may start frequently disobeying the law. The council might lose its reputation for effectiveness and trust, leading to more conflicts and threats to peace and security, which could harm hundreds of millions of people.

*Therefore...* Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will not increase UN Legitimacy.

*The next argument I will refute is...* reducing violence.



## **CON-02: Rebuttal vs. Reducing Violence**

*They said...* Abolishing “P5 status” from the U.N. Security Council will reduce violence.

*We say...* it will not reduce violence.

*Because...*

### **1. First... Insufficient Resources**

*According to...* *the Foreign Policy*, September 17, 2020

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/09/17/decolonizing-united-nations-means-abolish-permanent-five-security-council/>

*It states...*

The P5 members of the UN Security Council are unlikely to provide resources for solutions they did not propose. Their reluctance is due to a desire to maintain control over decisions and ensure their interests are prioritized. Consequently, they may withhold support for choices that do not align with their desires.

*This means...*

Without adequate resources, solutions proposed by new security council members may be ineffective. The lack of support could hinder the process, potentially worsening conflicts. Furthermore, the council's inability to provide effective solutions could undermine its global credibility.

### **2. Also... Member States Will Leave**

*According to...* *The Carnegie Endowment for Peace*, June 28, 2023

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/06/28/un-security-council-reform-what-world-thinks-pub-90032>

*It states...*

Countries may leave the UN due to a lack of confidence in their ability to effectively resolve global issues. This opinion may be caused by inefficiencies, political biases, or the UN's inability to adapt to constantly changing dynamics. The departure of permanent members could worsen the situation and raise questions about its relevance.

*This means...*

Instead of reducing conflicts, it could instead lead to increased hostilities as countries feel unsupported by the international community. The lack of a cohesive international group to stop conflicts could make the world more divided, with more chances of armed violence from the increased tensions.

*Therefore...* Abolishing “P5 status” from the U.N. Security Council will not reduce violence.

*So, for all these reasons please vote for the CON. Thank you.*

## 4-STEP REFUTATION AS REJOINDERS (BOTH SIDES)

### INTRODUCTION (PRO)

In this speech, I will defend each of my opponent's arguments.

The first argument I will defend is... Increasing UN Legitimacy.

### PRO-01: Rejoinder for Increasing UN Legitimacy

*They said we were wrong about...* abolishing "P5 status" to increase UN Legitimacy.

*We were not wrong, because...*

#### 1. **Promotion of Equality**

*According to...* *the Foreign Policy, September 17, 2020*

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/09/17/decolonizing-united-nations-means-abolish-permanent-five-security-council/>

*It states...*

The current P5 member status stems from the aftermath of World War II power dynamics, when countries were able to gain significant control during that time period. This has led to an imbalance of power, giving the permanent members more authority and dominance over the entire Council. As a result, their decisions are often easier to pass, even if they primarily serve their own interests.

*This means...*

Abolishing P5 status will make millions of people safer by creating a fairer distribution of power and representation within the Security Council, reflecting the diversity of the international community.

#### 2. **Adaptation to Changes**

*According to...* *the United Nations, November 28, 2018*

<https://press.un.org/en/2018/ga12091.doc.htm>

*It states...*

The current structure of the UN Security Council isn't very inclusive because it gives special privileges, veto power, to five powerful countries, leaving out the voices and opinions of others. This makes it more difficult for the Council to solve global issues since not everyone gets to voice their opinion on the matter.

*This means...*

Abolishing P5 status will make millions of people safer because more countries can join in the decision-making. The Council will have a fairer representation of the people and more countries will have a say in the solutions to global problems.

*Therefore, we were not wrong...* Abolishing "P5 status" from the United Nations will increase Legitimacy.

*The next argument I will defend is...* reducing violence.

## **PRO-02: Rejoinder for Reducing Violence**

*They said we were wrong about... abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council reducing violence.*

*We were not wrong, because...*

### **1. Abundant Resources Available**

*According to... the United Nations, February 12, 2024*  
<https://press.un.org/en/2024/soc4917.doc.htm>

*It states...*

The P5 members are not the only countries with an abundance of resources of wealth on the UN Security Council. Many other wealthy countries can contribute to the number of resources as well. However, the veto from the P5 members would block their ability to do so. As a result, rich countries other than the permanent members end up not helping much in funding solutions.

*This means...*

When abolishing P5 status, there would still be abundant resources and money from other wealthy countries to support solutions. So, even if the P5 countries aren't the only ones funding the actions of the UN Security Council, like the US often does, there will still be enough help available.

### **2. Collaboration Between Members**

*According to... the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*  
<https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1981/1981-3-4.htm>

*It states...*

Some countries in the UN Security Council often rely on the strength and wealth of the P5 members. However, the Council is made up of many more members beyond just the P5. These countries have learned how to coordinate and collaborate effectively, making the Council more powerful as a whole.

*This means...*

Abolishing P5 status won't cause any members to leave the Council, even though some countries might lean on influential permanent members. With a diverse range of members, there's plenty of opportunity for mutual support and coordination, ensuring that the Council remains strong even without the powerful backing of the P5.

*Therefore, we were not wrong... Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will reduce violence.*

*So, for all these reasons please vote for the PRO. Thank you.*

## INTRODUCTION (CON)

In this speech, I will defend each of my opponent's arguments.

The first argument I will defend is... Reducing UN Legitimacy.

### CON-01: Rejoinder for Reducing UN Legitimacy

*They said we were wrong about...* how abolishing "P5 status" would reduce UN Legitimacy.

*We were not wrong, because...*

#### 1. **Prioritizing Important Factors**

*According to...* the Council on Foreign Relations, Last Accessed: February 26, 2024  
<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/un-security-council>

*It states...*

Sometimes, the P5 members of the UN Security Council don't always put their own interests first when using their veto power. They might have bigger reasons, such as keeping global peace and security. Things like worries about their own safety and their diplomatic plans can affect their decisions to block resolutions.

*This means...*

By abolishing P5 status, the permanent members won't have the power to stop resolutions that aren't well thought out and don't consider all the different factors and outcomes. The P5 members won't carry the risk of potentially putting millions of lives at risk from a rushed decision.

#### 2. **Responsible Veto Decisions**

*According to...* the Security Council Report, January 3, 2024  
<https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un-security-council-working-methods/procedural-vote.php#:~:text=Article%2027%20provides%20that%20decisions,on%20%E2%80%9Call%20ot%20her%20matters%E2%80%9D.>

*It states...*

Sometimes, the P5 countries use their veto power for good reasons, not just to avoid being held responsible. The permanent members of the UN Security Council have lots of things to consider when making a decision, not just what's beneficial to their own countries.

*This means...*

Abolishing P5 status could actually make the UN Security Council less effective. The permanent members often think carefully about how decisions are made in the Council, putting global peace and security first, even if it means not focusing on their own interests.

*Therefore, we were not wrong...* Abolishing "P5 status" from the United Nations will reduce UN Legitimacy.

*The next argument I will defend is...* reducing violence.

## CON-02: Rejoinder for Increasing Violence

*They said we were wrong about... abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council increasing violence.*

*We were not wrong, because...*

*Because...*

### **1. Losing Influence Without the Veto**

*According to... the Better World Campaign, October 21, 2023*

<https://betterworldcampaign.org/blog/un-security-council-veto>

*It states...*

When the P5 countries use their veto power, it shows that the UN Security Council can still find ways to solve challenges, even when there are disagreements. Without the permanent members, smaller countries might have more arguments that could potentially lead to conflicts, worsening the situation.

*This means...*

Abolishing P5 status will not be beneficial, since the efficiency of the UN Security Council would decrease. The P5 members can act quickly and decisively, making timely actions to secure global peace. Without the permanent members, there may be less conflict, but also less courage to voice your own opinion.

### **2. Losing Access to Major Donors**

*According to... the United Nations*

<https://www.un.org/en/our-work/maintain-international-peace-and-security>

*It states...*

Without big donors, such as the US, the UN Security Council would cause a huge loss of money and resources for everyone. Even if smaller countries work together, they might not have enough to make up for what's lost. The permanent members also help keep peace in the UNSC from the top down.

*This means...*

By abolishing P5 status, we would be losing the largest donors in the UN Security Council. Without them, it would be harder to maintain stability within the Council. Taking away the veto power would only make it more difficult for the UN Security Council to stay peaceful and stable.

*Therefore, we were not wrong... Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will increase violence.*

*So, for all these reasons please vote for the CON. Thank you.*

## FINAL FOCUS: VOTING ISSUES (FOR BOTH SIDES)

### INTRODUCTION (PRO)

In this speech, I will present each of my team's voting issues.

Our first voting issue is about... Increasing UN Legitimacy.

#### PRO-01: Increasing UN Legitimacy

*We think the most important argument is... Increasing UN Legitimacy.*

##### **Because...**

If we abolish the P5 status, Then the UN will become more efficient because abolishing the P5 status on the UN Security Council would allow for more productive conversations and create meaningful solutions. The veto prevents meaningful solutions and by abolishing the P5 status we can respond more effectively.

##### **So....**

1. Millions of people can live equally across the globe through UN action.
2. Millions of dollars can be transferred to countries who need aid
3. The UN security council can be as decisive as needed.

*Therefore... Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will increase UN Legitimacy.*

*Our next voting issue is about... reducing violence.*

#### PRO-02: Reducing Violence

*We think another important argument is... reducing violence.*

##### **Because...**

If we abolish P5 status, Then the UN will be able to reduce violence because abolishing the P5 countries on the UN Security council because it would aid the resolution of global conflicts such as those in Ukraine and Palestine.

##### **So...**

1. Millions of people who would have been displaced can live prosperous lives under the supervision of the UN.
2. Millions of lives can be saved through conflict prevention.
3. The UN security council can establish world peace

*Therefore... Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will reduce violence.*

*So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO. Thank you.*

## **INTRODUCTION (PRO)**

In this speech, I will present each of my team's voting issues.

Our first voting issue is about... Reducing UN Legitimacy.

### **CON-01: Reducing UN Legitimacy**

*We think the most important argument is... reducing UN Legitimacy.*

#### ***Because...***

If we ban the P5 status, Then the UN will lack effectiveness because the veto creates meaningful solutions through compromise and by abolishing P5 status would lose resources for the UN.

#### ***So...***

1. The ban won't actually offer any significant benefits
2. Millions of people could lack sufficient aid from the UN
3. If we maintain the P5 status then millions of people can benefit from UN aid and resources.

*Therefore... Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will reduce UN Legitimacy.*

*Our next voting issue is about... increasing violence.*

### **CON-02: Increasing Violence**

*We think another important argument is... increasing violence.*

#### ***Because...***

If we ban P5 status, Then global violence will increase, because by abolishing the P5 status, the UN's power would be significantly reduced and its political power would be obsolete.

#### ***So...***

1. Millions of people can benefit from the great impact of the UN
2. The major world powers can work toward world peace with the UN
3. The UN can be as efficient as it has been for the past decade.

*Therefore... Abolishing "P5 status" from the U.N. Security Council will increase violence.*

*So, for all these reasons, please vote for the CON. Thank you.*