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WE ARE LOSING THE WAR

WE CONTROL UNIQUENESS RECENT LEAKS PROVE THAT WE ARE LOSING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN – INSTABILITY INCREASING

NEW YORK TIMES 07-25 [“View is bleaker than official portrayal of war in Afghanistan”, C.J. Chivers, Carlotta Gall, et al, staff writers, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/26/world/asia/26warlogs.html?_r=3&pagewanted=all>] ttate

A six-year archive of classified military documents made public on Sunday offers an unvarnished, ground-level picture of the war in Afghanistan that is in many respects more grim than the official portrayal.

The secret documents, released on the Internet by an organization called WikiLeaks, are a daily diary of an American-led force often starved for resources and attention as it struggled against an insurgency that grew larger, better coordinated and more deadly each year.

The New York Times, the British newspaper The Guardian and the German magazine Der Spiegel were given access to the voluminous records several weeks ago on the condition that they not report on the material before Sunday.

The documents — some 92,000 reports spanning parts of two administrations from January 2004 through December 2009 — illustrate in mosaic detail why, after the United States has spent almost $300 billion on the war in Afghanistan, the [Taliban](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/t/taliban/index.html?inline=nyt-org) are stronger than at any time since 2001.

As the new American commander in Afghanistan, Gen. [David H. Petraeus](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/david_h_petraeus/index.html?inline=nyt-per), tries to reverse the lagging war effort, the documents sketch a war hamstrung by an Afghan government, police force and army of questionable loyalty and competence, and by a Pakistani military that appears at best uncooperative and at worst to work from the shadows as an unspoken ally of the very insurgent forces the American-led coalition is trying to defeat.

AFGHAN INSTABILITY ADV EXTS – NATION-BUILDING IMPOSSIBLE

**COUNTERINSURGENCY EFFORTS WILL FAIL IN AFGHANISTAN – STRONG TALIBAN, NO LOYALTY FOR CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, REGIONAL FACTIONS**

**BABBIN 08-03** [Jed – former deputy undersecretary of defense under H.W. Bush, “Bonfire of the Neocons: Part 2”, *The American Spectator*, <http://spectator.org/archives/2010/08/03/bonfire-of-the-neocons-part-2/1>] ttate

Call it nation-building, call it counterinsurgency, the neocon way of war is based on the antihistorical idea that the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq are capable of resolution within those nations' borders. It willfully ignores the conclusive influence that the intervention of foreign terror-sponsoring nations has.

Many of us who supported military action in Afghanistan and Iraq weren't neocons then, and by condemning nation-building now aren't turning coat.

Literally from the moment the towers of the World Trade Center fell, I have written that the nations that sponsor terrorism are our enemy, and that we cannot win this war unless and until we force them out of that business.

On 9-11, I wrote a column that was published the following day in the Washington Times. In it, I said, "Nations that sponsor or harbor terrorists are our enemies. We have to treat them accordingly. We must act against them, using whatever force is necessary to destroy the threat."

The only other people to cast the war in those terms were Michael Ledeen in his 2002 book, The War Against the Terror Masters, and retired Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Richard B. Myers in his 2009 book, Eyes on the Horizon. I am honored to be in that small company.

Unless our national leadership quickly joins us, the terror sponsors will win this war and America will cease to be the land of the free.

From the beginning, I have argued that this war is as much an ideological war as a kinetic one. And, with equal consistency, I have been opposed to nation-building.

In Loose Canons on April 30, 2002 I wrote that Bush's thinking had become dangerously confused. On September 4, 2002, I wrote that even if we dealt with the terrorist threats in Afghanistan and Iraq, the war would not be over until we ended -- forcibly or otherwise -- nations' sponsorship of terrorism. And, on March 20, 2006, in a Loose Canons piece entitled "Endgame Conservatives," I explained comprehensively the problem with the neocons' war plan, that it placed us on the strategic defensive and precluded victory.

I explained that nation-building is not "neoconservatism" but actually "neo-Wilsonianism." That it is, at its core, a colonialist strategy bound to fail anywhere, not just in the Muslim world. That if you do not fight a war in a manner calculated to win it decisively, you will lose it inevitably.

It is immoral -- and contrary to the nation's security -- to spend American lives in nation-building. In the Muslim culture it's doubly so, because the religion prohibits democracy. Under sharia law, the separation of church and state is prohibited. The Koran prescribes a comprehensive law that encompasses both religion and government.

And that's the point of failure at which neocon nation-building and the military idea of "counterinsurgency" merge.

The commander of the International Security Assistance Force for Afghanistan reports regularly to Congress. In the April 2010 report, there is little but bad news. The classic text, "Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice" by the late David Galula, shows why the Bush-Obama nation-building strategy is failing in Iraq and Afghanistan. A few examples from the ISAF report and Galula's work illustrate the problem.

Galula wrote that for an insurgent to succeed, he must have a cause -- political, religious, economic or social -- that the counterinsurgent cannot also espouse. The Taliban's cause is the re-imposition of Islamic fundamentalism. It is already a dominant force in neighboring nations such as Iran and perhaps Pakistan. That cause is apparently succeeding in Afghanistan. The April ISAF report says, "[Taliban] organizational capabilities and operational reach are qualitatively and geographically expanding…. The strength and ability of [Taliban] shadow governance to discredit the authority and legitimacy of the Afghan Government is increasing."

The Karzai government offers no cause that can seriously compete. Vague promises of democracy and economic development -- made by an unpopular government seeking to bring the "good Taliban" into the fold -- cannot compete with the undiluted Islamic fundamentalism the Taliban offer.

Galula wrote that support for an insurgency from other nations can take five forms. The Taliban receive them all. First, moral support "…by the weight of public opinion and through various communications media." The Taliban receive it almost constantly in Islamic media and by word of mouth from the terror-sponsoring nations.

Second on Galula's list is political support "with pressure applied directly on the counterinsurgent, or indirectly by diplomatic action in the international forum." The Kabul government is not quite and international pariah, but American politicians may soon make it so. From Iran and Pakistan comes direct pressure on Karzai that accomplishes its isolation.

Third is technical support, fourth is financial, fifth is military support. All three come directly to the Taliban from Iran and elements of the Pakistani government. Financial help is even more prevalent.

The April ISAF report says, in part, that the Afghan insurgency "…has a robust means of sustaining operations." It mentions the availability of weapons and the fact that the Taliban has "consistent streams of money to sufficiently fund operations." The money comes in part from the opiate trade and, "Externally, funding originates in Islamic states and is delivered via couriers and halawas," an Islamic informal banking system.

That report also says, "Most concerning, Iran continues to provide lethal assistance to elements of the Taliban, although the quantity and quality of such assistance is markedly lower than the assistance provided to Shia militants in Iraq. Tehran's support to the Taliban is inconsistent with their historic enmity, but fits with its overall strategy of backing many groups to ensure a positive relationship with potential leaders and hedging against foreign presence."

How can the counterinsurgency succeed unless these sources of outside support are cut off? It can't.

Most telling, Galula wrote, "The cruelty of the revolutionary [i.e., insurgent] war is not a mass, anonymous cruelty but a highly personalized, individual one. No greater crime can be committed by the counterinsurgent than accepting or resigning himself to, the protraction of war. He would do as well to give up early." We have been nation-building in Iraq for six years and in Afghanistan for nine. It's too late to give up early, but not too late to be defeated.

The Pentagon report says, "Insurgents' tactics, techniques and procedures for conducting complex attacks are increasing in sophistication and strategic effect." The strategic effect is enormous: it prevents achievement of the first goal of any counterinsurgency campaign -- establishing security for the populace -- by hampering our operations from those bases. No counterinsurgency can succeed without establishing local security. In that, the Afghanistan campaign has already failed.

Elsewhere in Afghanistan, the Taliban are conducting a targeted assassination program, killing people -- even whole families -- who cooperate with American and Afghan government forces.

In Iraq and in Afghanistan we haven't been fighting the enemy: we've been fighting his proxies, bogged down on the battlefields the enemy has chosen, allowing them to control the pace and direction of the war.

If you were to choose an ideal country for an insurgency, Afghanistan would be at the top of the list.

There, are ideal for the insurgent: an ethnically diverse population loyal only to tribes and sects, highly dispersed, with no loyalty to or confidence in the central government; a highly-motivated insurgency which is actively supported with funding, arms and training by Iran and other terror-sponsoring nations; a weak economy; and a prolonged inability of the central government to provide security or basic services. All this adds up to a metaphysical impossibility for Obama's fourteen-month Afghanistan counter-insurgency to succeed.

It will have taken a decade, from September 1, 2001 to September 1, 2011 for the curtain to come down on the neocons' malignant nation-building idea. Counting Vietnam, Afghanistan will mark the third time America has been defeated as much by itself as by an insurgency.

AFGHAN INSTABILITY ADV EXTS – COIN INCREASES INSURGENCY

COIN FOCUS IS FUELING RESENTMENT – INCREASES VIOLENCE AGAINST OUR TROOPS – SUPERCHARGES INSTABILITY AND HEGEMONY ADVANTAGES

ASSOCIATED PRESS 08-02 [“Study ties civilian deaths to attacks on US forces”, <http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5h-q9VLXxunnFe-gJgzkS_WAWh6PgD9HBK7PO3>] ttate

WASHINGTON — Each time U.S. or NATO forces accidentally kill Afghan civilians, insurgents and their sympathizers typically retaliate with six additional assaults on foreign forces over the next six weeks, researchers using newly declassified NATO data conclude.

A new study published by the National Bureau of Economic Research supports the prevailing view of counterinsurgency strategists who believe civilian casualties help Taliban recruiting drives. The study found that attacks on foreign forces increase slightly even when the insurgents are to blame for the deaths of non-combatants.

"Our results show that if counterinsurgent forces in Afghanistan wish to minimize insurgent recruitment, they must minimize harm to civilians despite the greater risk this entails," says the study, to be released Tuesday through the Washington-based New America Foundation.

The principle that protecting civilians is the key to sidelining and ultimately defeating an insurgency is the heart of the strategy outlined by Gen. David Petraeus in Iraq and adapted for Afghanistan. As applied by the former U.S. commander in Afghanistan, Gen. Stanley McChrystal, the strategy includes strict limits on U.S. air strikes and firepower.

POLITICS – CONGRESS OPPOSES WAR

**CONGRESS AND PUBLIC’S OPPOSITION TO WAR CONTINUES TO INCREASE AS OUR INVOLVEMENT DEEPENS**

NEW YORK TIMES 07-25 [“View is bleaker than official portrayal of war in Afghanistan”, C.J. Chivers, Carlotta Gall, et al, staff writers, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/26/world/asia/26warlogs.html?_r=3&pagewanted=all>] ttate

The material comes to light as Congress and the public grow increasingly skeptical of the deepening involvement in Afghanistan and its chances for success as next year’s deadline to begin withdrawing troops looms.

The archive is a vivid reminder that the Afghan conflict until recently was a second-class war, with money, troops and attention lavished on Iraq while soldiers and [Marines](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/m/us_marine_corps/index.html?inline=nyt-org) lamented that the Afghans they were training were not being paid.

POLITICS – PLAN POPULAR WITH PUBLIC

Plan popular- public support for Afghanistan War decreasing by the month.

Politico 8/3 (Andy, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0810/40586.html>, “Poll: 43% call Afghanistan a 'mistake'”, Politico) yan

Forty-three percent of Americans now believe that it was a mistake to launch the war in Afghanistan, a new high, according to a new USA Today/Gallup poll out Tuesday. The number is a five percentage point jump from only weeks ago, before the website WikiLeaks released more than 90,000 private military documents. Fifty-two percent of Americans still think it was not a mistake to send the military into Afghanistan, which has become the longest running American war. Shortly after President Barack Obama took office, 66 percent believed the war was not a mistake compared to 30 percent who thought it was. Asked how they think the war is going, only 34 percent said either "very" or "moderately" well while 62 percent said the war is going "very" or "moderately" badly. A slim majority, 52 percent, said the war was going well when Obama became president. The poll of 1,208 adults was conducted July 27 to August 1 and has a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points. Read more:

MINERALS DA ANSWERS – NON-UNIQUE – SINO INVESTMENT NOW

China investing in Afghanistan NOW – US doesn’t care

**Desert** **News**, **2010**

(Desert News, "As US fights, China spends in Afghanistan, 2010, pg online @ http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700045427/As-US-fights-China-spends-in-Afghanistan.html//gh-ag)

 As the U.S. and its NATO allies fight to stabilize Afghanistan, China has expanded its economic footprint with several high-profile investments and reconstruction projects. In 2007, it became the country's largest foreign investor when it won a $3.5 billion contract to develop copper mines at Aynak, southeast of Kabul. The U.S. is in favor of the Chinese investment. "It can be a good thing. As a matter of fact, we encourage all of the international community to take an interest in the economic development of Afghanistan," said U.S. State Department spokesman Gordon Duguid. "Working with our coalition partners and other interested partners, we are trying to establish a viable market economy in Afghanistan. This is one way to wean people from illicit activities and also to fight the ideology of the terrorists," he said. For China, the reward is not only expanded trade and access to natural resources, it's also security for its western flank, the vast Xinjiang region that is home to a separatist movement of minority Uighurs, said Liu Xuecheng of the China Institute of International Studies, the Chinese Foreign Ministry's think tank. "Our interest is clear. We need a peaceful neighbor because we have our own problems in Xinjiang," Liu said. "If we have a friendly country in Afghanistan, they can help us to manage issues on the separatists, security and territorial integrity. We want Afghanistan to be successful." Though the two countries have always been friendly, the relationship has blossomed in recent years. In March, President Hamid Karzai made his fourth trip to Beijing, bringing back agreements on economic cooperation, technical training and lower tariffs for Afghan goods. The emerging alliance is giving Kabul an alternative to its sometimes strained ties with the West. The two neighbors share a narrow, mountainous border, the Wakhan Corridor, and links that date back centuries to the caravans of tea, spices and other riches that traveled the Silk Road. Afghanistan is "well aware that the U.S. is likely to only be a temporary ally, so it's looking for a longer-term partner in the region. China would be an obvious choice," said security analyst Christian Le Miere, editor of Jane's Intelligence Review. China drew worldwide attention with the $3.5 billion winning bid by the state-owned China Metallurgical Group Corp. tap one of the world's largest unexploited copper reserves. That deal — which included commitments to build a power plant, railway, hospital and mosque, and to employ thousands of Afghans as miners — has dwarfed all other countries' foreign investments, including the U.S. "China is the biggest buyer of raw materials in the world, whether that's in Africa, Asia or any other part of the world. So if China wants to come to Afghanistan, why not?" said Ghullam Mohammad Yalaqi, the Afghan commerce and industry minister. "We just like to do the deal." The country's untapped minerals, including gold, iron, copper and cobalt, is valued by a U.S. estimate at nearly $1 trillion. Afghan officials say it's triple that amount.

MINERALS DA ANSWERS – LINK TURN – MILITARY --> SINO MINING

TURN – US MILITARY PRESENCE PROVIDES SAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR SINO INVESTMENT

Landay, national security and intelligence correspondent, 2009 [Jonathan, “China's thirst for copper could hold key to Afghanistan's future,” 3-8, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/03/08/63452/chinas-thirst-for-copper-could.html>] emma b

In this Taliban stronghold in the mountains south of Kabul, the U.S. Army is providing the security that will enable China to exploit one of the world's largest unexploited deposits of copper, earn tens of billions of dollars and feed its voracious appetite for raw materials. U.S. troops set up bases last month along a dirt track that a Chinese firm is paving as part of a $3 billion project to gain access to the Aynak copper reserves. Some troops made camp outside a compound built for the Chinese road crews, who are about to return from winter break. American forces also have expanded their presence in neighboring Logar province, where the Aynak deposit is. The U.S. deployment wasn't intended to protect the Chinese investment — the largest in Afghanistan's history — but to strangle Taliban infiltration into the capital of Kabul. But if the mission provides the security that a project to revive Afghanistan's economy needs, the synergy will be welcome. "When you have men who don't have jobs, you can't bring peace," said Abdel Rahman Ashraf, a German-trained geology professor who's Afghan President Hamid Karzai's chief mining and energy adviser. "When we take money and invest it in a project like Aynak, we give jobs to the people." Indeed, the project could inject hundreds of millions of dollars in royalties and taxes into Afghanistan's meager coffers and create thousands of desperately needed jobs. Beijing faces enormous challenges in completing the project and gaining access to the estimated 240 million tons of copper ore that are accessible through surface mining.

MINERALS DA ANSWERS – NO LINK – NOT MUCH THERE

View reports of mineral wealth with suspicion—US military has a motive to exaggerate the discovery

Ricketts 6-14, lead writer for GreenBeats, [Camille, “Afghanistan’s lithium Eureka: A big win for China, or another Bolivia,” 2010, <http://green.venturebeat.com/2010/06/14/afghanistans-lithium-eureka-a-big-win-for-china-or-another-bolivia/>] imanol

Is it really realistic that a small band of Americans was able to dig up something the native population has been sitting on for years? Kachan says it’s possible, given lithium’s typically thin dispersal over large areas, but didn’t disregard skepticism. The U.S. has an array of motives for playing up news of the discovery. Afghanistan’s economy has basically been decimated by the ongoing war there, and the U.S. military hasn’t had any good news come out of that region for a while. In one shot, the mineral deposit seems to be solving the country’s financial woes while positioning America to capitalize on the potential profits. This seems pretty convenient. On top of that, the Pentagon memo revealing the mineral deposit states that the elements are scattered throughout the country, with concentrations near the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, where conflicts with Taliban insurgents are still frequent. Calling attention to the prospective wealth in this region could draw in new allies for the U.S. China has been traditionally resistant to sharing its burgeoning rare element monopoly, but might it make an exception and help the U.S. in this situation, or will it deal directly with the country’s reportedly corrupt government?

MINERALS DA ANSWERS – NO IMPACT – CAN’T BE MINED

Minerals can’t be mined—no infrastructure

Burgess, editor of Wealth Daily, 6-18 [Luke, “Afghanistan Mineral Discovery: A $1 Trillion Find,” 2010, <http://www.wealthdaily.com/articles/afghanistan-mineral-discovery-a-1-trillion-find/2553>] emma b

Officials are hopeful that the mining sector will eventually become the backbone of the now tiny Afghan economy, which is currently dominated by the illicit opium trade. But while the mineral potential of Afghanistan may seem very optimistic, there are some serious roadblocks that will hinder rapid development... For one thing, Afghanistan lacks even the most basic infrastructure for mining, such as railroads, electricity, and water pipelines. It will require billions of dollars in investment to build the infrastructure needed to develop and support a mining industry. Finding this investment will extremely prove difficult — if not impossible — considering security issues and the corruption in the Afghan government. And much of the mineral wealth found to date are located in or around Taliban strongholds, which could encourage fighting to gain control of the deposits. Without a dynamic change in security, investors will not be willing to put up the massive capital required to develop and build mines. And in the near term, it's unlikely that any of these minerals will see the light of day.

MINERALS DA ANSWERS – NO IMPACT – CHINA NOT INTERESTED

**CHINA HAS NO INTEREST IN MINING – THEY ARE SCALING BACK THEIR MINING EFFORTS TO GO GREEN**

**Montgomery**, Rare Earth Investing News, **2010**

(Michael Montgomery, "Will China's Need to 'Go Green, Affect the Rare Earth Market," July 2010, http://rareearthinvestingnews.com/1294/will-chinas-need-to-go-green-affect-the-rare-earth-market/.gh-ag)

 [2]The economic rise of China and its burgeoning urbanized middle class means that the nation of over 1 billion people will face serious challenges unlike any other country. The main problem is pollution. China just passed the United States as the world top energy consumer. This hasn't been the biggest concern for the Chinese, however, as the population grows wealthier and its drive for resources grows, the pollution problem can no longer be overlooked. The mining and energy sectors of the Chinese economy have been able to produce under very little regulations, making Beijing one of the most polluted cities in the world. The runoff from mining operations, from coal to rare earths, has destroyed the water table. “Almost a quarter of China's surface water remains so polluted that it is unfit even for industrial use, while less than half of total supplies are drinkable,” reported David Stanway [3], for Reuters. China controls over 97 percent of the worlds rare earth supply. These various metals are used in hybrid car technology, as well as the magnets and other materials used in wind and renewable electrical generation technology. China can no longer claim that as a developing nation it should be exempt from regulating its industries and cleaning up its environmental impacts. In regard to rare earth mining, China is considering consolidation of the various mining companies into four or five conglomerates. “Beijing wants to consolidate the industry and lower energy waste and environmental damage. Ironically, the rare earth mining business is one of the most energy-wasteful and highly polluting industries around. Think Chinese coal mining with acid,” stated Paul Denlinger [4], for Forbes. By lowering export quotas on rare earths by 72 percent, China is hoping to encourage investment and production of wind and solar power. If this plays out, China will be in the driver seat for a green energy sector that is set to explode. And why shouldn't they set up their economy around this? They have the minerals needed to produce the technology, and the population base to produce the products far cheaper than the rest of the world. They could clean up their own pollution problems, and make a profit on selling wind turbines, batteries and solar panels to the rest of the world.

MINERALS DA ANSWERS – NO IMPACT – IMPACT INEVITABLE

IMPACT INEVITABLE AND FAR OFF – CHINA WILL INEVITABLY OUTBID OTHER PARTIES AND EXTRACTION CAN’T OCCUR FOR YEARS

**NPR 7/14** (Alan Greenblatt, staff writer, “Tapping Afghan Minerals? Good Luck,” 7/14/10, NPR - http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127838998) van seeters

It's not news that Afghanistan is home to mineral wealth, but the scope of the potential treasure looks to be much greater than had been expected. Still, it's going to take some time for full-scale extraction to begin. The lithium **won't be coming out of the ground prior to July 2011, President Obama's announced date for starting the withdrawal of U.S. troops.** "It isn't a solution to our problem," says Starr, from the Asia-Caucasus Institute. "We need a faster income stream for the government and one that produces jobs, which this doesn't do for two to three years." There's already concern that the country's mineral treasure will be used as a propaganda tool by the Taliban, amplifying the group's contention that the United States is not in Afghanistan for security but to exploit the nation. But once extraction gets seriously under way, it's not likely to be American or perhaps even Western companies that do the digging. China outbid companies from several other nations in 2007 for the right to mine copper near the Afghan village of Aynak, paying $3.4 billion for the privilege (as well as alleged bribes)."President Bush tried to get American companies to bid on the copper mine. None did," Starr says. "Both Democratic and Republican administrations have done a poor job of engaging American investors in the region."

MINERALS DA ANSWERS – SINO INVESTMENT GOOD – ECONOMY

**NON-UNIQUE AND TURN – CHINA IS ALREADY INVESTING IN AFGHANISTAN’S NATURAL RESOURCES – SINO INVESTMENT AIDS AFGHANISTAN’S ECONOMY**

Islamic Republic of Afghanistan Ministry of Mines, "The largest contract in history of Afghanistan is signed," 2008 pg online @ http://www.mom.gov.af/index.php?page\_id=66//gh-ag)

The largest contract in history of Afghanistan is signed Exploration, exploitation, processing and smelting Contract of Aynak copper deposit signed between the ministry of mines of Afghanistan and MCC Company of China. Eng. Ibrahim Adel minister of mines, Dr. Anwarulhaq Ahadi, minister of finance, Dr. Jalil Shams, minister of economy, Mr. Yang Houlan, Chinese ambassador in Kabul and Shen Heting chairman of MCC were present at the special ceremony for this occasion. Inaugurating the ceremony, Eng, Adel said: ‘’I am glad to sign the contract of a project, which in viewpoints of physical mass, investment, and incomes for state and job Eng. Ibrahim Adel, minister of mines opportunities, is the largest contract in the history of our country’’. Pointing the history of copper resource of Aynak, the minister for mines said: ‘’about 40 years ago, the Aynak copper deposit was discovered and its exploration began, but unfortunately, its exploitation delayed for 40 years’’. During the cooperation of former Soviet Union with the ministry of mines, there was a plan to enrich the copper ores to 30%, and as raw materials transfer outside of the country, the process of melting and infiltrating will had been there, but Afghan experts in point of national interests, restrained this plan and were not afraid in this regard. Fortunately according to this contract, all of the exploration, exploitation, process, smelting and cathodic infiltration will done in side the country, that transfer the knowledge, experience and technology. This project provides electricity network and transportation facilities to the residences of around the copper resources of Logar province, and especially builds primary and secondary schools, regional markets, clinics and masques for the surrounding residents of the copper deposit of Aynak, Darband and Jowha Dr.Anwarulhaq Ahadi, minister of finance r. The minister for mines added: “This project provides high level of income for the government, and opportunities for more then 6000 people directly and for thousands others indirectly, is the largest project in the history of Afghanistan. And has other sub projects such as extinction of rail way form north of Afghanistan to Torkham border, exploration and exploitation of phosphors resours to produce the mineral fertilizer, exploration and exploitation of coal mines to generate 400 mega watts electricity - 200 MW will operate the project and other 200 mw will be bought by ministry of energy and water and distribute to people.- Each of these projects has economical and social benefits, specially the project of railway will have the basic and important role to reclaim the historic importance of Afghanistan (Silk way), and, because this railway will join the central Asia to south Asia and China, will not only play significant role in transit of mining products to international markets, but also will join the central Asian countries to the countries of south of Asia.