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1NC – Corruption Condition CP

Text: The United States federal government should < insert the plan > on the condition that President Karzai institutes corruption reforms in Afghanistan.

Solvency:

US troop withdrawal should be used as a bargaining chip for corruption reform.

**Washington Post 10** (Joshua Partlow and Scott Wilson, March 29 2010, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/28/AR20100328008280.html)IM

Obama's tone in brief public remarks alongside President Hamid Karzai was solemn, and he chose not to praise the Afghan leader. While U.S. officials have been encouraged by military advances in recent months, Obama said, "we also want to continue to make progress on the civilian process." Obama's national security adviser, James L. Jones, made the point in blunter terms. He said Obama wanted Karzai to understand "that in his second term, there are certain things that have not been paid attention to, almost since Day One." Karzai promised in his inaugural address four months ago to fight corruption and improve governance, but U.S. officials say they have seen little concrete change at a time when they are desperate to present a credible alternative to Taliban rule. The fate of Obama's troop buildup -- he has ordered 50,000 new troops to Afghanistan since taking office -- hinges in large part on the ability of the Afghan government to provide services after soldiers have pushed out insurgents. American troops can’t leave Afghanistan until Karzai takes responsibility for his government. The United States has been trying to persuade Karzai to appoint competent government officials, address rampant theft and extortion, and fight opium trafficking, which fuels the insurgency. Karzai, who won a fraud-marred election in August, has still not selected a full cabinet, and the central government is particularly impotent outside of major cities in the vast rural stretches where the insurgency makes its home. White House and national security officials think that the military offensive underway in Helmand province, and planned for neighboring Kandahar province, must be accompanied by a genuine improvement in local government.

Karzai will say yes – international pressure and concessions are key

**AP 9** (Kathy Gannon, Associated Press, Nov. 19 2009, http://www.cleveland.com/world/index.ssf/2009/11/afghanistan\_president\_hamid\_ka.html)IM

 KABUL -- Afghanistan's President Hamid Karzai promised today to prosecute corrupt government officials and end a culture of impunity, speaking during an inauguration closely watched by the international community for signs that his administration is moving beyond the cronyism and graft of the past five years. Karzai has come under intense international pressure to clean up his government, and has often bristled at the criticism of corruption leveled at him from Western powers. After being sworn in to a second five-year term, Karzai said his government was doing whatever it could to implement reforms, and pledged that Afghan forces would be able to take control of the country's security in the next five years. He also said he believed the "problem of international terrorism" in his country would be overcome. "We are trying our best to implement social, judicial and administrative reforms in our country," Karzai said. "Being a president is a heavy task and we will try our best to honestly fulfill this task in the future."

1NC – Corruption Condition CP

II. Net Benefit –

Reforms are key to long-term stability in Afghanistan

**The Nation 9** (Nov. 11, 2009, http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/International/11-Nov-2009/UN-body-urges-Karzai-to-fight-corruption)IM

UNITED NATIONS - The UN General Assembly has urged the government of re-elected Afghan President Hamid Karzai to press ahead with “strengthening of the rule of law and democratic processes, the fight against corruption (and) the acceleration of justice sector reform.” The 192-member assembly made that call Monday night by unanimously adopting a resolution that also declared that Afghanistan’s presidential election “credible” and “legitimate”, despite allegations of widespread fraud that led Karzai’s main challenger Abdullah Abdullah to pull out of the run-off round of the election. But the UN assembly raised no doubts about Karzai’s mandate or his right to continue leading the war-torn country. The resolution welcomed “the efforts of the relevant institutions to address irregularities identified by the electoral institutions in Afghanistan and to ensure a credible and legitimate process in accordance with the Afghan Election Law and in the framework of the Afghan Constitution.” It appealed to the international community to help Afghanistan in countering the challenges of the militants’ attacks that threaten its democratic process and and economic development. Before the assembly approved the resolution, 24 countries, including Pakistan, spoke in the debate on the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan in which they stressed the need for the Afghan Government and the global community to work closely together. Pakistan’s Acting Permanent Representative Amjad Hussain Sial said the core of violence and conflict in Afghanistan emanated from terrorist groups, foreign militants such as Al-Qaeda, and militant Taliban who were not prepared to reconcile and give up fighting. The nexus with drug traders was increasingly discernable. The key to long-term stability in Afghanistan, he said, was reformation of the country’s corrupt governmental systems. Equally important was building the civilian institutions at the central and subnational levels.

Instability in Afghanistan leads to nuclear war

**Wesley 10** (Michael, Exec. Director of the Lowy Institute for Int. Policy. Professor of Int. Relt’s @ Griffith U, Feb. 25 2010 http://www.lowyinterpreter.org/post/2010/02/25/A-stable-Afghanistan-Why-we-should-care.aspx)IM

We do have an interest in the future of domestic stability within Afghanistan, but we need to think much more clearly about which countries build and guarantee that stability. An Afghan state built just by the US and its allies will be inherently unstable because, as we demonstrated after the Soviet Union withdrew, we have little stomach for any continued strategic involvement in the region. Pakistan, India and China, on the other hand, have deep and enduring strategic interests there, and their competition would soon undermine anything ISAF and NATO leave behind. Understanding the dynamics of strategic competition among Asia's rising behemoths has to be the first step in trying to figure out how to mitigate it. Great power competition in the twenty-first century will be different because of the depth and extent of the dependence of national economies on the global economy. National economies are now less self-sufficient and more vulnerable to the disruption of trading and investment relations than at any time in history. What stops great power confrontations getting out of hand these days is not so much the fear of nuclear annihilation as the fear of global economic ruin – and the resulting national ruin.The danger is that in the heat of the competition, the great powers will lose sight of this fact. This is why instability and weakness in Afghanistan is so dangerous – because in the fog of proxy war, intensely jealous great powers will assume their rivals have the upper hand and redouble their own efforts to exert influence and control, leading to a vast, very likely nuclear, conflict. To avoid the worst possible outcome, all three rivals must be engaged in the process of building a stable Afghanistan – and collectively guaranteeing it. The most realistic route is to actively involve the SCO in the future of Afghanistan while broadening that organisation to include India and Pakistan. This solution ties the stability of the northern and southern tiers of Central Asia to each other, thereby broadening the stakes of those involved. The one hope and one fear that bind China and Russia together are also remarkably relevant to the SCO's proposed new members.

Solvency – Reforms

Karzai must implement reforms before Afghanistan can be stable

**Council on Foreign Relations 10** (Interview of Stephen Biddle by Bernard Gwertzman, Jan. 27 2010, http://www.cfr.org/publication/21315/afghanistan\_success\_hinges\_on\_karzai\_reforms.html)IM

back from his latest trip to Afghanistan, CFR defense analyst Stephen Biddle says that the allied command is guardedly optimistic that they will eventually succeed. But he notes that in a counterinsurgency "things get worse, inevitably, before they get better," and there is concern about whether there will be enough time for current plans to succeed. He also said, on the eve of an international conference in London on Afghanistan, that success in Afghanistan will "require, among other things, a conscious decision by [President] Hamid Karzai to . . . implement reforms. If we cannot persuade him to do that, we are not going to succeed." There are many schools of thought on what that means, and I don't think it's clear yet. There are layers upon layers upon layers of Afghan political intrigue associated with all of that. I think the most we can say with any really definitive knowledge is what I said before: We require political change from Karzai. That's going to require the West to bring corps of leverage to bear, and possibly to bring inducement to bear, regardless of what eventually shakes out with respect to Karzai's relationship to his own parliament. There are many who believe that Karzai's leverage against us is up now that the prospects of his removal from office are negligible. There are others who believe that the tarnishing of his reputation that came along with the corruption opens him to potential pressure from us. Either way, if we are going to get the governmental change we need in Afghanistan, it is going to require, among other things, a conscious decision by Hamid Karzai to support it and to implement reforms. If we cannot persuade him to do that, we are not going to succeed.

Solvency – Reforms Pre-Req to Aff

Successful withdrawal of US troops is impossible without government reform

**AP 10** (Associated Press, Mar. 29 2010, http://www.cleveland.com/world/index.ssf/2010/03/obama\_seeks\_delicate\_balance\_w.html)IM

KABUL, Afghanistan - President Barack Obama's tone in Kabul was all business as he hammered home his theme that the Afghans need to do more to fight corruption and reform government to defeat the Taliban. The arm's-length approach was the administration's latest attempt to strike the right balance in dealing with President Hamid Karzai. Although the U.S. believes Karzai is a flawed leader, it cannot afford to alienate him because his reforms are key to a successful American exit from the war. Former President George W. Bush established a more personal relationship with Karzai. In contrast, Obama was critical of Karzai from the start, stating last December when he announced his troop surge that "the days of providing a blank check are over." Neither strategy worked well. Bush's approach failed to push Karzai toward more effective governance. Obama's criticism angered Karzai, feeding fears that the Americans were trying to undermine him. The Afghan president's visits in recent weeks to neighboring China and Iran show that he has options for support from other countries. Such blunt criticism from the U.S. now appears more measured. A day after the visit, Karzai's spokesman, Waheed Omar, described the two leaders' private meeting as cordial and dismissed reports that Obama flew to Kabul on Sunday to order a recalcitrant Karzai to get his government in line. "Our relationship with the United States has gone through ups and downs," Omar said Monday. "At this point in time, there are more ups than downs. We have certain views about certain issues and they have certain views about certain issues. Sometimes we agree and sometimes we don't."

A stable Afghanistan, and removal of US troops, can’t happen until Karzai implements reforms

**The Tartan 10** (Michael Kahn, Apr. 5 2010, Carnegie Mellon’s Newspaper, http://www.thetartan.org/2010/4/5/forum/karzai)IM

“There is a thin curtain between invasion and cooperation-assistance.” So said Afghan President Hamid Karzai in a speech last Thursday. But, if there is also a thin curtain between political necessity in a war-torn nation and abuse of power, Karzai is dangerously close to the wrong side. The past months have seen a cooling of his relationship with the United States, but more importantly they have seen an increasing trend toward the centralization of power. Signs of corruption in his government have been present for years, but they seem particularly dire in light of recent events. Karzai must reform his administration and accept the balance of power or he will lose all legitimacy — and, with it, any hope of a stable government in Afghanistan. Though several of Karzai’s actions over the past months warrant concern, a few are particularly egregious. The first of these was the widespread fraud in Afghanistan’s presidential election last year. In the first ballot, Karzai received over 54 percent of the vote, but the election commission investigated nearly 20 percent of polling stations for fraud. Karzai initially refused a run-off vote, and though he eventually allowed one, it never occurred because his opponent, Abdullah Abdullah, withdrew from the race. Abdullah cited his lack of faith in a fair election when he left the race. It is easy to cynically assert that fair and free elections are simply impossible in Afghanistan, a country that suffered under the Taliban for seven years and has since experienced over eight years of conflict. And while truly democratic elections with high turnout may be idealistic, the future of Afghanistan is not so bleak that we should accept fraud without complaint. Some pre-election opinion polls gave Abdullah over 30 percent of the vote. The Afghan people are not blind to the events in their country, but they must be able to have their opinions heard. In fact, the problems Karzai is creating within Afghanistan pose as much of a threat as his foreign policy failures. Many in Afghanistan blame him for economic problems as well as government corruption. He has not taken firm steps to control the poppy trade that funds Taliban fighters. The hope of a prosperous and reborn Afghanistan that existed after the fall of the Taliban government has only partially come to pass, and Karzai’s is the most recognizable face associated with this failure.

Solvency – Reforms Pre-Req to Aff

Reforms against corruption are a prerequisite to troop withdrawal

**Harvard Business Review 10** (Ben Heineman Jr., Mar. 31 2010, http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2010/03/obamas\_toxic\_management\_dilemm.html)IM

The answer in any business organization is straightforward: you fire the division head. But this is exactly the problem that President Obama is facing in Afghanistan with President Hamid Karzai, and he obviously cannot fire Karzai — who, in addition to all the problems noted above, secured his current term as Afghan President through an election process riddled with fraud. Yet think of the stakes. President Obama has committed the prestige of the United States, his personal credibility, billions of taxpayer dollars and, most importantly, the lives of American military personnel to a war which depends — as his top generals, Petraeus and McChrystal have said — on attaining a key civilian, not military, objective: creating an Afghan state with security, order, rule of law and accountable institutions that protects and serves its people. That goal depends on defeating the corruption and instability which have plagued Afghanistan for centuries. Only when this is achieved will the Afghan populace resist seduction by the Taliban, who exploit government weaknesses and who must be defeated before American troops can be removed from the country. Crucial to that task is the central government itself, which, unfortunately, is not only weak, but is led by an uncooperative and increasingly antagonistic president. Recently, Karzai thumbed his nose at the United States by claiming the right to appoint all five members of the election complaint commission. In early March, he warmly welcomed Iranian President Ahmadinejad to Kabul on an official visit and two weeks later traveled to Tehran where the Iranian leader, as is his custom, launched inflammatory rhetoric against the United States.

Solvency – Karzai Has Potential

Karzai can be fixed – this is proven by his ousting of two corrupt officials – but that does not mean that he will, we follow this up with proper action

Oppel 10 (Richard, A., journalist for the New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/08/world/asia/08afghan.html) GAT

Under enormous pressure from Western governments, President Hamid Karzai ousted Afghanistan’s top two elections officials, who were seen as sanctioning the widespread fraud that favored him during last year’s presidential race. But Western diplomats said the significance of the move, which was announced on Wednesday, would not be known until replacements were named and could show whether they were less willing to condone fraud. “This is something everyone has been hoping for,” said one diplomat, who like other diplomats and Western officials interviewed for this article requested anonymity so they could openly discuss internal Afghan political matters. “But it will only have an impact if they are replaced by people who are better.” Some officials have already expressed deep concern over one possible replacement, Abdul Karim Khuram, who until a few months ago was minister of information and culture. Mr. Khuram, a Karzai partisan, was criticized last year for pressing broadcasters, including state-run television, to favor Mr. Karzai’s re-election campaign. His appointment “would be a slap in the face of the international community,” one Western diplomat said, adding that the independence of the election process “would be under question again.”

Solvency - Karzai Says Yes

Karzai wants to implement reforms, he won’t risk losing the support of Britain and the US

**Shah and Vogt 9** (Amir and Heidi, Associated Press, Nov.3 2009, http://www.fox11online.com/dpp/news/international/afghan\_president\_karzai\_promises\_reform\_1257257164069)IM

KABUL (AP) - Afghanistan's president welcomed his new term — achieved after his opponent withdrew from a runoff election — by reaching out to opponents Tuesday and promis(ed)ing to banish the corruption that has undermined his administration. Hamid Karzai did not spell out how he would institute reforms or mention whether he is willing to make concessions to his opponents. Karzai spoke a day after being declared victor of an election so marred by fraud that it took two and a half months to resolve. His main opponent, Abdullah Abdullah, said when he dropped out of a planned runoff that he was withdrawing because it could not be free or fair. Karzai said he wants people from every part of the country in his government, including political opponents and Taliban who are ready to cooperate with the administration. But he never mentioned Abdullah by name. "Those who want to work with me are most welcome, regardless of whether they opposed me in the election or whether they supported me in the elections," Karzai said. "We want our Taliban brothers and all others to come back and join with us," he added. The Taliban claimed their own victory, saying in a statement the canceled runoff showed their efforts to derail the vote by threats and attacks were successful. "Our brave mujahedeen were able to disrupt the entire process. Even the airstrikes and ground forces were not able to stop our mujahedeen from their attacks," the statement said. The canceled runoff vote also showed that Afghans heeded their call not to participate in an election they said was the tool of foreigners, the statement said. Election officials had cited security concerns as one reason not to go ahead with a vote with a foregone conclusion. Abdullah, who once served as Karzai's foreign minister, has said he will not join Karzai's administration, but will work from the outside for reforms and for national unity. Karzai said he needs international support and does not want to squander the goodwill of those supplying thousands of troops and funds to Afghanistan. Even so, people close to Karzai and Abdullah say they spent the past few days negotiating privately about ministry seats or accommodating Abdullah's platform in some way. The U.S. and its allies have also pressured Karzai to institute reforms and to reach out to the Abdullah camp. President Barack Obama said Monday that he had called for a new chapter during a telephone call congratulating Karzai over his re-election. When Karzai offered assurances, Obama told him that "the proof is not going to be in words. It's going to be in deeds." British Prime Minister Gordon Brown said Karzai should "make clear that he is going to take immediate action on corruption." Brown said Britain wants to see "a corruption-free government, an inclusive government and a government which will tackle the problem of bringing prosperity to the Afghan people."

Karzai is trying to implement reforms – but needs US support, not pressure

**Washington Times 10** (Feb. 23 2010, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/23/karzai-takes-control-afghan-vote-fraud-panel/)IM

KABUL, Afghanistan -- Afghanistan's president has taken control of a formerly independent body that monitors election fraud. President Hamid Karzai signed a decree last week giving him the power to appoint all members of the Electoral Complaints Commission, a group previously dominated by U.N. appointees that uncovered massive fraud on behalf of Mr. Karzai in last year's presidential election. The decree, which was made public Monday, suggests that Mr. Karzai wants to tighten control of the electoral process ahead of parliamentary balloting next September. The election was due in May but was postponed because foreign donors would not help pay for it without reforms. Following the fraud-marred August elections, the United States and other international partners pressed Mr. Karzai into promising to root out corruption and institute electoral reforms. The chaotic balloting exposed the corruption underlying Afghan politics, prompting critics in the United States and other NATO countries to question whether Mr. Karzai could be a reliable partner in the fight against the Taliban. Government corruption is often cited as a major reason many Afghans have turned to the Taliban. Mr. Karzai has taken some steps toward combating corruption, including requiring that all senior government officials register their assets.

Solvency - Karzai Says Yes

Karzai wants to eliminate corruption

**AP 9** (Associated Press, Dec. 15 2009, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/12/15/world/main5981674.shtml)IM

(AP) Afghan President Hamid Karzai responded to international criticism of corruption in his administration by calling Tuesday for large-scale reform to stamp out the bribery and graft that permeate ministries and state offices. Karzai has been under pressure to clean up his government following this year's fraud-tainted election. The Aug. 20 vote took months to resolve because of massive ballot-box stuffing that nearly derailed the vote, undermining support for the war against the Taliban in the U.S. and other troop-supplying nations. "I know corruption exists in the government and elsewhere. Let's be realistic. Let's acknowledge the problem first," Karzai said at the opening of a three-day conference on corruption that he ordered in his first decree after retaking office last month. Finance Minister Omar Zakhilwal said Karzai sent a clear message to officials to clean up their ministries. "The government first needs to clean itself up, then it can go after all the corruption in agencies outside the government," Zakhilwal said.

Karzai is interested in reducing corruption

**AP 9** (Deb Reichmann, Associated Press, Dec. 18 2009, http://blog.taragana.com/business/2009/12/18/karzais-new-cabinet-seen-as-attempt-to-balance-demands-of-the-us-local-bosses-and-warlords-13387/)IM

KABUL — Facing huge pressure to reform, President Hamid Karzai is submitting a Cabinet lineup to Parliament on Saturday that keeps U.S. favorites in several posts critical to the war and reconstruction — a nod to American demands for trusted hands to help manage the conflict. The new list also reflects Karzai’s need to serve a second master — political allies, including warlords, that kept him in power. World leaders have threatened to hold back troops and development aid if Karzai does not cleanse his government of corruption and mismanagement,, a consequence which Karzai won’t risk. But some Afghan lawmakers said the lineup looked too much like the existing one. These lawmakers also expressed concern that a few of Karzai’s new nominees — they did not say whom — were chosen because of links to political bosses or warlords. Karzai made a promise to clean up his government when he was sworn in for a second term last month following a fraud-tainted presidential election. “The ministers of Afghanistan must possess integrity and be professionals serving the nation,” Karzai said.

Reform K2 Stability

Reforms are key to long-term stability in Afghanistan

**The Nation 9** (Nov. 11, 2009, http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/International/11-Nov-2009/UN-body-urges-Karzai-to-fight-corruption)IM

UNITED NATIONS - The UN General Assembly has urged the government of re-elected Afghan President Hamid Karzai to press ahead with “strengthening of the rule of law and democratic processes, the fight against corruption (and) the acceleration of justice sector reform.” The 192-member assembly made that call Monday night by unanimously adopting a resolution that also declared that Afghanistan’s presidential election “credible” and “legitimate”, despite allegations of widespread fraud that led Karzai’s main challenger Abdullah Abdullah to pull out of the run-off round of the election. But the UN assembly raised no doubts about Karzai’s mandate or his right to continue leading the war-torn country. The resolution welcomed “the efforts of the relevant institutions to address irregularities identified by the electoral institutions in Afghanistan and to ensure a credible and legitimate process in accordance with the Afghan Election Law and in the framework of the Afghan Constitution.” It appealed to the international community to help Afghanistan in countering the challenges of the militants’ attacks that threaten its democratic process and and economic development. Before the assembly approved the resolution, 24 countries, including Pakistan, spoke in the debate on the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan in which they stressed the need for the Afghan Government and the global community to work closely together. Pakistan’s Acting Permanent Representative Amjad Hussain Sial said the core of violence and conflict in Afghanistan emanated from terrorist groups, foreign militants such as Al-Qaeda, and militant Taliban who were not prepared to reconcile and give up fighting. The nexus with drug traders was increasingly discernable. The key to long-term stability in Afghanistan, he said, was reformation of the country’s corrupt governmental systems. Equally important was building the civilian institutions at the central and subnational levels.

Impact – Regional Conflict

Collapse of Afghanistan collapses central Asia

**Akbulut 7** (Isis. Afghan Profile, July 19 2007 http://afghanprofile.net/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=163&Itemid=27)IM

Apart from Pakistan, Afghanistan is a key country for the Central Asia as well. Uzbeks, Tajiks and other societies are widespread in Afghanistan, and the changes in this country would inevitably affect the neighboring Muslim Central Asian republics. Besides most of Central Asian republics, especially Uzbekistan would not be able to resist the extremist and radical movements in Afghanistan. Under these circumstances, there is the risk that Afghanistan’s problems would spread not only on the direction of Southern Asia but also to Central Asia. In addition to Pakistan and Central Asia, the failure of the reforms and moderate groups in Afghanistan will add another Palestine, Iraq or Chechnya issue for the Muslim world. All these problems increased the victimization feeling of the Muslims and deepened the mistrust between Muslims and the West by luring many Muslims to the extremist ideas. In another word, if the world cannot solve the Afghanistan problem, Afghanistan will spread all over the world.

That leads to nuclear conflicts

**Starr** **1** (S. Frederick, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Dec 13 2001, http://www.cacianalyst.org/Publications/Starr\_Testimony.htm)IM

There exists a fundamental misunderstanding about the relationship of Central Asian states (and Russia, for that matter) to the war on terrorism. We hear about their cooperation with the US, as if they are doing us a favor that should be rewarded. Nothing could be further from the truth. For a decade, the Central Asian states have faced the threat of Islamic radicalism, terrorism, and drug trafficking, with which the first two are closely linked. All of the Central Asian states have identified these issues as their main security threat, and Afghanistan as the locus of that threat. So has Russia, which has used the issue to justify the stationing of troops in four of the five countries of the region. To address this threat, Central Asian governments have arrested countless suspects, abrogating the civil rights of many who are doubtless innocent. All of the countries have resorted to the same primitive policies, the differences among them being only of degree, not of kind. Some commentators have argued that these measures are largely responsible for the growth of terrorism in the first place. There is some truth in this, but we must be careful in levying this charge. When we demand that Messers, Musharraf, Arafat, or Mubarrak crack down hard on jihhadist groups, Palestinian terrorists, or Muslim brotherhoods, are we not asking them to do exactly what we criticize Central Asian governments for doing? Americans bridle when our critics abroad blame September 11 on the US actions, yet we come close to doing the same thing with respect to the Central Asians. Both the Central Asians and the Russians, who have claimed a special role in the region, have been notably unsuccessful in their campaigns against terrorism. But now the situation is changing, thanks to the United States. We are risking American soldiers lives and expending billions of our citizens resources to address a threat that hangs over their countries as much as ours. The fact that we have our own interests at heart in no way qualifies this truth. Early signs of progress in the war on terrorism already exceed what has been accomplished locally in a decade. And so let us cease all talk of some payment owed Central Asians (or Russians) for their cooperation. If anything, it is they who should thank us. However, this does not mean that US actions are without risk to the Central Asian states. Quite the contrary. For a decade they have faced not only the dangers arising from Afghanistan but also the constant threat posed by certain groups in Russia, notably the military and security forces, who are not yet reconciled to the loss of empire. This imperial hangover is not unique to Russia. France exhibited the same tendencies in Algeria, the Spanish in Cuba and Chile, and the British when they burned the White House in 1812. This imperial hangover will eventually pass, but for the time being it remains a threat. It means that the Central Asians, after cooperating with the US, will inevitably face redoubled pressure from Russia if we leave abruptly and without attending to the long-term security needs of the region. That we have looked kindly into Mr. Putin’s soul does not change this reality. The Central Asians face a similar danger with respect to our efforts in Afghanistan. Some Americans hold that we should destroy Bin Laden, Al Queda, and the Taliban and then leave the post-war stabilization and reconstruction to others. Such a course runs the danger of condemning all Central Asia to further waves of instability from the South. But in the next round it will not only be Russia that is tempted to throw its weight around in the region but possibly China, or even Iran or India. All have as much right to claim Central Asia as their backyard as Russia has had until now. Central Asia may be a distant region but when these nuclear powers begin bumping heads there it will create terrifying threats to world peace that the U.S. cannot ignore.

Impact – Regional Conflict

Promoting long-term stability in Afghanistan defeats extremist forces and prevents instability in the region

**Speedie 9** (David, Carnegie Council – The Voice for Ethics in International Affairs, Aug. 17 2009, http://www.cceia.org/resources/articles\_papers\_reports/0028.html)IM

The United States/NATO and Russia have(has) clear and urgent common interests in promoting long-term stability in Afghanistan. These include containing and defeating "radical extremist" forces, reversing the noxious effects of the opium trade from that country, and preventing instability in Afghanistan from impacting an extended region. Despite these shared interests, cooperation between Russia and the West is "episodic," rather than strategic or systematic. Afghanistan must be seen, not in isolation, but in a broader regional (Central Asian) context. This is true both in terms of the importance of the region (strategic location, energy resources) and of the formidable challenges (instability, economic reversals). Russia and the West both see advantages and interests to be protected (thus the recent competition for a military presence in the otherwise marginal Kyrgyzstan), but should avoid a new "Great Game" of promoting self-interest over shared concerns. Afghanistan is now, as one paper writer states, "Obama's War." From campaign pledge to return to the "right" war, the President has: appointed new military and diplomatic leadership in Kabul, including a special envoy; invested in an enhanced troop presence; and made strenuous, if incomplete, efforts to drum up international support for the military and reconstruction effort in Afghanistan.

Conflict in the Middle East escalates and goes nuclear

Steinbach **2** (John, Hiroshima/Nagasaki Peace Committee, March 2002, http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.03/0331steinbachisraeli.htm)IM

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum (and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major (if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon - for whatever reason - the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration." (44).

Impact – Regional Conflict

An unstable Afghanistan leads to central Asian instability and war and terrorism

**Kalburov 9** (Ivan, Move One, Nov. 25 2009, http://www.moveoneinc.com/blog/asia/instability-may-spread-from-afghanistan-to-central-asia/)IM

Analysts forecast instability can spread from Afghanistan to other states in central Asia. The landlocked war-torn Afghanistan heavily depends on deliveries through its neighbors for all kinds of supplies. We already wrote about the difficulties in transporting goods in the country, but if the insurgents stretch beyond its borders, it will become even more difficult for logistics companies to supply Afghanistan with products and equipment. As the long-lasting post-Soviet crisis is being further fueled by the current economic one, social problems are starting to create fertile ground for radical religious movements such as the one in Afghanistan. Afghanistan’s Taliban may seek to establish a foothold in ex-Soviet Central Asia to recruit supporters and disrupt supplies for U.S. troops in Afghanistan, regional security officials said Tuesday. Former Soviet republics Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan act as transit nations for U.S. Afghan supplies and all but Kazakhstan have reported armed clashes with Islamists this year. In the past year, the Taliban insurgency has spread to parts of northern Afghanistan that had long been relatively peaceful, even as violence raged in the south and east of the country. ‘The deteriorating situation in northern Afghanistan enables the Taliban to spread their influence in that region, giving international terrorists more opportunities to infiltrate the territory of Central Asian states,’ Mikhail Melikhov, a senior official at the Common Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), told a conference in the Kyrgyz capital Bishkek. CSTO, dominated by Russia, is a defense bloc of ex-Soviet republics. Marat Imankulov, the head of the anti-terrorist center of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), another post-Soviet bloc that focuses on economic and political ties, said security risks were compounded by the economic downturn. ‘Frankly speaking, the economic crisis in the CIS countries is turning into a social one,’ he told the conference. ‘We cannot avoid talking about the growing risks of extremist and terrorist activities.’ Imankulov said some security analysts expected the Taliban to try destabilizing Central Asian states ‘to disrupt equipment and food supply channels for coalition forces.’

Impact – Regional Conflict

Continued political instability will lead to widespread regional conflict

**Altman 10** (Alexander, RIA Novosti, Apr. 2 2010, http://en.rian.ru/world/20100204/157769505.html)IM

The rapidly deteriorating situation in Afghanistan creates security risks for bordering Central Asian states, the head of the Russian-led Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) said on Thursday. "We don't predict any military conflict in CSTO member-states any time soon," Nikolai Bordyuzha said in an interview with a Tajik newspaper. "However, the situation in Afghanistan, which borders on CSTO members Tajikistan and Uzbekistan is, I repeat, very strained and dangerous," he said. The CSTO also includes Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. Russia's security strategy until 2020 envisions the CSTO as "a key mechanism to counter regional military challenges and threats." Russia backed the 2001 U.S.-led military operation in Afghanistan to topple the radical Islamic Taliban. But in the past few years, Russia has grown increasingly alarmed about political instability in Afghanistan, where the Taliban has regained influence, defying in the process the Western-backed government and the presence of a powerful international force. Continued political instability in Afghanistan will undoubtedly spread, through insurgents, to the entire region. The Kremlin says that apart from the renewed threat from radical Islam, instability in Afghanistan has led to the sharp growth of heroin production in the country, trafficked to the West through the ex-Soviet Central Asian states and Russia. The Kremlin has described the growth of heroin use in Russia as a national security threat. Russia has vowed to assist U.S. President Barack Obama in tackling the Afghanistan problem and has allowed the transit of NATO military goods through its territory. But Moscow insists that military efforts cannot stabilize Afghanistan. "Only political measures can solve conflicts," Bordyuzha said. Bordyuzha said the lack of cooperation between the CSTO and NATO has hampered efforts to reduce regional threats arising from Afghanistan's instability. "We have repeatedly offered to set up cooperation on drug trafficking and anti-terrorism issues in Afghanistan," Bordyuzha said. "We hope that after the recent change of leadership in the alliance, Brussels will take a fresh look at CSTO-NATO relations."

Impact – Terrorism

Instability leads to terrorism – bad for Pakistan

**Pak Tribune 10** (June 9 2010, http://www.paktribune.com/news/index.shtml?228400)IM

He said that Pakistan, like other CICA member countries is deeply concerned on the continued instability in Afghanistan. We have(has) been closely working with Turkey and other partner countries for peace, stability and re-construction in Afghanistan. We support President Hamid Karzai’s initiative of national reconciliation and re-integration. Pakistan has high stakes in peace and stability in Afghanistan, as it would facilitate early return of 3.5 million Afghan refugees to their homeland in honor and dignity, further instability in Afghanistan would foster increased levels of terrorism. He further said that Terrorism remains the paramount security threat confronting the world today. As a neighbor of Afghanistan, Pakistan has been in the forefront of the fight against terrorism. We have suffered enormous losses both in human lives and material, which include more than 2500 security personnel and 10,000 civilians. Economic losses exceed US$ 40 billion. We even lost our most charismatic and popular leader, former Prime Minister Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto to a terrorist’s bullet. All this has not dented our resolve. If anything, it has led to a national consensus in Pakistan that we must root out terrorism from our territory and the region at large. We are determined to pursue the terrorists to the very end. We are pursuing a 3Ds strategy (Dialogue, Development and Deterrence) to eradicate terrorism from our land. The law enforcement operations in Swat, South Waziristan, Bajaur, and Mahmand agencies have met great success, FM pointed.

The lack of reforms is trapping US troops and aiding the Taliban

**Reuters 10** (Apr. 28 2010, http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/N28216948.htm)IM

WASHINGTON, April 28 (Reuters) - The U.S. military believes only a quarter of Afghans in key areas support President Hamid Karzai's government and that political will to tackle corruption "remains doubtful," according to a Pentagon assessment released on Wednesday. The 152-page Pentagon report to Congress underscores the extent of concerns about Karzai's ability to prove himself a viable partner to NATO efforts to turn the tide in more than eight-year-old conflict. It also comes just ahead of Karzai's May 10-14 visit to Washington, where he will meet U.S. President Barack Obama and likely attempt to soothe concerns about the effectiveness of a costly deployment of 30,000 additional U.S. forces. "While Afghanistan has achieved some progress on anti-corruption, particular with regard to legal and institutional reforms, real change remains elusive and political will, in particular, remains doubtful," it said. It warned that public perceptions of the government on corruption are "decidedly negative," and that blame extended to both international forces and the international community. The report said the population only supports Karzai's government in 29 of the 121 Afghan districts considered most strategically important in the war effort. "Perceptions of corruption within the Afghan government, the inability of the government to provide essential services, and exploitative behavior of some government officials and (Afghan security forces) are contributing to the success of the insurgents' campaign," it said, “and creating more need of American troops.”

Terrorism leads to extinction

**Sid-Ahmed 4** (Al-Ahram Mohamed, Weekly political analyst August 26 2004, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)IM

What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Impact – Terrorism

Government instability will collapse the country – the Taliban will gain power

**LA Times 10** (Jan. 4 2010, http://www.gazette.com/articles/worries-91758-afghanistan-government.html)IM

KABUL — U.S. forces in Afghanistan suffered their first combat deaths of the new year, the military report Monday, with four troops killed a day earlier in the country’s violent south. The battlefield losses came as Afghan President Hamid Karzai faced a fresh political confrontation, ordering parliament to put off its winter recess and vote on a new Cabinet lineup as soon as this weekend. On Saturday, lawmakers defied the president by rejecting two-thirds of his Cabinet picks. Western officials are worried about the weakness of the Karzai government as the Obama administration embarks on a troop buildup that will nearly double the American military presence in Afghanistan. The Afghan leader is also under pressure to form a government before a major conference of international donors in London beginning Jan. 28. As the first of 30,000 new U.S. troops begin flowing into the country, adding to some 68,000 already deployed here, Western commanders have warned that a commensurate increase in casualties is likely. That is in part because the additional American forces will push into parts of the country that were previously under the sway of the Taliban and other insurgents. In 2010’s first reported battlefield deaths, military officials said four American troops had been killed in a roadside bomb in the south. A British soldier was also killed in a separate explosion. Roadside bombs are the No. 1 killer of Western forces in Afghanistan, and have become the signature weapon of the Taliban and other insurgents. Multiple fatalities in a single incident, such as the strike that killed the four Americans, have become commonplace, because members of the Taliban are using larger and more powerful improvised explosive devices, or IEDs, capable of destroying armored vehicles and killing most or all of those inside. The military did not reveal the location of the latest U.S. deaths, but most Americans in the south are based in Helmand and Kandahar provinces, where the Taliban movement is the strongest. Those provinces are also a center of Afghanistan’s drug trade, which has close links to the insurgency. Most of the arriving reinforcements are to be deployed in the south, where thousands of U.S. Marines have been trying to secure a key swath of the Helmand River valley. Other U.S. troops are working to quell a rising insurgent presence around the city of Kandahar, the Taliban’s spiritual center. Fighting also has flared recently in Afghanistan’s north, where the insurgency has strengthened in recent months. Afghanistan’s Defense Ministry said at least 10 Taliban fighters were killed in a clash Sunday with Afghan troops. The Western war effort has been complicated by months of political paralysis, and the deadlock may deepen in coming days. While parliament’s weekend rejection of 17 of Karzai’s 24 Cabinet choices was seen in some quarters as a welcome display of independence on lawmakers’ part, it has also left the government barely functioning. Setting the stage for a potential showdown, senior aides to Karzai suggested that the president may put forth some of the same Cabinet nominees when the issue comes up for a second vote. Among those rejected was Ismail Khan, a powerful warlord who is the incumbent minister of energy. The support of a number of onetime militia leaders such as Khan helped Karzai win a second term in office, though the August election was clouded by massive fraud. While Karzai was eventually declared the winner, international auditors stripped him of nearly a million votes, depriving him of the clear mandate he had sought. If Karzai is able to strong-arm his Cabinet choices through parliament, it may add to widespread public disillusionment over corruption and inefficiency in the government. But a new political defeat for the president could open the door to prolonged infighting that could render his government completely useless, opening the door for the Taliban to control the country.

**Impact – Terrorism**

Corruption in Afghanistan collapses rule of law – that leads to instability and a Taliban takeover

Nelson 9 (Soraya, National Public Radio, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=121825564)JFS

Ask people in Afghanistan about justice and they'll most likely tell you there isn't any.

Laws in Afghanistan are often not enforced, especially if the offender is rich or powerful. The courts are a confusing maze in which justice is dispensed at a glacial pace. Often, the outcomes are determined by bribes. The U.S. and its allies have pledged to rebuild Afghanistan. But the coalition has lagged in its efforts to develop the rule of law — and ignoring the lack of justice is proving a costly mistake. … Afghan Supreme Court Justice Abdul Malik Kamawi is not surprised by such allegations. He says his government and its Western allies need to work a lot harder on tackling corruption in the justice sector, training court officers and paying judges livable wages. "If we don't improve justice, especially when it comes to property issues, the result will be chaos and insecurity that could ultimately lead to anarchy," he says. The Taliban has certainly used the lack of rule of law to strengthen its standing with Afghans in a growing number of districts. Militants who are trained in Islamic law hold mobile courts in homes, mosques and gardens. Reached by phone, a Taliban spokesman who goes by the name Qari Yousef Ahmadi says Afghans prefer his group's brand of Islamic justice because they don't trust the Karzai government to do anything but fill its pockets.

Impact – Taliban

The Taliban currently has the technology to create undetectable IEDs – this is crucial to the amount of casualties in the Middle East

DMG 10 (Dawn Media Group, 2/9/10, http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/07-taliban-develop-new-bomb-called-omar-ha-06) GAT

The biggest killer of Western troops in Afghanistan are home-made bombs, known as improvised explosive devices or IEDs, which the Taliban deploy to wide effect in their eight-year insurgency and detonate by remote control. Western military intelligence officials have said most foreign troop deaths, which hit a record 520 last year, are caused by IEDs. But the Taliban claimed – ahead of a major assault by foreign troops on the southern Taliban stronghold of Helmand province – to have created a new IED using materials that make them undetectable. The network’s spokesman, who identified himself as Yousuf Ahmadi, said the new bomb had been named after Taliban leader Mullah Mohammad Omar Mujahed, believed to be based in Pakistan. “Omar is our latest weapon in the war against the invaders,” he told AFP by telephone from an undisclosed location. “It’s a very effective bomb, it can’t be detected by mine-sweeping vehicles and it causes more deaths,” he said. He refused to provide more details, saying “it’s our military secret” but added that each Omar cost around 100 dollars to make. “With a 100-dollar mine we are able to destroy the enemy’s multi-million-dollar anti-mine vehicles,” he claimed, referring to heavily armoured vehicles used in Afghanistan by US and other NATO troops. Ahamdi charged the “Omar bomb” had already been used in attacks on Western forces, but his claim could not be verified immediately. Around 113,000 foreign troops are deployed to Afghanistan under US and NATO command fighting a Taliban insurgency that increasingly relies on IEDs and suicide bomb attacks as its tactics have morphed into guerrilla warfare. So far this year 62 foreign soldiers have died in the Afghan theatre, according to an AFP tally based on the independent icasualties.org website.

Impact – Nuclear War

Afghan stability is key to prevent instability in Pakistan and nuclear conflict

**Indian Express 9** (Oct 27 2009, http://www.indianexpress.com/news/afghan-instability-increases-risk-of-conflag/533860/)IM

Asserting that the Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden and his deputies are in Northwest Pakistan, a top American Senator has said that instability in Afghanistan is too dangerous for nuclear-armed Pakistan as the world cannot afford turbulence there. "While stabilising Afghanistan is not going to solve all of our problems in Afghanistan, I understand that instability in Afghanistan only increases the risk of conflagration where the world can least afford it, next door in Pakistan," Senator John Kerry said in a speech at the Council on Foreign Relations, a Washington-based think-tank. "That's why, regardless of what happens in Afghanistan, and especially if we want to reduce the needs for additional boots on the ground over the long-haul, it is vitally important that we support, that we intensify even, our support and improve our cooperation with Pakistan," said Kerry, who is chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Kerry, who has just returned from Afghanistan and Pakistan, said the decisions made and actions taken in the weeks and months ahead will be what really gives meaning to that moment and definition to the future of both the countries. Observing that what happens inside Afghanistan is important to US's strategic interests, Kerry said: "our goals and our mission do not end at Afghanistan's borders. No front is more important in our fight against international terrorism than nuclear-armed Pakistan, and the chaos next door in Afghanistan would have enormous repercussions there." Emphasising that bringing stability in Afghanistan and Pakistan is not the job of the United States alone, Kerry said: "The United States cannot do it alone. We want all nations to trade and invest in Afghanistan but we also want all nations to help with stabilising the country, including the cooperation of President Karzai."

Impact – Dehum

Rising instability and Taliban attacks are preventing humanitarian efforts, which are key to livable conditions

**HSRP 9** (Human Security Report Project, July 22 2009, http://www.afghanconflictmonitor.org/2009/07/instability-threatens-humanitarian-assistance-.html)IM

"Instability continues to threaten humanitarian assistance with NGOs involved in 75 security incidents within this 6 month period. These include ten fatalities and 29 abductions within an increasing number of violent attacks initiated by Armed Opposition Groups. The motives have included influencing the organizations activity, settling personal grievances, fatal mistakes of identity and pure bad luck. The total volume of incidents is consistent within the same period of 2008 and, although the most serious consequences - death and abduction - are slightly reduced new forms of risk, such as roadside IED and IMF airstrikes, are emerging as notable threats to NGO operations. The profile of NGO abductions appears to be changing, with fewer victims being held for significant periods, while the fact that all abductions and fatalities are Afghan nationals this year may be indicating 'risk transfer'. Relocating staff and resources out of conflict areas remains the dominant response strategy although incident mapping reveals an ongoing NGO presence in practically all areas of the country. Conflict metrics are following a familiar annual pattern with a 65% growth in AOG initiated attacks over the 2008 Q.2 period, predominantly in the close range and indirect fire attack classes, and the number of operations utilizing multiple suicide devices for 'spectacular-effect' is increasing." This is forcing a decreased effectiveness of such organizations in the country, placing its citizens in ever-worsening conditions, which will soon cease to be livable.

Dehumanization makes nuclear war, genocide and environmental destruction inevitable

Berube 97 (David, prof of speech communication, June/July 1997, Nanotechnology Magazine, http://www.cla.sc.edu/ENGL/faculty/berube/prolong.htm)IM

Assuming we are able to predict who or what are optimized humans, this entire resultant worldview smacks of eugenics and Nazi racial science. This would involve valuing people as means. Moreover, there would always be a superhuman more super than the current ones, humans would never be able to escape their treatment as means to an always further and distant end. This means-ends dispute is at the core of Montagu and Matson's treatise on the dehumanization of humanity. They warn: "its destructive toll is already greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity on record -- and its potential danger to the quality of life and the fabric of civilized society is beyond calculation. For that reason this sickness of the soul might well be called the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse.... Behind the genocide of the holocaust lay a dehumanized thought; beneath the menticide of deviants and dissidents... in the cuckoo's next of America, lies a dehumanized image of man... (Montagu & Matson, 1983, p. xi-xii). While it may never be possible to quantify the impact dehumanizing ethics may have had on humanity, it is safe to conclude the foundations of humanness offer great opportunities which would be foregone. When we calculate the actual losses and the virtual benefits, we approach a nearly inestimable value greater than any tools which we can currently use to measure it. Dehumanization is nuclear war, environmental apocalypse, and international genocide. When people become things, they become dispensable. When people are dispensable, any and every atrocity can be justified. Once justified, they seem to be inevitable for every epoch has evil and dehumanization is evil's most powerful weapon.

Impact – Economy (1/2)

Instability in Afghanistan leads to the collapse of its economy

**Afghan Journal 10** (May 30 2010, http://blogs.reuters.com/afghanistan/2010/05/30/saving-afghanistan-from-its-neighbours/)IM

Afghanistan shares a tiny sliver of border with China, and there have been security concerns over Islamic extremism spilling over into China which is battling an uprising in its predominantly Muslim-majority region of Xinjiang. But analysts say these concerns are overstated and that Beijing’s expanding involvement in Afghanistan is almost entirely driven by commercial interests. It sees Afghanistan as a potential source for mineral resources and energy to feed its vast demand. China is already developing the world’s largest unexplored copper deposits in Logar province and is a bidder for an iron ore project. Stability in Afghanistan is key to its economic interests and unlike the West pushing for democracy, the Chinese would rather have the Afghans choose a type of government based on local culture, customs and domestic conditions. The interests of China are also crucial to Afghanistan’s economic prosperity. It is also content to let all weather ally Pakistan lead the policy to Afghanistan, and has in the past not been overly critical of approaches to the Taliban.

Continued instability in Afghanistan hurts the US economy

**Global Research 9** (Dec. 25 2009, Center for Research on Globalization, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?aid=16646&context=va)IM

If Iraq war spending helped plunge the U.S. economy into its worst slump since the Depression, what does President Obama think his escalation of the Afghan war will do it? Besides forc(e)ing taxpayers to cough up fresh billions to enable the Pentagon to chase down a few hundred Taliban fighters, the Afghan war is liable to continue to inflate oil prices---and this means more than the ongoing swindle of motorists at the pump. Higher oil prices also slow the global economy, causing our trading partners to buy fewer Made-in-USA goods, thus reducing demand for our products and leading to layoffs. Spending money on war also siphons billions of dollars from truly productive uses. “Today, no serious economist holds the view that war is good for the economy,” write Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz and Harvard government finance expert Linda Bilmes in their book “The Three Trillion Dollar War: the True Cost of The Iraq Conflict.” Referring to Iraq, they write, “The question is not whether the economy has been weakened by the war. The question is only by how much.” They note, “Oil prices started to soar just as the war began, and the longer it has dragged on, the higher prices have gone.” Even so, by their estimate (a word they stress), the increased price of oil attributed to the war comes “to somewhat in excess of $1.6 trillion.” Not only consumers but State and local governments “have had to cut back other spending to pay the higher prices of oil imports.” The co-authors reason, “Government money spent in Iraq does not stimulate the economy in the way that the same amounts spent at home would.” A thousand dollars spent to hire a Nepalese worker to perform services in Iraq does not directly increase the income of Americans, Stiglitz and Bilmes point out. Ditto for Afghanistan---and Pakistan, friends. By contrast, the same thousand dollars spent on university research in the U.S. directly boosts the U.S. economy, then ripples out as the university researchers spend their money on goods and services, many of them made in America.

Impact – Economy (2/2)

**Economic decline causes the US to pull back from the international state – leaves a power vacuum that causes nuclear war**

**Friedberg and Schoenfield 8** (profs of politics + int. relt’s @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School, Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.vom/articles/SB122455074012352571.html)IM

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability.

Impact – Laundry List

Reforms to address governmental corruption are key to prevent increased Taliban control, extend US international influence, spread democracy and prevent regional conflicts

**Glevum USA 10** (May 14 2010, www.glevumusa.com/doc/speech\_Succeeding\_in\_Afghanistan-Utah.pdf)IM

Before one can have effective representative Governance, one must first have security and in order to have security the Coalition has to understand that it is battling the Taliban for influence not terrain. The key to the success of the Majar offensive and subsequent such operations, is not to drive out Taliban fighters from these communities but the reduction and eventual elimination of their influence. We can occupy every town and mountaintop and yet fail, if the Taliban can maintain its influence. And they can do this simply by sending a couple of fighters into an area to post night letters and through the killing of a few prominent local leaders. The Taliban understand, what we have failed to understand for too long. That we are both fighting for dominant influence with this contested population, which can then be used to build support for oneself and undermine support for ones enemies. 9 The US-led Coalition must therefore force fundamental top to bottom anti-corruption measures and a robust monitoring system through the President. Token measures from President Karzai will not suffice. And encouragement from President Obama to take steps to end corruption will have little or no impact. However, the reality is that, if we cannot find a way to persuade President Karzai to tackle corruption quickly and decisively, Afghan public support will continue to evaporate and the ranks of the Taliban will swell. Additionally, if we do not demand and support the introduction of comprehensive anti-corruption measures, the Afghan people will increasingly see us as propping up a corrupt and dysfunctional Government. The opinion of the people is critical to maintain the image of US influence, globally, as they display our authority. Perhaps most importantly of all, the Taliban expertly exploit intimidation tactics and violence to bolster or supplement their arguments and inducements. In Ireland, it included summary execution, tar and feathering, and kneecapping; in Afghanistan it is night letters, mutilation and beheadings. Similar tactics designed to achieve the same effect – to cow even a supportive population into accepting them and rejecting their Government and us. It is therefore vital that as well as driving out of a district Taliban fighters; we must also address the reasons why Afghans and particularly Pashtun Afghans are susceptible to the arguments of the Taliban and unwilling to resist their intimidation. Because unless we win this fight for influence with the Afghan people no amount of military force will defeat the Taliban. Corruption touches nearly every aspect of an Afghan’s life, requiring payment to obtain essential services; to acquire passports, permits, licenses, and other official documents; to secure jobs; and to obtain medical attention, to list just a few examples. Many Afghans seem resigned to this situation, even while describing such corruption as un-Islamic and a plague on Afghan society. However, it does magnify hugely their dissatisfaction with their Government and is a main propaganda coup for the Taliban.. While dealing with corruption we also have to deal with Afghanistan’s dysfunctional democracy, by believe it or not providing Afghan’s with more democracy not less. The Afghans want representative governance. They want to choose their own government and they want that government to represent their interests. Establishment of a stable democracy in the region will influence the political situations of surrounding countries. Yet many say they do not see their government as representative and certainly not below the national level. This is because Afghanistan lacks a truly representative form of government below the national level and a dysfunctional form of Governance at the national level, a situation made worse by the recent flawed Presidential election. In my view as part of our strategy for Afghanistan, we must persuade and if necessary force President Karzai and the Afghan parliament to exceed to the devolution of power and governance from Kabul to the lowest levels of Afghan society. The provision for district elections is already in the Afghan constitution and we must insist that the Afghan Government agree to hold district elections within the next two years, if not sooner; an electoral process that we must monitor very closely to ensure its integrity. The collapse of Afghanistan into another decade of civil war would be detrimental to any efforts made toward achieving peace in the Middle East and indeed, would spread rapidly escalating violence throughout the region.

Impact – Collapse

Reforms are key to prevent economic and political collapse

**Transparency International 9** (Nov 17 2009, http://www.earthtimes.org/articles/news/295055,afghanistan-and-somalia-worlds-most-corrupt-states-study-says.html)IM

Berlin - Afghanistan and Somalia, two countries currently embroiled in conflict, are the world's most corrupt nations, according to a study published in Berlin on Tuesday. The annual report by Transparency International (TI), an anti- corruption watchdog, scores 180 countries on the perceived level of public sector corruption. The least corrupt state according to the report in 2009 is New Zealand, closely followed by Denmark and Singapore. "Bribery, cartels and other corrupt practices undermine competition and contribute to massive loss of resources for development in all countries, especially the poorest ones," the report said. TI's methodology relies on surveys of country analysts and business people to determine how corruption operates in everyday life. The group defines corruption as the "abuse of entrusted power for private gain." The report said that a global economic recovery was threatened by corruption, which could reduce the effectiveness of stimulus packages and "fast-track disbursements of public funds". The particularly poor result for Afghanistan, which has failed to improve its score on the TI index since 2008, comes at a time when Western leaders have openly berated President Hamid Karzai for the corruption of his government and the conduct of recent elections there. TI described public sector corruption in Afghanistan as "rampant ... ranging from public posts for sale and justice for a price to daily bribing for basic services." "It affects both individual citizens trying to do things like get passports or driving licences. But also the perception is of widespread political corruption at the top. The only way to fight corruption is to tackle both," Robin Hodess, TI's director of policy and research told the German Press Agency dpa. “Continued conflict and corruption prevent it from embarking on reforms to overcome economic and political collapse," the report said.

Impact – Collapse

Corruption collapses the effectiveness of the police force – that destabilizes

Legon 9 (Andrew, June, Research Analyst for the Foreign Policy Research Institute, http://www.fpri.org/enotes/200906.legon.afghannationalpolice.html)JFS [ANP = Afghan National Police]

It is little wonder, then, that the ANP is regularly deemed ineffective, a problem exacerbated by its members’ role as quasi-soldiers rather than civilian police officers. The ANP has the immense challenge of switching between policing duties and supporting full-scale military operations with very little notice. Conversely, too much police time is wasted on non-core duties such as road construction and maintenance. This may be why the public complains that the police are lazy and remiss in their duties, with calls to the emergency 119 number often going unanswered. This conduct is undoubtedly compounded by narcotic use; British officials estimate that 60 percent of the ANP in Helmand use drugs.

More serious than charges of unprofessionalism, however, the ANP are never far from accusations that they habitually abuse their power, using torture as a means of evidence collection and shaking down houses “like criminals” during home searches.[[3]](http://www.fpri.org/enotes/note3) In September, a reporter from the *Washington Independent* watched as Afghan police in Paktia province attempted to exploit a joint U.S.-Afghan raid on a suspected Taliban safehouse in order to rob the inhabitants.[[4]](http://www.fpri.org/enotes/note4)

Despite efforts to tackle corruption, the ANP is shot through with graft, a problem some American officers have argued is “a bigger threat to the stability of the Afghan government than the Taliban.”[[5]](http://www.fpri.org/enotes/note5) Bribes determine everything from recruitment to assignments and promotion prospects. Payoffs are extracted not only from criminals, drug runners and Taliban, but also the general public, shopkeepers, and even the victims of crime whom the ANP are meant to be protecting.[[6]](http://www.fpri.org/enotes/note6) Corruption is such a lucrative growth industry on Afghanistan’s highways that reports suggest police posts along major transport routes such as Balu Beluk can be sold for $200,000. Newspaper headlines that suggest Afghan truckers seek a return of the Taliban to end corruption may be media hyperbole,[[7]](http://www.fpri.org/enotes/note7) but a 2007 strike over increased taxes and roadside extortion by those transporting goods along Afghanistan’s highways is indicative of deeply troubling developments. Little wonder that widespread sentiment views the ANP as thieves in official uniform. In some instances this is literally the case; a doctor from Ghazni related an incident on the Ghazni Highway during which a bus was robbed by men dressed as Taliban. Subsequently it was discovered that “it was the entire police of that area.” Such corruption is detrimental to the reputation not only of the police, but of the central government more broadly, as the police are one of the most public faces of the state.

Consequently, in June 2008, a U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) study reported that not one Afghan police unit out of 433 was assessed by the Department Defense as fully capable of performing its mission; over three-fourths of them were assessed at the lowest capability rating.[[8]](http://www.fpri.org/enotes/note8) Clearly a new approach to the ANP is long overdue.

Impact – Feminism (1/2)

We should pull out of Afghanistan only if there is a stable governmental system in place – this prevents Taliban takeover and thus stops the oppression of Afghan women

Petrou 6/18 (Michael, foreign correspondent for Maclean’s news, http://www2.macleans.ca/2010/06/18/meet-one-of-afghanistan’s-most-influential-women/) GAT

Fatima Gailani, president of the Afghan Red Crescent Society, remembers the last time Afghanistan was abandoned. She was a young activist in exile and spokesperson for the anti-Soviet mujahideen during the Russian occupation. Her father, Pir Sayed Ahmad Gailani, founded the National Islamic Front of Afghanistan, a political party that helped funnel CIA-funded weapons to Afghans fighting the Soviets. “During the Cold War, Afghanistan was the star of the stars,” she tells Maclean’s during a recent visit to Ottawa. “Then, as soon as the last Russian soldiers got out of Afghanistan, we looked left and right, and we didn’t see anyone around to help us. Only a few NGOs.” The September 11th attacks and the subsequent American-led overthrow of the Taliban refocused the world’s attention on Afghanistan, and, despite the frustrations that have come with the Taliban’s resurgence and the ongoing war, Gailani says Afghans have benefited from it. “For the people of Afghanistan, this is still better than what they had,” she says. “When I talk to my colleagues [about their lives before Western intervention], they say they virtually didn’t have a tomorrow. They didn’t know if a rocket would land on their house, if the school would be standing tomorrow, how many people in the house would be alive. If they compare today with what they had 10 years ago, they are still happy. You would be surprised.” Gailani is now one of Afghanistan’s most influential women. She attended the Bonne Conference on Afghanistan in 2001, was a delegate to the 2002 Loya Jirga, and took part in drafting the 2004 constitution. Most recently, she was invited to join the “peace jirga” conference President Hamid Karzai convened this month to seek support for his efforts to negotiate an end to the Taliban’s insurgency. The Taliban have so far shown little interest in a deal. They rocketed the conference and say they won’t talk until all foreign troops leave. Karzai, however, is committed to reconciliation with the Taliban—motivated, surely, by the inability of his government and its foreign backers to defeat them militarily. Gailani worries what political accommodation with the Taliban will mean for Afghan women, who, during Taliban rule, were forbidden to work, attend school, or leave the house wearing anything other than an all-concealing burqa. “We, the women of Afghanistan, are the most vulnerable people in this situation,” she says. “When you go to the negotiating table, I would like to know if my future is your bargaining chip. Are you going to compromise on my future, on the schooling of my daughters, my work, freedom of the press, things that are so valuable to me? We have achieved a lot. I don’t want to lose it.” Gailani says foreign troops should leave Afghanistan—but not yet. The police, the military and civil society are still in “shambles,” she says. If foreign troops go now, the country risks collapse. Foreigners, however, can’t fight for Afghanistan forever, she says. “We will never have a safe Afghanistan unless our forces are capable of guarding their own country. The army of Afghanistan needs to be rebuilt. It needs to be trained. Not just how to fight and how to protect, but the ethics of soldiering. We have to learn to be human with the people in our hands.”

Impact – Feminism (2/2)

Creating an inequality between women and men is equivalent to ignoring women’s very humanity

Bunch and Frost 2K (Charlotte and Samantha, Exec. Director of Center of Women’s Global Leadership, Assoc. Prof. of Poli. Sci. at Univ. of Illinois, http://www.cwgl.rutgers.edu/globalcenter/whr.html) GAT

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights defines human rights as universal, inalienable, and indivisible. In unison, these defining characteristics are tremendously important for women's human rights. The universality of human rights means that human rights apply to every single person by virtue of their humanity; this also means that human rights apply to everyone equally, for everyone is equal in simply being human. In many ways, this universality theme may seem patently obvious, but its egalitarian premise has a radical edge. By invoking the universality of human rights, women have demanded that their very humanity be acknowledged. That acknowledgement and the concomitant recognition of women as bearers of human rights-mandates the incorporation of women and gender perspectives into all of the ideas and institutions that are already committed to the promotion and protection of human rights. The idea that human rights are universal also challenges the contention that the human rights of women can be limited by culturally specific definitions of what count as human rights and of women's role in society.

Subordination of women to men makes global nuclear war inevitable

**Reardon 93** (Betty, Co-founder of Peace Education Program at Columbia, *Women and Peace*, pp. 30-31) GAT

A clearly visible element in the escalating tensions among militarized nations is the macho posturing and the patriarchal ideal of domination, not parity, which motivates defense ministers and government leaders to “strut their stuff” as we watch with increasing horror. Most men in our patriarchal culture are still acting out old patterns that are radically inappropriate for the nuclear age. To prove dominance and control, to distance one’s character from that of women, to survive the toughest violent initiation, to shed the sacred blood of the hero, to collaborate with death in order to hold it at bay all of these patriarchal pressures on men have traditionally reached resolution in ritual fashion on the battlefield. But there is no longer any battlefield. Does anyone seriously believe that if a nuclear power were losing a crucial large-scale conventional war it would refrain from using its nuclear war missiles because of some diplomatic agreement? The military theater of a nuclear exchange today would extend instantly or eventually to all living things, all the air, all the soil, all the water. If we believe that war is a “necessary evil,” that patriarchal assumptions are simply “human nature,” then we are locked into a lie, paralyzed. The ultimate result of unchecked terminal patriarchy will be nuclear holocaust.

Impact – Afghan Perception (1/2)

The Afghan people don’t approve of Karzai’s actions – they perceive him as illegitimate

Galbraith 10 (Peter W., former U.N. representative in Afghanistan, http://host.madison.com/ct/news/opinion/column/article\_03e20f07-d1e8-577d-8934-3446a61e5d6e.html) GAT

President Obama will soon have 100,000 troops fighting a counterinsurgency campaign in Afghanistan. Their success depends on having a credible Afghan partner. Unfortunately, Obama’s partner is Hamid Karzai. In the eight years since the Bush administration helped install Karzai as president after the fall of the Taliban, he has run a government so ineffective that Afghans deride him as being no more than the mayor of Kabul and so corrupt that his country ranks 179th on Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index, just ahead of last-place Somalia, which has no government at all. Afghanistan held a presidential election last August just as Obama was ramping up U.S. support for the war. Although funded by the United States and other Western countries and supported by the United Nations, the elections were massively fraudulent. Afghanistan’s Independent Election Commission -- which, despite its name, is appointed by and answers to Karzai -- oversaw massive vote-rigging in which at least one-third of Karzai’s tally, more than 1 million votes, was fake. A separate, independently appointed Electoral Complaints Commission eventually tossed out enough Karzai votes to force a second round of balloting, but the IEC ensured that the voting procedures were even more prone to fraud than those applied to the first round. Karzai’s main opponent, Abdullah Abdullah, rightly chose not to participate in the second round. Many Afghans understandably do not see Karzai as a democratically elected leader. So America’s Afghan partner suffers from a legitimacy deficit in addition to his track record of ineffectiveness and corruption. Karzai has responded to this legitimacy crisis not by fixing his country’s broken electoral processes but by trying to corrupt it further. Ahead of parliamentary elections due this fall, Karzai promulgated a decree giving himself power to appoint all five members of the Electoral Complaints Commission and stripping the commission of most of its powers. Far from rejecting this outrageous power play, the U.N. mission in Kabul tried to broker a compromise. Fortunately, Afghanistan’s parliament recently rejected  this shameful effort. The parliament’s actions seem to have sent Karzai off the deep end, as his recent remarks show. In contrast to previous assertions that last year’s elections were not fraudulent, Karzai claimed in a speech recently that I orchestrated the deception while serving in Afghanistan: “Foreigners did the fraud. Galbraith did it,” he said. According to Karzai, I stole the election on his behalf so I could embarrass him by leaking word of the fraud to the international media and thus weaken his authority. (The irony, as I wrote in The Washington Post last October, is that I urged my superiors at the United Nations to do something about the fraud, and they not only disagreed but fired me.) Some American supporters have suggested that Karzai is simply playing to the crowd back home. But many Afghans find his behavior as disturbing as Americans do. Abdullah Abdullah, a medical doctor as well as a politician, said in a news conference recently that Karzai’s behavior was “not normal” and criticized him for squandering U.S. support. The White House has rightly expressed concern. Press secretary Robert Gibbs called Karzai’s allegations “simply untrue” and “troubling.” He declined recently to call Karzai an ally and suggested his May 12 visit to Washington might be in jeopardy. The Obama administration should put the United States squarely on the side of democracy in Afghanistan. First, U.S. officials should stop saying, as Gibbs did, that Karzai is in office as a result of legitimate democratic elections. Afghans know that is not true. Afghanistan cannot hold parliamentary elections this fall unless other countries fund them. As Congress considers appropriations for the Afghanistan war, it should attach a rider making any U.S. financial  contribution to the parliamentary elections contingent on Afghanistan establishing genuinely independent election bodies that have no Karzai appointees. As bad as it would be to not hold parliamentary elections, fraudulent elections could plunge Afghanistan into a civil war. U.S. troops can clear Taliban forces from an area. But if the Taliban is to be kept away, U.S. efforts must be followed by Afghan soldiers who can provide security and Afghan police who can provide law and order. Most important, an Afghan government must provide honest administration and win the loyalty of the population. Karzai’s corrupt, ineffective and illegitimate government cannot win the loyalty of the population. U.S. troops do not have the credible Afghan partner that is essential for the success of Obama’s counterinsurgency strategy. And because U.S. troops cannot accomplish their mission in Afghanistan, it is a waste of military resources to have them there. President Obama should halt the surge in Afghanistan and initiate a partial withdrawal -- not as a means to pressure Karzai but because Karzai’s government is incapable of becoming a credible local partner.

Impact – Afghan Perception (2/2)

Improving the perception of the Afghan government is crucial to successful counter-insurgency efforts

Garrigues and Matthews 8(Juan and Robert, Adviser in the Policy Unit for Prime Min. of Spain, Associate Researcher of the Peace and Security Programme at FRIDE, http://www.humansecuritygateway.com/documents/FRIDE\_Afghanistan\_limitsofcounterinsurgency.pdf) GAT

A participant stressed the different mind-set that the military needs in a counter-insurgency environment. Counter-insurgency is not about killing as many insurgents as possible; it is about reducing the insurgency’s influence on the population and therefore it requires a comprehensive process where security is not an end in itself. It is an inter-agency effort, a three-tier battle or a mosaic war, as the US calls it. All PRTs have improved their approach and the US army has become wiser and more flexible, as shown in its December 2006 counter-insurgency document, which states that counter-insurgency is a long term process. Nevertheless, other departments such as USAID and the State Department need to make similar efforts. In counterinsurgency strategy there is also the need to make the distinction between hard-line extremists and local followers in Afghanistan. It was argued that battlefield victories (i.e., the control of Kandahar) had shown that defeating the Taliban is relatively easy. The problem is that local followers are easy to recruit because they are poor and have a negative perception of the central government and of the national police. A young man can be recruited for the price of a packet of cigarettes and a telephone card. There is therefore a need to persuade the local followers to stop fighting and for the international community to start developing a comprehensive “Marshall plan” where soldiers must build as well as fight.

Terrorism results in extinction

Sid-Ahmed 4 (Mohamed, Political Analyst, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm) GAT

We have reached a point in human history where the phenomenon of terrorism has to be completely uprooted, not through persecution and oppression, but by removing the reasons that make particular sections of the world population resort to terrorism. This means that fundamental changes must be brought to the world system itself. The phenomenon of terrorism is even more dangerous than is generally believed. We are in for surprises no less serious than 9/11 and with far more devastating consequences. A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Impact – Time Frame

Now is key to fight corruption – 4 warrants

Chawla et al 10 (Sandeep, Director of Policy Analysis and Public Affairs, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, January 2010)JFS

As one survey respondent rightly pointed out, there is now a unique window of opportunity to break the spiral of corruption. The issue is in the spotlight, there is an unprecedented expression of political will to fight corruption, there are increased expectations among the population, and international partners expect – and are pushing for – demonstrable change. Now is the time to act.

Impact Helper – Taliban Terrorism

Taliban sleeper cells could easily gain access to Pakistani nuclear weapons

Thompson 9 (Mark, Analyst for Time Magazine, http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1893685,00.html) GAT

When asked last year about the security of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal, Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman Admiral Mike Mullen didn't hesitate: "I'm very comfortable that the nuclear weapons in Pakistan are secure," he said flatly. Asked the same question earlier this month, his answer had changed. "I'm reasonably comfortable," he said, "that the nuclear weapons are secure." As America's top military officer, Mullen has traveled regularly to Pakistan — twice in just the past two weeks — for talks with his Pakistani counterpart, General Ashfaq Kayani, and others. And like all those who have risen to four-star rank, Mullen chooses his words with extreme care. Replacing "very comfortable" with "reasonably comfortable" is a decidedly discomforting signal of Washington's concern that no matter how well-guarded the nukes may be today, the [chaos now enveloping Pakistan](http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0%2C8599%2C1893370%2C00.html) doesn't bode well for their status tomorrow or the day after. ([See pictures of the recent militant attack on a Pakistani police academy](http://www.time.com/time/photogallery/0%2C29307%2C1888338%2C00.html)) The prospect of [turmoil in Pakistan](http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0%2C8599%2C1852847%2C00.html) sends shivers up the spines of those U.S. officials charged with keeping tabs on foreign nuclear weapons. Pakistan is thought to possess about 100 — the U.S. isn't sure of the total, and may not know where all of them are. Still, if Pakistan collapses, the U.S. military is primed to enter the country and secure as many of those weapons as it can, according to U.S. officials. The U.S. has been keeping a watchful eye on Pakistan's nukes since it first [detonated a series of devices](http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0%2C9171%2C988383%2C00.html) a decade ago. "Pakistan has taken important steps to safeguard its nuclear weapons, although vulnerabilities still exist," Army General Michael Maples, chief of the Defense Intelligence Agency, told the Senate Armed Services Committee last month. Then, he immediately turned to the threat posed by al-Qaeda, which, along with the Taliban, is sowing unrest in Pakistan. "Al-Qaeda continues efforts to acquire chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear materials," he said, "and would not hesitate to use such weapons if the group develops sufficient capabilities." The concern in Washington is less that al-Qaeda or the Taliban would manage to actually seize Pakistan's nuclear weapons, but instead that increasingly-radicalized younger Pakistanis are finding their way into military and research circles where they may begin to play a growing role in the nation's nuclear-weapons program. Pakistani officials insist their personnel safeguards are stringent, but a sleeper cell could cause big trouble, U.S. officials say. Nowhere in the world is the gap between would-be terror-martyrs and the nuclear weapons they crave as small as it is in Pakistan. Nor is their much comfort in the fact that [Abdul Qadeer Khan](http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0%2C9171%2C1025193%2C00.html), the father of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal who was recently ordered [freed from house arrest](http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0%2C8599%2C1877608%2C00.html) by the country's supreme court, was the Johnny Appleseed of nuclear proliferation, dispatching the atomic genie to Iran, Libya and North Korea. But U.S. and Pakistani officials insist it is important to separate Pakistan's poor proliferation record with what is, by all accounts, a modern and multilayered system designed to protect its nuclear weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

Politics – Link Shield

Success would boost Obama’s political capital – he is personally committed to achieving reforms

**Harvard Business Review 10** (Ben Heineman Jr., Mar. 31 2010, http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2010/03/obamas\_toxic\_management\_dilemm.html)IM

The answer in any business organization is straightforward: you fire the division head. But this is exactly the problem that President Obama is facing in Afghanistan with President Hamid Karzai, and he obviously cannot fire Karzai — who, in addition to all the problems noted above, secured his current term as Afghan President through an election process riddled with fraud. Yet think of the stakes. President Obama has committed the prestige of the United States, his personal credibility, billions of taxpayer dollars and, most importantly, the lives of American military personnel to a war which depends — as his top generals, Petraeus and McChrystal have said — on attaining a key civilian, not military, objective: creating an Afghan state with security, order, rule of law and accountable institutions that protects and serves its people. That goal depends on defeating the corruption and instability which have plagued Afghanistan for centuries. Only when this is achieved will the Afghan populace resist seduction by the Taliban, who exploit government weaknesses and who must be defeated before American troops can be removed from the country. Crucial to that task is the central government itself, which, unfortunately, is not only weak, but is led by an uncooperative and increasingly antagonistic president. Recently, Karzai thumbed his nose at the United States by claiming the right to appoint all five members of the election complaint commission. In early March, he warmly welcomed Iranian President Ahmadinejad to Kabul on an official visit and two weeks later traveled to Tehran where the Iranian leader, as is his custom, launched inflammatory rhetoric against the United States.

\*\*Aff Answers\*\*

**Non-Unique**

**Their cards are powertagged – Karzai admitted no solvency for 5 years, and he’s already implementing reform**

**Daily Mail 9** (David Williams, Nov 21 2009, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1229183/Miliband-Clinton-watch-Karzai-vow-fight-corruption-inauguration--minister-accused-30m-bribe.html)IM

Afghanistan will not be able to control its own security for another five years, Hamid Karzai admitted yesterday as he was sworn in for a second term as the country's leader. His forecast comes under increasing pressure to bring British troops home and Barack Obama set to announce whether the U.S. will send a further 40,000 soldiers to Afghanistan. Mr Karzai used his inauguration speech to spell out his timetable for when Afghan forces would be ready to take over security. He said that beyond the five years foreign troops would need to remain to provide support and training. The inauguration was attended by dignitaries from 40 countries, including Foreign Secretary David Miliband and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. As he was sworn in for his second five-year term, Mr Karzai took the opportunity to portray himself as a unifying force in Afghanistan, insisting he will address the corruption that tainted his first term and re-election. Karzai has come under intense international pressure to clean up his government, and has often bristled at the criticism of corruption levelled at him from Western powers. At his inauguration yesterday, Karzai swore he would prosecute corrupt government officials and end a culture of impunity. After being sworn in to the second five-year term, Karzai said his government was doing whatever it could to implement reforms. Mired in controversy: President Karzai told an audience at the Presidential Palace that Afghanistan will control its own security within five years And he claimed he believed the 'problem of international terrorism' in his country would be overcome. 'We are trying our best to implement social, judicial and administrative reforms in our country,' Karzai said. 'Being a president is a heavy task and we will try our best to honestly fulfil this task in the future.'

Karzai is already addressing corruption in his government

**CNN 9** (Nov. 19 2009, http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/asiapcf/11/19/afghanistan.karzai/index.html)IM

Kabul, Afghanistan (CNN) -- Amid intense international pressure for reform, Afghan President Hamid Karzai vowed to tackle corruption and drug-trafficking in a speech delivered at his inaugural ceremony Thursday. Karzai was sworn in for a second term following a fraud-marred election that questioned his legitimacy. His inauguration also came a day after a report of grave government graft had surfaced. "Corruption is a very dangerous enemy of the state," Karzai told about 800 guests assembled in the fortified presidential palace in the Afghan capital, Kabul. Security was tight throughout the city, fraught with the potential for Taliban attacks on inauguration day. With U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton sitting in the front row, Karzai said he was sorry if he had let his allies down. "I am sorry if I have not fulfilled anything I have promised," he said. "It's not easy to govern this state." The Obama administration, considering sending up to 40,000 more U.S. troops to Afghanistan, has expressed concerns about Karzai's viability and has ratcheted up pressure to end corruption in order to combat an intensifying Taliban insurgency. Clinton reiterated those concerns in a dinner meeting with Karzai on the eve of his inauguration and encouraged him to seize the "clear window of opportunity" before him at a "critical moment" in Afghanistan's history. Clinton's remarks came after The Washington Post reported that a Chinese firm apparently had secured a contract for a big copper extraction project after a government minister accepted a $30 million bribe. The Afghan ministry denied the allegation. "Good governance -- that's what I want," Karzai said. "I want competent ministers who can lead this country." He said government officials who overstep should be prosecuted. He linked graft to Afghanistan's heroin trade. "It is our duty to tackle drug traffickers and punish those people who are cultivating poppies," Karzai said.

**Non-Unique**

Karzai’s current efforts towards creating a more tribe-centric government in Afghanistan are the best option for democracy in that region – reform would only hurt the region

**Ungaro 6/14** (Carlos, former Italian diplomat to Afghanistan, http://www.opendemocracy.net/carlo-ungaro/is-afghan-jirgah-way-forward) GAT

The military intervention in Afghanistan has become one of the longest-lasting war efforts in US history. It does not  look like a coincidence that particularly deadly attacks are being carried out by the Taleban, while the repeated threats of an “all out attack” on Kandahar underlines the Sisyphean nature of NATO’s efforts. These circumstances do not bode well for the success of the recently convened “[Peace Jirgah](http://www.president.gov.af/Contents/88/Documents/1834/resolution_English.htm)”, and yet the idea  deserves close scrutiny and should not be dismissed, out of hand, as yet another failed attempt  by The Afghan Government - with the support of its allies – to embark upon a political path instead of relying mainly on a military venture which shows no signs of  imminent success. My first memory of an Afghan Jirgah dates back to the years of World War II, when, as a child, I was living in Kabul with my parents: the British had issued strong demands that Afghanistan deport all Axis citizens, and close their Diplomatic Missions. A “Loya Jirgah” was convened and, after many days of debate, declared – to our great relief – that this would contravene Afghanistan’s laws of hospitality. A fundamentally important decision had been taken which would guarantee Afghanistan’s neutrality until the Soviet invasion of 1979. The Jirgah has traditionally been an institute of primary importance in the Pathan tribal areas of Pakistan and the Pashtun areas of Afghanistan. Although, traditionally, it gathered only Pashtun tribal elders, in modern times it has been extended also to include representatives of all the other areas. It can be argued, as, indeed it has been argued, that this form of representation is much more suited to the Afghan political reality than a western-style Parliament, no matter how correct the electoral process. Afghanistan, as Pakistan’s North-West, is basically a tribal society, and peaceful coexistence among the tribes cannot be guaranteed by political processes which do not take this reality into account. With the passage of time, the term “democracy” has acquired a rather dogmatic aspect, and is associated with certain particular rituals which have evolved, in the course of centuries, in some western societies, and which have then been applied, with success, also outside Europe and North America. An analysis, even a superficial one, of local interpretations of democracy would be completely out of context in an attempt to examine the Afghan situation, which is of grave and understandable concern, but serious thought ought to be given on how it would be possible to reconcile the need for stability in such a volatile and strategically important area with social and political realities which long predate the current insurgency, and all this without further eroding basic liberties. It is, of course, probable that the Jirgah called by president Karzai will not have immediate, appreciable repercussions in the desired direction, mainly because, rightly or wrongly, the President no longer has the massive backing of the Afghan people, not even in his own tribal area. At the same time, his support among the leading international actors in Afghanistan has also sensibly declined. These circumstances, unfortunately, lend credibility to the accusations that this Jirgah is rigged and that it has been packed with Karzai supporters, thereby depriving it of the dignity essential to its success. A future scenario could, however, be envisaged in which enhanced local autonomy would allow the application of “our” democratic rules in Towns and Provinces ready freely to choose such a solution (Herat comes to mind), while others could choose more traditional methods of local rule. The central Government, instead, with a role more of guidance and coordination rather than dominance or rule, would be more in tune with the traditions of the land. This arrangement has worked in the past, and could be an indication – with the necessary variations – of a way  forward. The calling of Jirgahs, and their composition and competencies should not be left to the arbitrary will of the Head of State, but rather be regulated in a new, bold and imaginative attempt to reconcile respected and valid Afghan traditions to the country’s aspirations to be part of the modern family of nations. Of course, the principal obstacle to any durable, credible negotiated settlement remains the massive and bellicose foreign military presence, whose support of the government is distasteful to many strata of Afghan opinion. The possibility of solutions along the lines suggested by the Jirgah would be greatly enhanced if agreements in that sense would coincide with a publicized, credible and accepted timetable for the withdrawal of the bulk of foreign troops. As things stand, there are few alternative suitable solutions, and recourse to the Jirgah as a convincing instrument of negotiation should not be discarded.

Non-Unique

Karzai is already implementing tough reforms

**King 9** (Laura, LA Times, Nov. 17 2009, http://articles.latimes.com/2009/nov/17/world/fg-afghanistan-corrupt17)IM

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN — Seeking to smooth over a key point of contention in advance of President Hamid Karzai's inauguration this week, senior Afghan officials Monday unveiled what they described as tough new anti-corruption measures. With the Afghan leader poised to be sworn in Thursday for a second five-year term, the West has been putting pressure on Karzai to institute swift reforms or face a loss of international support. Recent days have seen criticism from Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, both of whom suggested that future aid to Karzai's government could be tied to his efforts against corruption. In apparent response to the growing international pressure, Afghanistan's chief justice, interior minister, justice minister, security chief and attorney general appeared at an unusual joint news conference to announce the launch of a major-crime task force and a new anti-corruption unit. The ambassadors to Britain and the United States also attended the briefing, in what appeared to be a gesture aimed at demonstrating solidarity in the anti-corruption fight but also providing an implicit warning to the Karzai camp of the consequences of a failure to act. Karzai's inauguration coincides with debate in the Obama administration over war strategy in Afghanistan, including whether to send in tens of thousands more U.S. troops. Rather than providing a hoped-for mandate for the next Afghan government, the election exacerbated long-simmering anger over the pervasive reach of corruption in public life, extending from the village to the national level. Bribes are routinely extorted for everything, from fixing traffic tickets to awarding lucrative contracts.

Karzai is implementing reforms, the best he can

**AP 10** (Nov. 19 2010, http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/2009/11/19/2009-11-19\_hamid\_karzai\_sworn\_in\_as\_afghan\_president\_vows\_to\_end\_corruption\_that\_marked\_fir.html)IM

KABUL - Afghanistan will control its own security within five years and prosecute corrupt officials, President Hamid Karzai pledged Thursday in an inauguration speech made under intense pressure to shed the cronyism and graft that marked his government's first term. Karzai also said he wanted private Afghan and foreign security companies to stop operating in the country within two years. "We are determined that by the next five years, the Afghan forces are capable of taking the lead in ensuring security and stability across the country," with foreign troops only responsible for support and training, he said. Karzai won this year's fraud-marred presidential election after his main rival, Abdullah Abdullah, pulled out of a runoff, saying it was impossible for the vote to be fair. But in his speech, Karzai sought to portray himself as a unifying force and invited those who ran in the election to work together for the benefit of the country. "I would like to invite all the presidential candidates, including my brother Dr. Abdullah Abdullah, to come together to achieve the important task of national unity, and make our common home, Afghanistan, proud and prosperous," he said. He stopped short, however, of inviting any political rivals into his government. He said a loya jirga, or traditional council of elders, would be called to address the insurgency, but did not set a timeframe. "We will utilize all national and international resources to put an end to war and fratricide," he said. Karzai, who has often bristled at the criticism leveled at him from Western powers, said his government was doing whatever it could to implement reforms. "We are trying our best to implement social, judicial and administrative reforms in our country," he said. "Being a president is a heavy task and we will try our best to honestly fulfill this task in the future."

Karzai committed now

**CBC News 9** (Nov. 3 2009, http://www.cbc.ca/world/story/2009/11/03/karzai-afghan-president-election108.html)IM

Afghan President Hamid Karzai has promised to establish an inclusive government that will banish the corruption that undermined his previous administration. Afghanistan "has a bad name from corruption," the president said. "We will do our best through all possible means to eliminate this dark stain from our clothes." Karzai delivered a speech in Kabul on Tuesday after he was declared victor of his country's presidential election by the Independent Election Commission. Karzai effectively secured a second term when his only contender, Abdullah Abdullah, dropped out of the run-off election on Sunday, alleging the Nov. 7 vote wouldn't have been transparent or fair. The election commission cancelled the run-off on Monday. Karzai has been told by several Western leaders and the UN that he must do more to tackle corruption in the government. But the president has contended that cannot be accomplished by just shuffling officials from his cabinet. The problem of corruption was not certain officials, but inadequate laws and enforcement, Karzai said. "We need to review the law where we have problems, and draft what is needed," he said, adding that an anti-corruption commission created a year ago should also be strengthened.

A2 – Corruption

Corruption in Afghanistan is mostly Western media hype

**Reuters 10** (Peter Graff, Jan 8 2010, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60717B20100108)IM

(Reuters) - A defiant Afghan President Hamid Karzai defended his record on corruption in an interview broadcast on Friday, saying the issue that has damaged his reputation had been "blown out of proportion" by Western media. In the interview, with Qatar-based Al Jazeera television, the Afghan leader said he did not depend on the good opinion of Western leaders, who had sent their troops out of self interest. Repeatedly emphasizing Afghanistan's sovereignty, he said he would not ask for more cash from donors at a conference later this month, but would demand foreign troops stop arresting Afghans, halt night raids and work harder to end civilian deaths. "With the international community, I don't need to have their favor. They are here for a purpose: the fight on terror. And we are working with our purpose, which is the stability and safety of Afghanistan," he said. "The international community, especially the West, they must respect Afghanistan and its government, and understand that we are a people, we are a country, we have a history, we have interests, we have pride, we have dignity," he said. "Our poverty must not become a means of ridicule and insult to us." The issue of corruption has driven a wedge between Karzai and many of the Western leaders who have nearly 110,000 troops in the country fighting a growing Taliban insurgency. Karzai's standing abroad has slid especially since his re-election in August, when a U.N.-backed probe threw out nearly a third of his votes as fake. That forced a second round, which was canceled when Karzai's opponent withdrew. Karzai acknowledged that Afghanistan "like all countries" has problems with graft, but said: "The Western media has blown corruption totally out of all proportion in Afghanistan."

Afghanistan instability has leveled off

**Washington Post 10** (Craig Whitlock, Apr. 29 2010, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/28/AR2010042805747.html)IM

The Afghan government can count on popular support only in a quarter of the main urban areas and other districts that are considered key to winning the war with the Taliban and other insurgents, the Pentagon said in a report delivered to Congress on Wednesday. In the status report on the war in Afghanistan, the Defense Department said that years of rising instability had "leveled off" since January and that the number of Afghans who see their government heading in the right direction has increased. The report stops short of declaring that the tide has turned in a nine-year war in which the Taliban has made a strong comeback since it was toppled from power after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. "Afghanistan has achieved some progress on anti-corruption, particular with regard to legal and institutional reforms” the report stated.

A2 – Corruption

Karzai’s reputation is fine – the international community thinks it is worse than it is

Coburn 9 (Noah, Socio-Cultural Anthropologist at The United States Institute of Peace, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit Post-Election Brief 2, p. 5)JFS

Karzai’s reputation in the communities studied seems to have been much less damaged by the flawed election process than much of the current debate in the international community suggests. With the exception of some Tajiks who originally voted for Karzai but later moved to Abdullah, in general there seemed to be little real movement in opinions about Karzai or his government as a direct result of the election process. Most people originally supporting Karzai maintained their positive opinion of him and those initially opposed to him used the electoral fraud only as further evidence of the problems of his administration.

Much of the criticism was instead directed at Karzai’s political allies. As one voter in Qarabagh stated, “His brother is the leader of all smugglers and his first assistant is the leader of the mafia in Afghanistan.” Another added, “A group of traitors, smugglers, mafia and robbers are leading Afghanistan and now the destiny of the country is in their hands.” Karzai was also criticised for his relationship with the international community, particularly for not responding more strongly to issues such as civilian casualties and for some of his criticisms of conservative religious leaders, which many believe is done at the behest of the international community: “If Karzai follows his previous strategy of not bringing foreign soldiers to justice for killing innocent Afghans and calling legitimate religious scholars Al Qaeda, his government will weaken.”

Others, particularly in Dasht-i Barchi, maintained a positive opinion of Karzai and his government. He was particularly praised for bringing some degree of stability and economic growth to the country, and for preventing ethnic conflict. As one man stated, “Most people voted for Karzai because he is the symbol of unification among the ethnicities of Afghanistan...he is the only person who can bring peace and security in Afghanistan because he is in touch with all the ethnicities.”

A2 – Terrorism

Pressuring Karzai to reform gives strength to the Taliban and increases terrorism

Munir 10 (Manzer, Agora Vox, Pakistanis For Peace, http://www.agoravox.com/news/international/article/hamid-karzai-is-losing-all-his-11440)JFS

Kabul, Afghanistan- President Hamid Karzai’s troubling remarks this past Saturday that he would join the Taliban if he continues to come under pressure to reform by the United States and other “outsiders” has caused a stir in Washington DC. Karzai’s comments came a week after President Obama’s surprise visit to Afghanistan at the end of March to pressure Karzai’s government to reform the political system, end corruption, and do a better job of fighting the Taliban. Instead, what Karza delivered was a threat of the worse kind and quite possibly the most offensive and troubling thing one can say to a country that is risking countless soldiers lives daily to secure the country from the Taliban and other militant warlords in Afghanistan. In 8 short years, Hamid Karzai has gone from being the special guest of honor at George Bush’s State of the Union address to a leader who threatened to join our worst enemy. All because he feels that the US needs to stop badgering him to be a more responsible, fair, and an equitable leader as well as an effective partner in fighting the Taliban. Karzai apparently made these unusual comments at a closed door meeting of lawmakers on Saturday, just days after accusing “foreigners” presumably the Unites States of being behind the fraud of the disputed elections of 2009. “He said that if I come under foreign pressure, I might join the Taliban”, said Farooq Marenai, a lawmaker from the eastern province of Nangarhar. Mareni also stated that Karzai appeared nervous and demanded to know why parliament last week rejected legal reforms that would have strengthened Karzai’s authority over the country’s electoral institutions. Several other lawmakers confirmed that Karzai twice threatened to join the insurgency and the Taliban. Karzai’s comments are troubling on many levels. First and foremost, he gives legitimacy and strength to the Taliban as his comments present the Taliban as an alternative option to American support or view on the situation. Karzai’s statement will no doubt have traveled the length and breadth of Afghanistan as word will spread that there is a weakness in the American-Afghan coalition that has been fighting and hunting the Taliban since October of 2001, post 9-11. The remarks by Karzai also puts every American, NATO, and Pakistani soldiers as instead of liberators, the foreign armies would be thought of as invaders, literally overnight. Lastly, Karzai’s remarks prove to the fact that Karzai is no longer an ally nor a credible partner for the US , NATO, and Pakistani army fighting with the Taliban with all their might.

**A2 – Reform Solvency**

Electoral reform can’t solve legitimacy – it’s about outcomes of Karzai’s government, not the process

Coburn 9 (Noah, Socio-Cultural Anthropologist at The United States Institute of Peace, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit Post-Election Brief 2, p. 3)JFS

“Legitimacy” has often been discussed in the Afghan and international press in the context of these elections, but these discussions often include blanket-statements about Afghan voter opinion that miss some of the nuance found in respondents’ descriptions of their perceptions of government. As many interviewees pointed out, legitimacy for most voters is about having trust in the government and the satisfaction of certain expectations. The legitimacy of the elections were not as damaged by accusations of fraud as some have concluded because legitimacy for many Afghans is more about outcomes than processes, and the legitimacy of Karzai’s new government is based more on what he will now deliver than how he came into office. It was uncommon for interviewees to use the formal Dari word for legitimacy, *mashroyat*, in their criticisms of the government or the elections. Instead, a much more used phrase was *baa atebaar*, “with trust.” Those critical of the election process often said they had “lost trust” in Karzai and his government. … Across interviews, legitimacy was perceived to derive mostly from the meeting of voter expectations. Those with higher expectations and those who thought Abdullah and his supporters should ultimately have been given a firmer place in the government tended to state that they had lost trust in the government and elections more generally over the past several months. For most voters, however, the greatest concern was security, and they tended to voice support for any government that could provide it, regardless of the flaws in the democratic process. As a teacher at Kabul University said, “Ordinary people do not consider matters of legitimacy and whether the election process is transparent; the things that are most important for them are peace, security and jobs.” Another man believed, “Democracy is second to the needs of the people. First there should be security and an improvement of people’s economic situation, then democracy can be practiced.”

Hopes of a free election in Afghanistan are idealist – the status quo is fine

Coburn 9 (Noah, Socio-Cultural Anthropologist at The United States Institute of Peace, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit Post-Election Brief 2, p. 3)JFS

Other respondents said that international expectations for a free and transparent election in an unstable country with a population that has limited experience of elections were unrealistic. From the start of the process, Afghan observers generally had much lower expectations than the international community. As one community leader said, “I accept that there has been fraud and people’s votes were not respected and candidates were disgraced, but still this situation and the government is much better than the past governments we have experienced in this country.” Another man added, “Thirty years of destruction cannot be reconstructed in eight years,” a sentiment typical of Karzai supporters.

A2 – Reform Solvency

Your impacts are not the result of corruption – it’s a question of cultural difference between America and Afghanistan

Eland 9 (Ivan, December, LA Progressive, http://www.laprogressive.com/the-middle-east/more-corruption-is-needed-in-afghanistan/)JFS

One of the reasons why most counterinsurgency campaigns fail is that they’re run by foreign occupiers who don’t know the culture of the invaded country. This usual cultural ignorance, latent for eight years of the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan, came into sharp focus during the recent election campaign. The American foreign policy elite blanched at the massive fraud allowing President Hamid Karzai to win a second term handily. The election fraud then led to a thorough examination by the American media of Afghanistan’s corrupt government and questions about whether such a venal government could ever win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. Of course, the implication was that it couldn’t and that the U.S. war effort, attached to this sinking anchor, would ultimately fail. Odds are that the U.S. war effort will ultimately fail, not primarily because of a tainted election or a corrupt government—but because the U.S. elite and ordinary Afghans have such different worldviews that they might as well live on different planets. Two things that Afghans have gotten used to in the last 200 years are wars caused by foreign occupiers and corruption from their own rulers. The impact of the fraudulent election, as an example of the latter, probably has not disillusioned Afghans as much as it has Westerners. That is because in Afghan culture, elections and majority rule don’t have that much legitimacy anyway. People in Afghanistan usually solve their political issues by inviting tribal leaders and warlords to a grand assembly called a loya jirga. Rather than majority rule governing, a consensus is hammered out. Furthermore, what is considered corrupt in Western countries is just good clean fun in Afghanistan. In the West, to soothe our consciences, our leaders disguise fighting for loot, territory, influence, or national interest in terms of high national principle (peacekeeping, nation-building, spreading democracy, etc.), and then people actually start believing the malarkey. In Afghanistan, fighters who switch sides for money may seem corrupt to the Western eye, but may be more honest with themselves than are Westerners. Because of this vast cultural divide, the United States should realize that a foreign occupier can never really win hearts and minds in Afghanistan. Afghan factions loyal to the U.S. will only be so until the cash or in-kind payments run out. Thus, the Obama administration needs to realize that it probably can never bring about long-term stability in Afghanistan—which should have been obvious since the Russians, Soviets, and British all failed to do so. The Afghans will somehow have to do that themselves.

A2 – Terrorism

The only way to solve for the motives that create Middle Eastern terrorism is to pull out and not push reform upon them – allowing them to create their own democracy is the best option

Miles 10 (Jim, contributor to Middle East Online, http://www.middle-east-online.com/english/?id=39246) GAT

Jihadism returns with more discussion of its ideological/theological development as well as the development of the suicide bomber as a holy warrior. At first concerned with the near enemy - apostate governments and citizens of their own countries and regions - the idea was transformed by bin Laden and Zawahiri against the far enemy, in this case, the US and its allies. He concludes that confronting “the social movement that Osama bin Laden and Ayman Zawhiri inspired a decade ago will require more than military might.” He does not quite reiterate his initial comment about refusing to fight the war, but indirectly says it is a “battle that can be won not with bullets and bombs but with words and ideas.” Unfortunately the latter idea is well pronounced in US publicity about its intentions, about winning the hearts and minds of the indigenous population, but that cannot be done with the ongoing occupation and military surges that fully contradict the ill-considered verbiage. The focus shifts to Europe with its small yet significant Muslim population, a section of society that is one result of Europe’s colonial past. As immigrants from oppression and as immigrants being employed as cheap labour the Muslim people of Europe are generally well integrated into their respective societies. Aslan is a bit starry eyed about the both globalization and the European Union. He never does fully define what his idea of globalization is and what affects it has on society, and he arrives at a rather surprising statement that “For the enthusiasts of globalization, the European Union offers a thrilling glimpse into a future of transnational interdependency.” Thrilling for sure as the debt crisis surges through the ‘have not’ countries of Europe, threatening to shake once again the global financial markets; and the transnational interdependency relies much more on transnational corporations and their non-democratic rule over the rights of nations. That weakness of analysis aside, the observations and analysis of jihadism as represented in Europe are accurate. He examines it as a social movement as much as a religious movement (in Islam as with Christian fundamentalists, there is little difference). The terrorist does not arise from poverty but from the educated population that has put considerable thought into the injustices - real and perceived - of society, sacrificing themselves not so much from hatred but “to sacrifice oneself for a positive reason such as love, reputation, or glory.” The final chapter points out some significant ideas. First is that “this was never conceived of as a war against terror per se” otherwise it would have included a much broader range of ideological targets other than just Islamic people, and a broader range of physical targets other than the oil rich Middle East. Next, if this war is about the “hearts and minds of Muslims, there should no longer be any question that the battle has been lost.” Included in Aslan’s list of uncommon perceptions is the brief bout of democracy in 2006 in Lebanon, Palestine, Egypt, and Morocco, described as the US “telling the world that the promise of peaceful political reform through democratic participation was a lie.” Democracy is the “one issue President Bush was right: only through genuine democratic reform can the appeal of extremist groups be undermined and the tide of Muslim militancy stemmed.” That includes the idea that “radical groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah must be brought into the political fold,” (and concurrently, the Taliban in Afghanistan). Aslan correctly identifies that it was not the promise of democracy, but the “retraction of the promise that led to fracturing of the Palestinians, the blockade of Gaza, the war between Hamas and Israel, and, ultimately the devastation of 1.5 Palestinian lives.” But there it stops. Aslan does not reiterate his call to “refuse to fight” the war. Nor does he provide the practical physical steps required to do so, so simple at one level - leave - and yet more complicated at another to try and provide the infrastructure and support for true democracy and to accept its results in a region where the entrenched privileges of the transnational corporations tie into the privileges of the current political elites on both sides of the Atlantic. Much could be managed by reversing the manipulation of US money, as has been done in supporting Israel over the years, buying the loyalty of many Arab regimes and many insurgent groups over the years. The ongoing problem of US support for Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory and its brazen double standards when it comes to nuclear weapons and the intent of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty in relation to Israel, Iran, India, and Pakistan (among others) is the symbolic and most significant hot spot that requires a solution before any overall attempts at democracy are able to come into play. True democracy needs to given its due, not at the barrel of a US military gunship, but from the votes of the people and the participation of all political elements in the area - and then to have it supported even if the democratic outcome is quite different in style and look from what the developed countries envision. It has been seen in Ireland and South Africa - and more recently Lebanon - that significant changes can be made in drawing together disparate groups who can at least suppress their ideological differences from a warring status to a negotiating status if outside interference and ideologically contrived interventions are avoided. Aslan’s views in Beyond Fundamentalism have some back-ground weaknesses (globalization, the US role in jihad), but the specific ideas he presents about terrorism, global jihad, fundamentalism and democratic rights are sound and accurate. It is a short work with some powerful statements, a bit sensational at times, but mostly well grounded.

A2 – Terrorism

Attempting to push democratic reform upon the Afghan people fails – their own local thoughts must be integrated into politics to avoid assisting the Taliban

Adiparvar 9 (Naysan, UN diplomat to Afghanistan, http://archive.arabnews.com/?page=7&section=0&article=128406&d=13&m=11&y=2009) GAT

The foundations of democracy are alive and well in Afghanistan. However the recent elections did nothing to build upon them. They were meant to present a facade to the "folks at home" demonstrating that all is well, allowing the state-building machinery to roll on. But they failed to contribute to a sustainable democracy. Why? The answer lies behind the elections. The recent fraudulent elections in Afghanistan cost over $250 million, and added to a growing dissatisfaction among the Afghan people. This money was spent on staging an elaborate political exercise - an exercise aimed at demonstrating that the "West" had brought democracy to Afghanistan. The exercise failed. What it did demonstrate, however, was first, patronage on a grand scale, second, the importance of ethnic allegiance, and third, the inappropriateness of the "Western" model of democracy for Afghanistan. Following the reinstatement of Hamid Karzai as president we must not take our eye of the ball: Is democracy for Afghanistan? Was this multimillion-dollar fortune wasted? To respond to these questions we must look at the focus and approach of democracy building in Afghanistan. It is after spending the majority of the last three and a half years working in Afghanistan with nongovernmental organizations and the United Nations that I realize that we - the US-dominated international community in Afghanistan - have been naive in our pursuit of democracy. We have aimed to demonstrate democracy superficially with "free and fair" elections, a "vibrant" civil society and a "representative" Parliament. Yet they are far from free, fair, vibrant or representative. In other words, we have focused our efforts on the visible outcomes of democracy at the expense of the quality of the processes that produce them. Democracy is about people and their interactions. Acknowledging that Afghanistan is a country marked by strongly established hierarchies and age-old systems of patronage, is it any surprise that the elections proceeded as they did - with 1 in 3 ballots potentially fraudulent and with many of the votes cast under coercive circumstances? No, and this wouldn't have changed had an election runoff gone ahead. In fact what the second round would have done would have been to further polarize people along ethnic lines, present opportunity for further violence and most likely reinstated Karzai through fraudulent means. It is only by broadening our focus beyond democratic outcomes - beyond elections - to include democratic process that we have any chance at democratizing Afghanistan. We must strive to promote social and economic equality in a land rife with corruption, where money is power and the majority is poor; where ethnicity, tribe, and gender determine one's lot. We must work at local levels - in villages - with ordinary people to do this. The democratic ideal will never be achieved solely through national-level initiatives. But what is the democratic ideal in Afghanistan? If we are to engage on the uneven ground of inequality, hierarchy and patronage we must do so carefully. It is only by beginning a process of democratization that is amenable to the Afghan people and realistic in its expectations that we have any chance of success. We must always be working at the boundary of what is culturally and religiously acceptable, rather than rushing toward benchmarks founded on Western values and concepts. If we demand too great a change from Afghan culture it is likely to be rejected and provide ideological ground for the Taleban's advance. To identify the Afghan "democratic ideal" then we must separate democracy-as-a-mode-of-governing from democracy-as-a-value: We must separate the concept of the democratic political system from its associations with Western liberal values, which will not be accepted in present-day Afghanistan. We must Afghanize democracy. Research recently conducted by Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (www.areu.org.af) indicates that a different notion of democracy exists in Afghanistan. It is a democracy shrouded in culture and founded on Islam. It is a democracy that is founded on the Islamic concept of "Shoura". In Afghanistan a Shoura is a group of selected people, who through consultations, resolve problems and make decisions. However, years of conflict, political interference and opportunism have distorted its functioning. Thus, another cornerstone of Islam must be promoted: Social justice. This has already been demonstrated in Afghanistan and with mixed results. Across the country village-level Shouras have been elected as part of the National Solidarity Program. This process has met with mixed results, but what cannot be denied is that first seeds of an Afghan Islamic democracy have been sown. We must nurture these seeds to help them grow. It is only by pursuing democratization, at local levels with Afghan people, that we have any chance of success. Our focus must be on the quality of democracy rather than solely on its outcomes: We must strive to ensure social justice for the people of Afghanistan. We must strategically work toward producing an environment in which freedom to vote is realized, in which civil society is able to support the Afghan people to challenge nondemocratic behavior, and we must ensure that political representatives meet with and lobby on behalf of their constituents, primarily to receive the services they so desperately need. We must adopt an approach that is culturally and religiously amenable to the Afghan people - they must respect our intentions and we theirs. We must begin with a feasible start point: We must recognize and facilitate the establishment of a progressive Islamic Democracy.

A2 – Pakistan (Impact turn)

The US-Karzai alliance is at a brink – if we push for reform too hard, his administration will collapse – this leads to insurgency in Pakistan and Afghanistan, turning the net benefit

Khan 10 (Wasif, contributor to Dawn Media Group, http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/03-the-karzai-conundrum-ss-08) GAT

While both sides have softened their stance and made attempts at reconciliation following the week-long spat, it is clear that the long term prospects for the US-Karzai alliance are bleak. For the moment though, necessity and pragmatism have compelled the American’s to mend fences with Hamid Karzai. The absence of (viable) alternative leadership and an expanding military offensive in the Taliban stronghold of Kandahar have left the west with limited options for the time being.   The rocky American-Karzai relationship has serious implications for neighboring Pakistan as well. On one hand, the Karzai regime has hardly masked its mistrust and hostility toward Pakistan. The Afghan President has publicly accused Pakistan of meddling in domestic affairs and even supporting the Taliban on numerous occasions during his stint in power. Karzai has also actively encouraged Indian support and involvement in Afghanistan, which has been of great concern for the Pakistani establishment. Yet, if Karzai’s government were to crumble following a US withdrawal, the consequences for Pakistan could be disastrous. A Taliban resurgence in Kabul would undoubtedly bolster the insurgency in Pakistan, where the military and security forces are already spread thin battling homegrown militants, and the population is reeling from frequent suicide attacks. Like all other stakeholders, for Pakistan, there are no easy solutions in Afghanistan. Perhaps one reason for optimism is that in contrast to the 1980’s, the US has indicated a firm and balanced resolve to support and engage Pakistan in the long run, at least under the Obama administration.

A2 – Reform Solvency

More US involvement will not provide what is needed – the only way to prevent the animosity against the US is to fulfill Obama’s Cairo rhetoric by allowing the people to decide, not the politicians

LeVine 10 (Mark, Prof. of Hist. at UC Irvine, http://english.aljazeera.net/focus/2010/05/2010518111649460720.html) GAT

The "war on terror" might have been retired as the official term for describing US military activities across the Muslim world, but the focus on a military surge in Afghanistan while intensifying covert military operations in Pakistan's Northwest Frontier Province have in fact doomed the prospects for peaceful reconciliation precisely because they exacerbate the incredibly corrupt and violent political and economic system the US helped create in Afghanistan and the border regions of Pakistan. Indeed, Obama's "middle of the road" policy of greater violence - touted as a compromise between withdrawal or all out occupation - has helped radicalise increasing numbers of Pakistanis and Afghans. What was needed was a radical shift in the other direction; ending support for corrupt and autocratic leaders, supporting freedom and democracy unequivocally, demanding more equitable distribution of national resources in client states, and a laser-like focus on what is the only legitimate reason the US has to maintain troops in Afghanistan - to capture or kill the men directly responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and nothing more. Of course, such a shift vis-à-vis AfPak policy could not occur in a vacuum. It would have to part of a larger and even more radical shift in the orientation of US policy throughout the Middle East. Instead, however, the incoming Obama administration publicly touted as a refreshing dose of "realpolitik" and "pragmatism" its laying aside of the Bush administration's pro-democracy rhetoric in favour of no - or at best, few - questions asked diplomatic support for, and tens of billions of dollars in military aid or weapons sales to, Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria and other client states with miserable human rights records. This policy was doomed to fail. Such pragmatism is precisely what has increased animosity towards the US, who for decades refused to walk the talk when it comes to advocating democracy, freedom and human rights in the Muslim world. What Obama desperately needed to do was radical, but it was and remains achievable: to build credibility through offering tangible support for the peoples rather than the leaders of the region. He hinted at significant change in his famous Cairo speech of one year ago with his call for a "new beginning" based on "tolerance and dignity," but his rhetoric has turned out to be just more smoke and mirrors. Not only does his administration continue to "tolerate" dictators and systematic human rights violations, he has sought to continue and in some cases even extend policies that violate constitutional norms and/or US law. This is evidenced most recently by the administration's support for loosening Miranda rights for terrorism suspects and the extension of assassinations to people who merely share certain "lifestyle characteristics" of supposed anti-US rebels. As we saw with the Bush administration, and during the Johnson administration in Vietnam, even with the best intentions once a government crosses over to the "dark side" it is almost impossible to come back to the light. In fact, it becomes a "force multiplier" for militancy among the peoples the US is occupying - expanding the anger and hatred across a region that is already filled to the brim with both (as one friend remarked to me, you can't kick people in the stomach and not expect them to go for your groin in return). Simply put, as long as the US is not serious about supporting real freedom, accountability and democracy in the Middle East, animosity to and violence against the US - both there and when possible in the US - will continue. Moreover, when the president needs to make bold moves, such as in trying to reinvigorate the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, he will not have the credibility to demand major compromises from either side.

Impact – Taliban

The Taliban currently has the technology to create undetectable IEDs – this is crucial to the amount of casualties in the Middle East

DMG 10 (Dawn Media Group, 2/9/10, http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/07-taliban-develop-new-bomb-called-omar-ha-06) GAT

The biggest killer of Western troops in Afghanistan are home-made bombs, known as improvised explosive devices or IEDs, which the Taliban deploy to wide effect in their eight-year insurgency and detonate by remote control. Western military intelligence officials have said most foreign troop deaths, which hit a record 520 last year, are caused by IEDs. But the Taliban claimed – ahead of a major assault by foreign troops on the southern Taliban stronghold of Helmand province – to have created a new IED using materials that make them undetectable. The network’s spokesman, who identified himself as Yousuf Ahmadi, said the new bomb had been named after Taliban leader Mullah Mohammad Omar Mujahed, believed to be based in Pakistan. “Omar is our latest weapon in the war against the invaders,” he told AFP by telephone from an undisclosed location. “It’s a very effective bomb, it can’t be detected by mine-sweeping vehicles and it causes more deaths,” he said. He refused to provide more details, saying “it’s our military secret” but added that each Omar cost around 100 dollars to make. “With a 100-dollar mine we are able to destroy the enemy’s multi-million-dollar anti-mine vehicles,” he claimed, referring to heavily armoured vehicles used in Afghanistan by US and other NATO troops. Ahamdi charged the “Omar bomb” had already been used in attacks on Western forces, but his claim could not be verified immediately. Around 113,000 foreign troops are deployed to Afghanistan under US and NATO command fighting a Taliban insurgency that increasingly relies on IEDs and suicide bomb attacks as its tactics have morphed into guerrilla warfare. So far this year 62 foreign soldiers have died in the Afghan theatre, according to an AFP tally based on the independent icasualties.org website.