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AFGHAN INSTABILITY ADV ANS – STATUS QUO SOLVES

PETRAEUS REVAMPING COIN STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN NOW – FOCUSING ON WINNING THE HEARTS AND MINDS

TUUTTI 08-02 [Camille, staff writer, “Gen Petreaus releases new counterinsurgency guidance for Afghanistan”, EXECUTIVEGOV, <http://www.executivegov.com/2010/08/gen-petreaus-releases-new-counterinsurgency-guidance-for-afghanistan/>] ttate

To successfully conduct counterinsurgency operations in Afghanistan, the United States should “learn and adapt,” Army Gen. David Petraeus said last week.

Petraeus, who serves as the current commander of the U.S.  Central Command, last Thursday released [new guidelines on conducting counterinsurgency operations in Afghanistan](http://defensetech.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/COMISAF_COIN_Guidance_Jul_2010.pdf), which included earning the trust of the Afghans, confronting the culture of impunity and pursuing the enemy “relentlessly.”

In his written statement, the general stressed the human aspect of counterinsurgency operations, emphasizing a collaboration with the Afghan partners, civilian and military.

“Treat them as brother-in-arms,” Petraeus wrote. “Unity of effort and cooperation are not optional.”

The guidance also offered a reminder for U.S. troops interacting the locals: Be a good guest.

“Treat the Afghan people and their property with respect,” Petraeus stressed. “Think about how you drive, how you patrol, how you relate to people, and how you help the community. View your actions through the eyes of the Afghans. Alienating Afghan civilians sows the seed of our defeat.”

When it comes to going after the enemy relentlessly, Petraeus wrote how the pursuit must be done with minimal damage.

“Hunt the enemy aggressively, but use only the firepower needed to win a fight,” he stated. “We can’t win without fighting, but we also cannot kill or capture our way to victory. Moreover, if we kill civilians or damage their property in the course of our operations, we will create more enemies than our operations eliminate. That’s exactly what the Taliban wants. Don’t fall into their trap.”

HEGEMONY ADV ANS – WITHDRAWAL GUTS US CREDIBILITY

**ALL OF THE AFF’S HEGEMONY ARGUMENTS ARE ONLY TRUE IN A WORLD THAT WE WERE NOT ALREADY IN AFGHANISTAN – WITHDRAWING NOW WILL ONLY GUT OUR CREDIBILITY – SHOWS THAT OUR MILITARY MIGHT CAN BE DEFEATED BY LOCALS**

**STEPHENS 08-03** [Bret – deputy editorial page editor and former editor-in-chief of *Jerusalem Post*, “Is Afghanistan worth it?”, *WALL STREET JOURNAL,* <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704702304575403140818458112.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>] ttate

What about the conservative case? Let's start with the best conservative case against the war. It holds that (a) all attempts to build Afghanistan as a nation will prove as futile as all past attempts to subdue it; (b) Afghanistan is a sideshow when the focus of our efforts in the region should be Pakistan, Iran or elsewhere; (c) even a "successful" outcome in Afghanistan wouldn't be worth the toll in lives, effort and expense; (d) we've basically defeated al Qaeda already and can keep them in check through drone strikes, so why are we now taking sides in a sectarian Afghan blood feud?; and (e) if Afghans massacre each other in the wake of a U.S. withdrawal, that's their unfortunate business and further proof of proposition (a).

This analysis might be somewhat more compelling if we were having an argument about whether to invade Afghanistan in the first place, as if history were a cassette we could rewind and re-record at will. (Now there's a liberal fantasy.) We are in Afghanistan now. So the choices before us are not what we should have done in 2001, when most Americans—and almost all conservatives—demanded we take Kandahar the way Sherman took Atlanta. The question is what we do in 2010.

For conservatives in particular, the answer ought to entail notions of consistency and responsibility. Consistency, in the sense of supporting a counterinsurgency strategy for Afghanistan similar to the one conservatives urged (and that worked) for Iraq after the abject failure of the "light footprint" approach advocated by Joe Biden. Responsibility, in the sense of keeping faith with those to whom we make commitments.

This is not just a moral argument: The U.S. cannot remain a superpower if the suspicion takes root that we are a feckless nation that can be stampeded into surrender by a domestic caucus of defeatists. Allies or would-be allies will make their own calculations and hedge their bets. Why should we be surprised that this is precisely what Pakistan has done vis-a-vis the Taliban? It's not as if the U.S. hasn't abandoned that corner of the world before to its furies.

How a feckless America is perceived by its friends is equally material to how we are perceived by our enemies. In his 1996 fatwa declaring war on the U.S., Osama bin Laden took note of American withdrawals from Beirut in 1983 and Mogadishu a decade later. "When tens of your soldiers were killed in minor battles and one American pilot was dragged through the streets . . . you withdrew, the extent of your impotence and weakness became very clear." Is it the new conservative wisdom to prove bin Laden's point (one that the hard men in Tehran undoubtedly share), only on a vastly greater scale?

Nor does it seem especially conservative to subscribe to the non sequitur that because Hamid Karzai is not George Washington our efforts in Afghanistan will be of no avail. Utopia is a liberal temptation; conservatism is comfortable with the good enough. In Afghanistan that would mean a run-of-the-mill Third World country that can fend for itself, menaces nobody and is an updated version of what the country was in the 1960s. That's a reminder that Afghan history does not ineluctably condemn it to chaos or fanaticism. It's also a reminder that the measure of success in Afghanistan isn't whether we create a new Switzerland, but whether we avoid another South Vietnam.

CONSULT NATO CP HELPERS – SAY YES

NATO STARTING TO BRING TROOPS HOME FROM AFGHANISTAN NOW

**Huffington Post 8/2** (Dan Froomkin, former reporter for Washington Post, now White House correspondent for the Huffington Post, 8/2/10, " Obama's Afghan Allies Bugging Out ", [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/08/02/obamas-afghan-allies-bugg\_n\_66 7447.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/08/02/obamas-afghan-allies-bugg_n_66%207447.html)) yan

Even as President Obama sends more American troops to Afghanistan, his NATO allies are starting to bring their troops home.

The Netherlands was one of only about a dozen countries making anything more than a token contribution to the U.S.-led effort in Afghanistan.

But the Dutch flag was lowered over their base in the central Afghanistan province of Uruzgan on Sunday as approximately 1,900 Dutch soldiers prepared to leave the country. American troops took their place, patrolling a province full of Taliban and poppy fields.

The last song played on Radio Uruzgan before it ceased broadcasting, according to the Australian newspaper, was "We Gotta Get Out of This Place" by the Animals, which became an anti-war anthem during the Vietnam era.

The Dutch departure, combined with the extraordinary unpopularity of the seemingly endless war in Afghanistan, could lead to a rush for the exits.

Other countries are on their way out already. Canada has long intended to withdraw all of its 2,700 troops within a year. And just last month, Polish President Bronislaw Komorowski urged NATO to draft a new strategy for leaving Afghanistan more quickly and said Poland will withdraw its 2,600 soldiers by 2012, regardless.

When Obama's surge reaches its peak of 100,000 troops, the size of the American force will even further dwarf the commitments of other nations. According to the latest NATO numbers, there are 9,500 British troops serving in Afghanistan; 4,350 from Germany; 3,750 from France; and 3,300 from Italy. Along with Canada and Poland, those are the only countries with more than 2,000 troops on the ground. (See this Wikipedia chart and the NATO website.)

The Dutch lost 24 soldiers in Afghanistan since they arrived in 2006. NATO's request that the government extend its mission triggered a political row that brought down the country's coalition government in February.

**MINERALS DA – WITHDRAWAL LINKS**

Withdrawing from Afghanistan will make the Taliban a mineral superpower—turns case

Gordon G. Chang 10, “The Taliban: World's Next Minerals Superpower”,”Afghanistan's resources raise the stakes in Central Asia”. Forbes, [http://www.forbes.com/2010/06/16/taliban-minerals-afghanistan-asia-opinions-columnists-gordon-g-chang\_2.html] imanol

Most significantly, Afghanistan has substantial deposits of rare earth minerals, estimated to be worth $7.4 billion. And why is this so important? At present, China has a near monopoly over them. It possesses about 36% of world reserves, by far the biggest share for any nation, and accounts for around 97% of global production. Five years ago Beijing substantially tightened export controls on these minerals. At this moment, officials are building a strategic reserve of them. Last August China's Ministry of Industry and Information Technology announced it would prohibit exports of some heavy rare earth minerals and restrict exports of other rare earths to levels far below current global needs. The complete prohibition may go into effect by 2015. Beijing, unfortunately, is not content to control just its own rare earth resources. The Chinese are buying deposits around the world, including those in the U.S. and Canada. And that brings us back to Afghanistan. Beijing, not surprisingly, has already shown great interest in the resources of its troubled neighbor to the west. In 2007 a Chinese company won the concession to the Aynak copper mine in Afghanistan's Logar province--after paying, according to American officials, a bribe of $30 million to the now-former minister of mines. As the New York Times reports, the Chinese want to buy up even more of Afghanistan's resources. They will surely succeed in exploiting most of the trillion dollars of minerals if the Taliban fighters take back control of the country, as they will if President Obama adheres to his plan to begin withdrawing troops next July. The Taliban, in short, could become a minerals superpower in a few years time. That will surely mean an even larger portion of the world's rare earth deposits will be under Chinese control. Beijing has traditionally maintained strong ties to the Taliban, continuing relations even after Sept. 11. Since that horrible event, for instance, China went through with the sale of a telephone system for Kabul and, after the group's ouster, has supplied it with weapons used against NATO forces. The Pentagon, in September, is scheduled to complete its report identifying “national security risks due to rare earth material dependencies.” Yet we don't have to wait until then to know what it will say. The U.S. is not mining any rare earth minerals at the moment, and there is only one American company with commercially significant deposits of heavy rare earths. It is not entirely clear what defense planners will do when China's export ban on these minerals goes into effect. Rare earth minerals are used in every major weapons system the U.S. fields today, from M1A2 Abrams tanks to Arleigh Burke-class destroyers. There is not a plane in the American inventory that will fly tomorrow without some mineral that is now mined in China. Lasers, radar and missile-guidance systems? Yes, they all require rare earth minerals, as do the military's hard drives. So the stakes just went up in Afghanistan with the release of the information this week. The U.S. has a critical reliance on what is in the ground in that war-torn land. Kabul can undercut Beijing's virtual monopoly on rare earths--or it can help the Chinese tighten their grip over global markets. Right now, the prognosis does not look good for us.

MINERALS DA – AT: NOT MANY MINERALS THERE

Afghanistan’s minerals are worth far more than originally believed

Synovitz 6-14, senior correspondent in RFE/RL's Central Newsroom, [Ron, “New Surveys On Afghan Minerals Raise Hopes In Kabul,” 2010, <http://www.rferl.org/content/New_Surveys_On_Afghan_Minerals_Raise_Hopes_In_Kabul/2071232.html>] imanol

New aerial surveys of Afghanistan have revealed a far greater amount of mineral riches than previously estimated. U.S. officials say the nearly $1 trillion of untapped minerals include deposits of iron, copper, gold, semi-precious gems, and valuable industrial metals like lithium. Afghan and U.S. officials say that if the sector can be developed, the country's economy can be fundamentally changed -- potentially ending the role of the illegal opium trade as the main pillar of the economy. Omar Jawad, a spokesman for Afghanistan's Ministry of Mines and Industries, told RFE/RL's Radio Free Afghanistan today that there are great hopes about development. "New technical studies show that Afghanistan has more mineral resources than was previously estimated," Jawad said. "Undoubtedly, the exploitation of these mineral fields will have a significant effect on the economy of Afghanistan and its people." Senior U.S. officials say they now think the value of Afghanistan's undeveloped mineral deposits is nearly $1 trillion. That's almost 300 times the value, estimated by the United Nations, of illegal opium exported from Afghanistan in a year.