Afghanistan Aff

Afghanistan Aff 1

\*\*1AC Advantages\*\* 5

1AC Ethnic Strife Advantage 6

1AC Ethnic Strife Advantage 7

1AC EU Relations Advantage 8

1AC EU Relations Advantage 9

1AC Karzai Credibility 10

1AC Karzai Credibility 11

1AC Karzai Credibility 12

1AC Karzai Credibility 13

1AC NATO Relations 14

1AC NATO Relations 15

1AC Opium Brides Add-On 16

1AC Opium Brides Add-On 17

1AC - Positive Peace Add-On 18

1AC - Positive Peace Add-On 19

1AC Poverty Advantage 20

1AC Poverty Advantage 21

1AC Poverty Advantage 22

1AC Poverty Advantage 23

1AC Stability Advantage – Uniqueness 24

1AC Stability Advantage – Terrorism Module (1/2) 25

1AC Stability Advantage 26

1AC Terrorism Advantage 27

1AC Terrorism Advantage 28

1AC Terrorism Advantage- Impacts 29

1AC Terrorism Advantage- Impacts 30

\*\*Inherency\*\* 31

Eradication Awful- Human Rights 32

Obama Policy Fails 33

Obama Policy Fails 34

WOD Fails 35

\*\* EU Relations\*\* 36

EU Rel 37

EU Rel- I/L 38

EU Rel Good- Bioterrorism 39

EU Rel Good- NATO (1/2) 40

EU Rel Good- NATO (2/2) 41

EU Rel Good- Nuke War 42

\*\*Karzai Impacts\*\* 43

Karzai- Democracy Module 44

Impacts- Heg/Terrorism 45

Impacts- Jirga Scenario 46

Impacts- Jirga Scenario 47

Impacts- Jirga Scenario – Iran Nukes 48

Impacts- Jirga Scenario- Iran Nukes 49

\*\*NATO Alliance \*\* 50

NATO Relations K2 Troops 51

Internal- NATO k2 Peace 52

NATO impacts- Pakistan Nukes 53

NATO impacts- Pakistan Nukes 54

\*\*Opium Brides\*\* 55

A2: Hegemony Solves 56

Discourse Solvency 57

Opium Brides – Environment/Rights/Turn 58

Opium Brides Extensions 59

Opium Brides Impact 60

\*\*Poverty\*\* 61

WOD 🡪 poverty 62

WOD 🡪 poverty 63

WOD 🡪poverty 64

Poverty Impacts- War 65

Poverty Impacts- Root Cause 66

\*\*Stability Stuff\*\* 67

Stability Advantage – I/L – WOD Leads to Taliban 68

Stability Advantage – I/L – WoD Leads to Taliban 69

Stability Advantage – I/L – WoD Leads to Taliban 70

Stability Advantage – WoD Trades-off With WoT 71

Stability Advantage – Drug war K2 Terror War 73

US k2 WOD 74

\*\*SOLVENCY\*\* 75

DEA/ US K2 WOD 76

DEA/ US K2 WOD 77

DEA/US K2 WOD 78

A2: SQUO Solves 79

\*\*Terrorism/ Taliban Resurgence\*\* 80

I/L 81

I/L 82

Terrorism Impacts- Nukes Spillover 83

\*\*NEG STUFF\*\* 84

\*\*Case\*\* 85

Neg- Inherency 86

No Solvency 87

Squo Solves 88

Squo Solves 89

\*\*CPs\*\* 90

Alternative Crops CP- Solvency 91

Legalizing Opium CP- Solvency 92

Opium Brides – Alt Cause – Sold for Addiction/Opium Bad 93

\*\*2AC Answers\*\* 94

2AC AT: Alternative Crops 95

2AC AT: Alt Crops/ Cap 96

2AC AT: Capitalism 97

2AC AT: Drug War DA (1/3) 98

2AC AT: Drug War DA (2/3) 99

2AC AT: Drug War DA (3/3) 100

2AC A2: Opium Licensing CP (1/3) 101

2AC A2: Opium Licensing CP (2/3) 102

2AC A2: Opium Licensing CP (3/3) 103

2AC AT: Politics - Afghanistan Unpopular 104

2AC AT: Politics – Afghanistan Unpopular 105

2AC AT: Politics - Afghanistan Popular 106

\*\*WOD GOOD\*\* 107

WoD Good 108

\*\*WOD Bad\*\* 109

Drug war bad 110

Drug war bad 111

\*\*\* K Aff\*\*\* 113

Opium Brides 1AC 114

Opium Brides 1AC 115

Opium Brides 1AC 116

Cuomo Advantage (1/4) 117

Cuomo Advantage (2/4) 118

Cuomo Advantage (3/4) 119

Cuomo Advantage (4/4) 120

Internal Links 121

Internal Link – Patriarchy 122

Internal Link – Patriarchy 123

Internal Links – Patriarchy 124

Internal Link – Slavery 125

Internal Link – Slavery 126

Internal Link – Abuse 127

Impacts 128

Impact – Human Rights 129

Impact – Slavery 130

Impact – Patriarchy 131

Impact – Patriarchy => Terrorism 132

Impact – Patriarchy => Root Cause of War 133

Impact – Environment/Opium Nevit 134

Impact – Militarism 135

Impact – War on Drugs 136

Impact – Imperialism 137

Solvency 138

Solvency – Discourse 139

Solvency 140

Solvency 141

Solvency 142

2ACs AT 143

A2: Hegemony Solves 144

2AC – AT: DAs – Cuomo 145

2AC – AT: Nuke DAs 146

2AC – AT: Heg DAs 147

2AC – AT: Environment DAs 148

2AC – AT: Disease DAs 149

2AC – AT: Terrorism DAs 150

2AC – AT: T 151

2AC – AT: T 152

1AR – EXT - Education 153

\*\*Case Neg\*\* 154

A2: Solvency 155

A2: Solvency 156

A2: Solvency 157

\*\*1AC Advantages\*\*

1AC Ethnic Strife Advantage

The WOD forces smuggling, which leads to conflict between the Pashtun, Tagik & Hazar tribes

Corti & Swain 9 ( Daniela &Ashok, AS- Prof of Peace & conflict research @ Uppsala, DC- no quals found, *Peace and Conflict Review*, vol 3 issue 2, pg 5) ET

With the onset of anarchy in the country in the post-Soviet period, a remarkable increase of opium production was registered in 1990s. Several thousand refugees returned after years of war, taking their lands and beginning to cultivate the only profitable crop: the opium poppy. In fact, by 1991, Afghanistan surpassed Burma in becoming the largest narcotics producer. Not only the opium production but also its refining process to make morphine and heroin [27] boomed whilst banditry and civil war affected the country. Taking political advantage of the lawlessness, a fundamentalist Islamic movement, the Taliban, captured state power with the help of Pakistani ISI and Saudi financial support. [28] By 1996, they controlled 80 per cent of the country and brought order to the countryside. After the defeat of several tribal war-lords, the Taliban reopened the country’s drug routes to enable highly profitable smuggling between Pakistan, Iran and Central Asia. Ideologically, the Taliban were against drug production and consumption; however they recognized the importance of this crop to Afghanistan’s fragile economy. While drug consumption was strictly forbidden, the production and trade of narcotics was considered inadvisable but undertaken due to necessity. The Taliban allowed the cultivation of opium poppies with religious authorization; poppy fields were tolerated, especially in Helmand and Nangarhar provinces where the loyal Pashtun tribes represented the majority and opposed Tagik or Hazar tribal organizations. [29] The opposition to the Taliban was formed by a heterogeneous coalition cantered around the Northern Alliance, created by different ethnicities living in Afghanistan and in other neighbouring countries (Iran, Turkey, India, Russia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan).

Conflict spills over to Central Asia

Corti & Swain 9 ( Daniela &Ashok, AS- Prof of Peace & conflict research @ Uppsala, DC- no quals found, *Peace and Conflict Review*, vol 3 issue 2, pg 7) ET

While the Northern American market is provided with Mexican and Colombian heroin, European consumption is supplied in a large part by heroin from South-West Asia, mostly from Afghanistan. Afghan opiates reach the European markets through two main routes. One is the traditional “Balkan Route” (the dominant one in the 1990’s) via Pakistan, Iran, and Turkey. Turkey has become the main staging post from where narcotics take either the direction of the Central European route (Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Czech Republic) or can be smuggled through Albania and the former Yugoslav republics. The other main trafficking route is known as the “Silk Road” which runs from Afghanistan through post-Soviet Central Asia to Russia.[44] From there, Afghan heroin can also make its way to Europe.[45] According to one UNODC estimate in 2004, one quarter of total Afghan opiate exports (500 tons of morphine and heroin, and 1,000 tons of opium) were smuggled through Central Asia; suggesting that the majority of narcotics exports still reach Europe through the traditional route via Turkey. In the recent years, however, the importance of the “Silk Road” has steadily risen. [46] The trafficking along this route is due to the failing border controls in the Central Asia and Caucasus. Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan are easy targets for drug traffickers. They are young states, still facing various problems associated with nation-building in the post-Soviet transition period, affected by weak democratic institutions, slow economic growth, and galloping inflation. The spread of the illicit drug trade has had serious negative implications for these Central Asian countries. It expands organized crime, exacerbates political and social instability, encourages corruption, and contributes to institutional decay. The significant drug related informal economy undermines the democratic process in Central Asia and causes serious law and order challenges. It is even argued that the drug trade has fomented ethnic rivalries and armed conflict in the region. [47] Some go so far as to suggest that the drug trade had a role to play in the 2005 revolution in Kyrgyzstan. [48] According to the US Department of State, Tajikistan represents a particularly attractive transit route for illegal narcotics. Every year 80-120 tons of Afghan heroin are smuggled through this country.[49] Several factors could explain why this country has become one of favoured transit routes of Afghan narcotics. The civil war in this country in the early 1990s severely affected its social and the economic situation, and they continue to suffer from rampant corruption, political instability, few economic opportunities and high unemployment rates. Tajikistan is in fact the poorest of the former Soviet Republics. Geographically, it shares more than 1,000 kilometres of porous borders with Afghanistan. The International Narcotics Control Strategy Report (INCSR) details that significant quantities of drugs are smuggled across the Pyanj River that forms large part of the Afghan-Tajik border, which can be easily crossed at numerous points without inspection due to the lack of adequate border control

1AC Ethnic Strife Advantage

Central Asian Instability causes nuclear war

Ahrari 9 ( Eshan-, professor of national security and strategy @ Armed Forces Staff College, 1

, August, online, p. 41 www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/Pubs/display.cfm?pubID=112) ET

South and Central Asia constitute a part of the world where a well-designed American strategy might help avoid crises or catastrophe. The U.S. military would provide only one component of such a strategy, and a secondary one at that, but has an important role to play through engagement activities and regional confidence-building. Insecurity has led the states of the region to seek weapons of mass destruction, missiles, and conventional arms. It has also led them toward policies which undercut the security of their neighbors. If such activities continue, the result could be increased terrorism, humanitarian disasters, continued low-level conflict and potentially even major regional war or a thermonuclear exchange. A shift away from this pattern could allow the states of the region to become solid economic and political partners for the United States, thus representing a gain for all concerned.

Ending the war on drugs would bankrupt warring factions

Hari 9 (Johann, staff writer for The Independent, *The Huffington Post,* Feb 10-9) ET

With the global economy collapsing all around us, the last issue President Barack Obama wants to talk about is the ongoing War on Drugs. But if he doesn't -- and fast -- he may well have two collapsed and hemorrhaging countries on his hands. The first lies in the distant mountains of Afghanistan. The second is right next door, on the other side of the Rio Grande. Here's a starter-for-ten about where this war has led us. Where in the world are you most likely to be beheaded? Where are the severed craniums of police officers being found week after week in the streets, pinned to bloody notes that tell their colleagues: "This is so that you learn respect"? Where are hand grenades being tossed into crowds to intimidate the public into shutting up? Which country was just named by the US Joint Chiefs of Staff as the most likely after Pakistan to suffer a "rapid and sudden collapse"? Most of us would guess Iraq. The answer is Mexico. The death toll in Tijuana today is higher than in Baghdad. The story of how this came to happen is the story of this war -- and why it will have to end, soon. When you criminalize a drug for which there is a large market, it doesn't disappear. The trade is simply transferred from pharmacists and doctors to armed criminal gangs. In order to protect their patch and their supply routes, these gangs tool up -- and kill anyone who gets in their way. You can see this any day on the streets of London or Los Angeles, where teenage gangs stab or shoot each other for control of the 3,000 percent profit margins on offer. Now imagine this process on a countrywide scale, and you have Mexico and Afghanistan today. Drugs syndicates control eight percent of global GDP -- which means they have greater resources than many national armies. They own helicopters and submarines and they can afford to spread the woodworm of corruption through poor countries, right to the top. Why Mexico? Why now? In the past decade, the U.S. has spent a fortune spraying carcinogenic chemicals over Colombia's coca-growing areas, so the drug trade has simply shifted to Mexico. It's known as the "balloon effect": press down in one place, and the air rushes to another. When I was last there in 2006, I saw the drug violence taking off and warned that the murder rate was going to skyrocket- - but I didn't imagine it would reach this scale. In 2007, more than 2,000 people were killed. In 2008, it was more than 5,400 people. The victims range from a pregnant woman washing her car to a four year-old child to a family in the "wrong" house watching television. Today, 70 percent of Mexicans say they are frightened to go out because of the cartels. The cartels offer Mexican police and politicians a choice: plato o ploma. Silver or lead. Take a bribe, or take a bullet. The Interior Secretary, Juan Camilo Mourino, admits that the cartels have so corrupted the police they can't guarantee the safety of informers or the general public any more. The former U.S. drug agency director Barry McCaffrey says Mexico is "not confronting dangerous criminality -- it is fighting for its survival against narco-terrorists." Within five years, he said, it will be a narco-state controlled by the cartels. So the U.S. is trying to militarize the attack on the cartels in Mexico, offering tanks, helicopters and hard cash. The same process has occurred in Afghanistan. After the toppling of the Taliban, the country's bitterly poor farmers turned to the only cash crop that earns them enough to keep their kids alive: opium. It now makes up 50 percent of the country's GDP. The drug cartels have a far bigger budget than the elected government, so they have left the young democracy, police force and army riddled with corruption and virtually useless. The U.S. reacted by declaring "war on opium." The German magazine Der Spiegel revealed that the NATO Commander has ordered his troops to "kill all opium dealers." Seeing their main crop destroyed and their families killed, many have turned back to the Taliban in rage. The drug war has brought the Taliban back to life. What is the alternative? Terry Nelson was one of the America's leading federal agents tackling drug cartels for over thirty years. He discovered the hard way that the current tactics are useless. "Busting top traffickers doesn't work, since others just do battle to replace them," he explains. A crackdown simply produces more violence, as an endless pool of young men hungry for the profits step into the vacuum and fight off their rivals. Nelson concluded there is an alternative: "Legalizing and regulating drugs will stop drug market crime and violence by putting major cartels and gangs out of business. It's the one surefire way to bankrupt them, but when will our leaders talk about it?" Of course, the day after legalization, a majority of gangsters will not suddenly open organic food shops and join the Hare Krishnas. But their profit margins will collapse as their customers go to off-licenses and chemists rather than to them. The incentives for going into crime and staying there will be decimated. Norm Stamper, the former head of the Seattle Police Department, says plainly: "Regulated legalization of all drugs will drive drug dealers out of business: no product, no profit, no incentive. We don't have to speculate about these effects; we can look at the last time prohibition ended. When alcohol was criminalized in the US, the murder rate soared. The year it was legalized, the number of murders fell off a cliff -- and continued to drop for the next ten years. (Rates of alcoholism remained the same; deaths from alcohol poisoning declined dramatically as beer replaced moonshine.) Just as Al Capone was bankrupted by legalizing alcohol, we now have a chance to bankrupt the Mexican cartels, the Taliban, the Bloods and the Crips, and the gangs that are shooting their way across world -- before they cause the collapse of two countries.

1AC EU Relations Advantage

EU doesn’t want the US to continue the war on drugs- creates tension in the relationship

Weitz 7 (Richard,  Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Political-Military Analysis at Hudson Institute, Apr 2, *Eurasia.net,* http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insight/articles/eav040307.shtml) ET

Hoping to stem burgeoning narcotics production and trafficking in Afghanistan, the Bush administration has established a "drug czar" for the country. However, the administration's choice for the post, Thomas A. Schweich, has provoked criticism on Capitol Hill. The US move comes as European Union nations are pondering a radically different approach – the legalization of poppy production in Afghanistan. The creation of the drug czar post, formally known as the Coordinator of Counter-Narcotics and Justice Reform in Afghanistan, was announced in late March. For Schweich, his new responsibilities do not seem to differ much from his former job -- principal deputy assistant secretary in the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement at the State Department.In recent months, members of Congress and US policy analysts urged the administration to improve coordination of US anti-drug efforts in Afghanistan. Existing US programs, according to many inside the Beltway, are failing to curb narcotics cultivation and exports, and thus are helping to fan the Taliban insurgency and raise the threat of spreading instability across Central Asia. In a letter sent to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, members of Congress blamed inter-agency rivalries and the lack of close international coordination for the failing anti-drug efforts. With the support of Great Britain and other EU countries, however, Karzai has blocked moves to spray poppy fields, arguing that doing so would enrage a large number of rural Afghans who are dependent on poppy production, and thus greatly expand grassroots support for the Taliban. Meanwhile, it seems that the United States and EU are heading in different directions in their efforts to contain Afghan drug production. While the creation of the US drug czar is seen as a precursor to a toughened anti-drug response, leading EU nations are now seriously considering endorsing the legalization of poppy production, as well as the implementation of a program to buy opiates directly from Afghan farmers. According to reports in London on April 3, British Prime Minister Tony Blair has ordered a review of Britain's anti-drug policy for Afghanistan. German, French and Italian officials are also reportedly open to a drastic policy overhaul. Under one plan now being studied by EU experts, poppy production would be legalized and state-sanctioned agents would buy the opiates directly from farmers, then resell the crop to pharmaceutical companies for use in pain medications and related products. News of the possible change in the EU's position already has produced shock and rage from within the Bush administration. Whether or not the ideas currently under consideration in EU capitals are ever translated into action depend on several yet-to-be-determined factors. For example, experts and officials are still debating what the effect of legalization would be on Afghan poppy production -- would such a move merely encourage Afghan farmers to expand the amount of land devoted to poppy cultivation, or would it promote a greater sense of security, prompting Afghans to explore other methods of income generation? Whatever the outcome of the EU debate, it would seem that Schweich will be hard-pressed to promote US-EU unity on a regional counter-narcotics plan.

1AC EU Relations Advantage

US- European alliance is key to check Russian manipulations

Shapiro 9 (Brookings Institution Director, EU council on foreign rel fellow, Oc. 9,    
http://ecfr.3cdn.net/05b80f1a80154dfc64\_x1m6bgxc2.pdf , pg 56, *EU Council on Foreign Rel*) ET

This analysis suggests that Europeans might have more success if they worry a little less about what the US is up to and a little more about defining and asserting their own common interests in relation to Russia. Having launched their new Eastern Partnership initiative – albeit with German Chancellor Angela Merkel as the sole EU head of government in attendance – they now need to devote the necessary attention and resources to making it a success. They need to make it harder for the Russians to play on their divisions by presenting a more united front to Moscow, not just on issues such as energy but also on the wider economic relationship that is waiting to be developed to mutual benefit. Europeans should also debate Moscow’s ideas on a “new security architecture” rather than just waiting to see what the US thinks about them. Europe’s interests in relation to Russia are not identical with those of the US. Nor is it paranoid to believe that the Obama administration would like to see the Europeans taking rather more responsibility for themselves and indeed for the post-Soviet states covered by the Eastern Partnership. As a global power, the US cannot afford to assign disproportionate time and attention to a region of the world that does not, or at least should not, need it. The US wants the EU to be a more effective player on its own continent. From a European point of view, this would not only be a more effective way of dealing with Russia, but also would prevent Washington and Moscow doing deals over querulous European heads. From an American point of view, a Europe that acted in this way would be the sort of partner that it wants at the other end of an effective transatlantic relationship.

Russian manipulations creates middle east instability

International Crisis Group 7 (24 May, *International Crisis Group,*  http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/central-asia/133-central-asias-energy-risks.aspx ) ET

Oil and gas are proving as much a burden as a benefit to Central Asia. The three oil and gas producers in the region – Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan – are showing signs of the “resource curse” under which energy-rich nations fail to thrive or develop distorted, unstable economies. Geography and their history in the Soviet Union have bound them to Russia, through which most of their energy exports must be transported. Moscow is proving to be an unreliable partner for foreign consumers as it has been willing to cut off pipelines to apply commercial or political pressure. Low investment, corruption and gross mismanagement in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan may mean that their supplies run low before they can diversify their links to markets or their economies. Central Asia is likely to see energy create instability within the region; the chances are low that it will be a factor in improving European energy security any time soon.

Asian Instability causes nuclear war

Ahriri 1 (ehsan, Professor of Nat’l Security/ Strategy @ Armed Force College @ VA, *Strategic Studies Institute* ) ET

South and Central Asia constitute a part of the world where a well-designed American strategy might help avoid crises or catastrophe. The U.S. military would provide only one component of such a strategy, and a secondary one at that, but has an important role to play through engagement activities and regional confidence-building. Insecurity has led the states of the region to seek weapons of mass destruction, missiles, and conventional arms. It has also led them toward policies which undercut the security of their neighbors. If such activities continue, the result could be increased terrorism, humanitarian disasters, continued low-level conflict and potentially even major regional war or a thermonuclear exchange. A shift away from this pattern could allow the states of the region to become solid economic and political partners for the United

1AC Karzai Credibility

Karzai is blamed for drug issues- he’s seen as the “symbol of corruption”

Goodspeed 10 ( Peter, Award winning reportor for nat’l post in foreign rel, *National Post* http://www.sabawoon.com/articles/index.php?page=waliKarzai\_king*,* 10) ET

Last August, a report by the U.S. Senate committee on foreign relations named Ahmed Karzai as an example of the corruption allegations that constantly dog the Afghan government. The report said Afghanistan's drug problem exploded in 2001, when the U.S. military enlisted warlords with drug links to help topple the Taliban, "laying the groundwork for the corrupt nexus between drugs and authority that pervades the power structure today." Whenever any foreign governments urge Afghanistan to stamp out corruption and build an effective government, they begin their argument with reference to Ahmed Karzai, who, says Steve Coll, a New Yorker magazine columnist and former journalist in Afghanistan, is "the most visible, intractable symbol of the corruption and the corporate self-interest of the Karzai government in southern Afghanistan." At least two U.S. ambassadors have privately pleaded with President Karzai to, at a minimum, remove his half-brother from Kandahar, possibly by giving him an ambassadorial posting.

Karzai is blamed by the public for the crackdown on poppy- it alienates his support

Felbab-Brown 5 (Vanda, poli sci PHD @ MIT, p. 63-64, Autum 5, *The Washington Quarterly)* ET

The amnesty for the Taliban announced by the U.S. and Afghan governments in January 2005 will further complicate eradication efforts. The Taliban activists returning to their villages will remind the population of the “good times” before 2000 when the Taliban sponsored the illicit economy and poppies bloomed unharmed. The Taliban can thus exploit the popular frustration with eradication and agitate against the Karzai government and the United States. Moreover, any unequal enforcement of eradication, which could result from varying levels of security in different regions, will result in the perception of ethnic and tribal favoritism, augmenting ethnic divisions. The northern non-Pashtun provinces, for example, already have complained that they bear the brunt of eradication while their Pashtun counterparts were let off easy. Whether such claims are accurate does not matter to those ethnic political entrepreneurs that seek to exploit tribal and ethnic divisions and insecurities. Conversely, the relationship between ethnicity and counterdrug measures is acutely uncomfortable for Karzai, whose victory in the presidential elections depended on the support of his fellow Pashtuns. Any effective crackdown against poppy cultivation will have to take place in the Pashtun Helmand region, thus alienating his very support base. Still, the criticism the United States levied against Karzai just before his May 2005 visit to Washington was unfounded. In a memo sent from the U.S. embassy in Kabul in advance of Karzai’s visit and leaked to the press, embassy officials criticized Karzai for being “unwilling to assert strong leadership” in eradication and doing little to overcome the resistance of “provincial officials and village elders [who] had impeded destruction of significant poppy acreage.” The memo also criticized Karzai for being unwilling to insist on eradication “even in his own province of Kandahar.”30 In fact, despite the political repercussions for his government, Karzai has been rather compliant with the U.S. demand to undertake eradication. To satisfy international pressure, however, he has unwisely been promising unrealistic outcomes, including the eradication of all poppy fields in two years.31 The United States cannot be blind to the political realities in Afghanistan: in the absence of large-scale rural development, eradication is politically explosive. Strong-fisted measures to suppress the peasant resistance will further fuel unrest. Such actions will undermine Karzai’s government as well as Afghanistan’s process of stabilization and democratization

1AC Karzai Credibility

Afghanistan would dissolve into civil war without Karzai’s perceived leadership

Kemp 4 (Jack, US Congressman, *Foundation for Defense of Democracies*, 12-june-4) ET

Afghanistan's way to stability and democracy definitely faces a number of important obstacles. It is true there are U.S. allies who are corrupt. Moreover, al Qaeda, the Taliban and warlordism continue threatening the political process. As the security and destinies of both nations are intertwined, success is contingent upon responsible U.S.-Afghanistan partnership in confronting these obstacles. Long-term success against terrorism requires attacking al Qaeda at its foundation. Afghanistan is, therefore, crucial to vanquishing al Qaeda. Afghanistan, under the Taliban, was the country al Qaeda chose for its model and headquarters. Muslim countries modeled after the Taliban will advance al Qaeda's ideals, activities and endanger U.S. national security. Furthering democratization and stability in Afghanistan will strike at the very heart of al Qaeda's ideological modus operandi. Failure in Afghanistan, subsequently, would be regarded as an al Qaeda victory over the U.S. That is why it is so important for the United States to establish a 21st century version of the Marshall Plan for Afghanistan. Without President Karzai's moral leadership and America's assistance, Afghanistan would have great difficulty fulfilling its role in the partnership against terrorism. Afghanistan without Mr. Karzai could conceivably dissolve into civil war. With President Karzai, Afghanistan will move toward being a stable, democratic and effective ally. It is thus important to honor Hamid Karzai's role in the war against terrorism.

Karzai needs to be trusted to get Japan to invest in mining projects

Sakamaki June 20th (Sachiko- Bloomberg staff writer, June 20th 10, *Bloomberg Businessweek*) ET

June 19 (Bloomberg) -- Afghan President Hamid Karzai invited Japanese companies including Mitsubishi Corp. to invest in mining projects in his country to express his gratitude for Japanese aid. “We want to return some of the good Japan has done for us,” Karzai said today in a speech at Doshisha University in Kyoto. “I had a meeting with Mitsubishi yesterday for that purpose.” The Afghan leader has sought to raise global interest in his country’s mineral wealth while assuring leaders his government can be trusted. Karzai assured Prime Minister Naoto Kan on June 17 that international aid won’t be squandered. The U.S. is promoting development of Afghanistan’s estimated $1 trillion in untapped mineral wealth as a means to stabilize Karzai’s government against Taliban insurgents. At the same time the U.S. and other nations are pushing Karzai to show he can effectively run the country amid reports of rampant government corruption.

These mining deposits could transform Afghanistan’s economy and help develop a solution to the war

Risen 10 (James, Pulitzer Prize-winning American journalist for The New York Times, *New York Times*, 7-13-10) ET

The United States has discovered nearly $1 trillion in untapped mineral deposits in Afghanistan, far beyond any previously known reserves and enough to fundamentally alter the Afghan economy and perhaps the Afghan war itself, according to senior American government officials.The previously unknown deposits — including huge veins of iron, copper, cobalt, gold and critical industrial metals like lithium — are so big and include so many minerals that are essential to modern industry that Afghanistan could eventually be transformed into one of the most important mining centers in the world, the United States officials believe. An internal Pentagon memo, for example, states that Afghanistan could become the “Saudi Arabia of lithium,” a key raw material in the manufacture of batteries for laptops and BlackBerrys. The vast scale of Afghanistan’s mineral wealth was discovered by a small team of Pentagon officials and American geologists. The Afghan government and President Hamid Karzai were recently briefed, American officials said. While it could take many years to develop a mining industry, the potential is so great that officials and executives in the industry believe it could attract heavy investment even before mines are profitable, providing the possibility of jobs that could distract from generations of war. “There is stunning potential here,” Gen. David H. Petraeus, commander of the United States Central Command, said in an interview on Saturday. “There are a lot of ifs, of course, but I think potentially it is hugely significant.” The value of the newly discovered mineral deposits dwarfs the size of Afghanistan’s existing war-bedraggled economy, which is based largely on opium production and narcotics trafficking as well as aid from the United States and other industrialized countries. Afghanistan’s gross domestic product is only about $12 billion. “This will become the backbone of the Afghan economy,” said Jalil Jumriany, an adviser to the Afghan minister of mines.

1AC Karzai Credibility

Karzai needs political capital to push a reconciliation through, which is key to keeping factions that would otherwise join the Taliban supporting him

Siddique 10 (Journalist, *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, 3.16.10)ET

In an effort to woo opposition lawmakers to end their boycott of peace jirga, Karzai on June 1 appointed a six-member commission to rule on constitutional disputes. His spokesman also promised to nominate 11 ministers for parliamentary approval next week, a sign that the Karzai administration is prepared to give in to the demands of legislators who have held up the formation of his cabinet. Prominent opposition leader and Karzai's opponent in the first round of last year's presidential election, Abdullah Abdullah, responded by saying on June 1 that neither he nor his supporters would join the jirga. He stopped short of a boycott, but said "we will not participate in it," agencies reported. the potential prize the administration can gain from the jirga, observers suggest, is being able to walk away with support for inviting hard-line Islamist leader Hekmatyar to join the political mainstream. Discussing Hekmatyar's fate was reportedly high on Karzai's agenda as he toured Washington last month. In March, his representatives met with Karzai and senior UN officials and offered to support Kabul's government if Western troops were to gradually withdraw. Hekmatyar has also distanced himself from Al-Qaeda, whose leaders he has known for decades. Briefly a prime minister in a failed postcommunist factional government in the 1990s, Hekmatyar joined hands with the Taliban after the U.S.-led military intervention in Afghanistan in 2001. But as he led part of the insurgency, many of his past associates joined with Karzai to become cabinet members, advisers, provincial governors, and lawmakers. Reconciliation with Hekmatyar, though significant, would not end the insurgency, and delegates to the peace jirga are well aware of their country's complexities. Qari Abdul Rahman Ahmadi, a member of the Parwan provincial council north of Kabul, says that the Afghan government and its international partners should commit to implementing the jirga's decisions and proposals. "The opponents of the government, people that we are trying to make peace with, they should accept our peace proposals and they should put forward their particular plans and mechanisms for peace," Ahmadi says.

1AC Karzai Credibility

Further Talibanization of Afghanistan spillover in Pakistan, wars across Central Asia, and escalatory nuclear strikes against India and Israel

Morgan 6 (Stephen J, British Labour Party Exectutive Committee, *Electric Articles*) ET

Musharraf probably hopes that by giving de facto autonomy to the Taliban and Pashtun leaders now with a virtual free hand for cross border operations into Afghanistan, he will undercut any future upsurge in support for a break-away independent Pashtunistan state or a “Peoples’ War” of the Pashtun populace as a whole, as he himself described it. However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could no be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US. What is at stake in “the half-forgotten war” in Afghanistan is far greater than that in Iraq. But America’s capacities for controlling the situation are extremely restricted. Might it be, in the end, they are also forced to accept President Musharraf's unspoken slogan of «Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!

1AC NATO Relations

**Drug war undermines US- NATO cooperation**

Kaufman 9 (Richard, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International  
Studies, Spring, http://www.sais-jhu.edu/academics/regional-studies/southasia/pdf/KAUFMANFinal.pdf)

It is this simplified vision that has prompted some American officials such as U.S. Army General John Craddock to push for an expansion of the ISAF mandate to include targeting of the Afghan drug industry. Yet this has sparked controversy among NATO officials, especially given that international law on armed conflict prohibits military action against civilians, even if they are involved in drug trafficking (Lobjakas, 2009, January 18). In what appears to be a growing rift between the American and European approaches to counternarcotics, some European states that contribute troops to ISAF such as Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain have expressed their reservations about expanding the ISAF mandate to include attacks on narcotics networks (Snyovitz, 2009, March 7).

NATO unity key to deal with political violence and potential nuclear war

Brzezinski 9 (Zbigniew Brzezinski, former U.S. National Security Adviser, Sept/Oct 2009, Foreign Affairs, 88(5), pp. 6-7) GAT

NATO's potential is not primarily military. Although NATO is a collective-security alliance, its actual military power comes predominantly from the United States, and that reality is not likely to change anytime soon. NATO's real power derives from the fact that it combines the United States' military capabilities and economic power with Europe's collective political and economic weight (and occasionally some limited European military forces). Together, that combination makes NATO globally significant. It must therefore remain sensitive to the importance of safeguarding the geopolitical bond between the United States and Europe as it addresses new tasks. The basic challenge that NATO now confronts is that there are historically unprecedented risks to global security. Today's world is threatened neither by the militant fanaticism of a territorially rapacious nationalist state nor by the coercive aspiration of a globally pretentious ideology embraced by an expansive imperial power. The paradox of our time is that the world, increasingly connected and economically interdependent for the first time in its entire history, is experiencing intensifying popular unrest made all the more menacing by the growing accessibility of weapons of mass destruction -- not just to states but also, potentially, to extremist religious and political movements. Yet there is no effective global security mechanism for coping with the growing threat of violent political chaos stemming from humanity's recent political awakening. The three great political contests of the twentieth century (the two world wars and the Cold War) accelerated the political awakening of mankind, which was initially unleashed in Europe by the French Revolution. Within a century of that revolution, spontaneous populist political activism had spread from Europe to East Asia. On their return home after World Wars I and II, the South Asians and the North Africans who had been conscripted by the British and French imperial armies propagated a new awareness of anticolonial nationalist and religious political identity among hitherto passive and pliant populations. The spread of literacy during the twentieth century and the wide-ranging impact of radio, television, and the Internet accelerated and intensified this mass global political awakening. In its early stages, such new political awareness tends to be expressed as a fanatical embrace of the most extreme ethnic or fundamentalist religious passions, with beliefs and resentments universalized in Manichaean categories. Unfortunately, in significant parts of the developing world, bitter memories of European colonialism and of more recent U.S. intrusion have given such newly aroused passions a distinctively anti-Western cast. Today, the most acute example of this phenomenon is found in an area that stretches from Egypt to India. This area, inhabited by more than 500 million politically and religiously aroused peoples, is where NATO is becoming more deeply embroiled. Additionally complicating is the fact that the dramatic rise of China and India and the quick recovery of Japan within the last 50 years have signaled that the global center of political and economic gravity is shifting away from the North Atlantic toward Asia and the Pacific. And of the currently leading global powers -- the United States, the EU, China, Japan, Russia, and India -- at least two, or perhaps even three, are revisionist in their orientation. Whether they are "rising peacefully" (a self-confident China), truculently (an imperially nostalgic Russia) or boastfully (an assertive India, despite its internal multiethnic and religious vulnerabilities), they all desire a change in the global pecking order. The future conduct of and relationship among these three still relatively cautious revisionist powers will further intensify the strategic uncertainty. Visible on the horizon but not as powerful are the emerging regional rebels, with some of them defiantly reaching for nuclear weapons. North Korea has openly flouted the international community by producing (apparently successfully) its own nuclear weapons -- and also by profiting from their dissemination. At some point, its unpredictability could precipitate the first use of nuclear weapons in anger since 1945. Iran, in contrast, has proclaimed that its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes but so far has been unwilling to consider consensual arrangements with the international community that would provide credible assurances regarding these intentions. In nuclear-armed Pakistan, an extremist anti-Western religious movement is threatening the country's political stability. These changes together reflect the waning of the post-World War II global hierarchy and the simultaneous dispersal of global power. Unfortunately, U.S. leadership in recent years unintentionally, but most unwisely, contributed to the currently threatening state of affairs. The combination of Washington's arrogant unilateralism in Iraq and its demagogic Islamophobic sloganeering weakened the unity of NATO and focused aroused Muslim resentments on the United States and the West more generally.

1AC NATO Relations

NATO is key to preventing Russo-Chinese resource wars

Talbott 2 (Strobe, President of Brookings Institution, http://www.cfr.org/publication/5259/from\_prague\_to\_baghdad.html) GAT

Less than 20 years ago, Russia seemed to be in another galaxy altogether. Now it has been drawn into multiple Western-centered orbits, including the NATO-Russia Council, the Partnership for Peace, and the Council of Europe. Bush, like Bill Clinton before him, has left open Russia's eligibility for NATO membership. Although that day is still a long way off, Russia today is more genuinely a partner of NATO than it was before. President Vladimir Putin's decision to accelerate his country's alignment with the West has profound implications for the future of NATO, including its scope and even its name. "North Atlantic" will seem inadequate as the geographic designation of an experiment in collective security expanding, as Winston Churchill might have put it, from Vilnius on the Baltic to Vladivostok on the Pacific. As that possibility becomes more of a reality, NATO planners will have to give fresh thought to the alliance's relations with China. Strategists in Beijing cannot be sanguine about Russia's eventually becoming a real ally of the West. Four NATO partners -- Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Russia -- are already on China's borders. As for the Russians themselves, they look to China not as a natural partner but as an almost certain geopolitical rival and as a potential military adversary. One reason Putin has been relatively relaxed about the next wave of NATO enlargement and the impending admission of the Baltic states is that he knows, as Western officials have long been saying, that Russia faces no threat from the west. But it does face one from the east, if only for a combination of demographic and economic reasons. Siberia and the Russian Far East are as rich in resources as they are barren in population, while the opposite is true on the Chinese side of the Amur and Ussuri Rivers. That discrepancy is a recipe for tension and even conflict. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization, or "Shanghai Six," might serve as a useful starting point for engaging China in the network of NATO-sponsored Eurasian security structures. That organization brings Chinese officials together with ones from Russia and several Central Asian states, all members of the Partnership for Peace and of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. Thus, in a development Truman and his contemporaries could hardly have imagined when they founded NATO 53 years ago, the alliance may turn out to be, at least indirectly through the EAPC, an ameliorating agent in relations between what used to be the Soviet Union and what is still the People's Republic of China

1AC Opium Brides Add-On

Opium eradication results in the commodification of women for money to pay off debts – these women suffer huge physical and psychological trauma.

Yousafazi 08 (Sami, writer for Newsweek, 3/29, http://www.newsweek.com/2008/03/29/the-opium-brides-of-afghanistan.html)

Afghans disparagingly call them "loan brides"—daughters given in marriage by fathers who have no other way out of debt. The practice began with the dowry a bridegroom's family traditionally pays to the bride's father in tribal Pashtun society. These days the amount ranges from $3,000 or so in poorer places like Laghman and Nangarhar to $8,000 or more in Helmand, Afghanistan's No. 1 opium-growing province. For a desperate farmer, that bride price can be salvation—but at a cruel cost. Among the Pashtun, debt marriage puts a lasting stain on the honor of the bride and her family. It brings shame on the country, too. President Hamid Karzai recently told the nation: "I call on the people [not to] give their daughters for money; they shouldn't give them to old men, and they shouldn't give them in forced marriages." All the same, local farmers say a man can get killed for failing to repay a loan. No one knows how many debt weddings take place in Afghanistan, where 93 percent of the world's heroin and other opiates originate. But Afghans say the number of loan brides keeps rising as poppy-eradication efforts push more farmers into default. "This will be our darkest year since 2000," says Baz Mohammad, 65, a white-bearded former opium farmer in Nangarhar. "Even more daughters will be sold this year." The old man lives with the anguish of selling his own 13-year-old daughter in 2000, after Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed Omar banned poppy growing. "Lenders never show any mercy," the old man says. Local farmers say more than one debtor has been bound hand and foot, then locked into a small windowless room with a smoldering fire, slowly choking to death. While law enforcers predict yet another record opium harvest in Afghanistan this spring, most farmers are struggling to survive. An estimated 500,000 Afghan families support themselves by raising poppies, according to the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. Last year those growers received an estimated $1 billion for their crops—about $2,000 per household. With at least six members in the average family, opium growers' per capita income is roughly $300. The real profits go to the traffickers, their Taliban allies and the crooked officials who help them operate. The country's well-oiled narcotics machine generates in excess of $4 billion a year from exports of processed opium and heroin—more than half of Afghanistan's $7.5 billion GDP, according to the UNODC. Efforts to promote other crops have failed. Wheat or corn brings $250 an acre at best, while poppy growers can expect 10 times that much. Besides, poppies are more dependable: hardier than either wheat or corn and more tolerant of drought and extreme heat and cold. And in a country with practically no government-funded credit for small farmers, opium growers can easily get advances on their crops. The borrower merely agrees to repay the cash with so many kilos of opium, at a price stipulated by the lender—often 40 percent or more below market value. Islam forbids charging interest on a loan, but moneylenders in poppy country elude the ban by packaging the deal as a crop-futures transaction—and never mind that the rate of return is tantamount to usury. Opium is thriving in the south, particularly the provinces of Helmand and Nimruz, where Taliban fighters keep government eradication teams at bay. But times are perilously hard for farmers in other places like Nangarhar, a longtime poppy-growing province on the mountainous Pakistani border. Mohammad Zahir Khan, a Nangarhar sharecropper in his late 40s, borrowed $850 against last spring's harvest, promising 10 kilos of opium to the lender—about $1,250 on the local market. The cash bought food and other necessities for his family and allowed him to get seed, fertilizer and help tending his three sharecropped acres. In the spring he collected 45 kilos of raw opium paste, half of which went immediately to the landowner. But before Khan could repay the loan, his wife fell seriously ill with a kidney ailment. She needed better medical care than Nangarhar could offer, so he rushed her across the Pakistani border to a private hospital in Peshawar. It cost almost every cent they had, and Khan knew his opium debt would only grow. Worse, the provincial governor, a former warlord named Gul Agha Sherzai, chose that moment to declare his own war on drugs, jailing hundreds of local farmers who were caught planting opium. Nangarhar had 45,000 acres in poppies a year ago; today drug experts say the province is totally clean. Late last year Khan reluctantly gave his 16-year-old daughter, Gul Ghoti, in marriage to the lender's 15-year-old son. Besides forgiving Khan's debt, the creditor gave him a $1,500 cash dowry. Khan calls him an honorable man. "Until the end of my life I will feel shame because of what I did to my daughter," Khan says. "I still can't look her in the eye." But at least she was old enough to marry, he adds. He claims one local farmer recently had to promise the hand of his 2-month-old daughter to free his family from an opium debt. Khan is raising wheat this year. He doubts it will support his family, and he worries that eventually one of his two younger daughters will become a loan bride. Neither of them is yet in her teens. Eradication efforts aren't the only thing pushing opium marriages. Poppy acreage is expanding in Helmand province, but loan brides are common there, too, says Bashir Ahmad Nadim, a local journalist. He says moneylenders in Helmand are always looking for "opium flowers"— marriageable daughters ready for plucking if crop failure or family emergency forces a borrower into default. In the south's drug-fueled economy, fathers of opium brides often get hefty cash bonuses on top of having their debts forgiven. But in Nangarhar, even former lenders are feeling the pinch. Enaghul, 40, used to be a relatively prosperous poppy farmer. Today he has little to show for his past wealth aside from his 17-year-old daughter-in-law, Shaukina, and a 2-month-old grandson. "She is pretty and works hard in the fields," Enaghul says, still happy to have won her for his son. Four years ago he gave
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<CONTINUED>Shaukina's father a loan in return for a promise of 30 kilos of opium, never imagining that both their fields would be eradicated before harvest. That's how Enaghul's son married Shaukina. But with the opium ban, Enaghul says his family is barely surviving. They make less than $2 a day growing tomatoes and potatoes. Enaghul casts an appraising eye on his youngest daughter, Sharifa, 5, as she runs after a goat in the courtyard of their mud-and-brick home. "I think she would fetch between $500 and $600," he says. With luck, he says, he might be able to postpone the wedding five or six years. Some Western officials promise the hard times won't last much longer. Loren Stoddard, Afghanistan director for the U.S. Agency for International Development, says crop-substitution programs are already yielding results. As many as 40,000 farming families in Nangarhar are receiving some kind of compensation for the loss of opium revenues, he says, and USAID has financed the planting of 1.3 million fruit, nut and other trees in the province since 2006, with plans for an additional 300,000 this year. There's even a new mill producing 30 tons of chicken feed a day. "Good things are happening here," Stoddard says. "I think Nangarhar will take off in the next two years." Many farmers doubt they can hold out that long. Kachkol Khan looks around his single acre of wheat in Pa Khel village and asks how he will feed his family of seven. "What we earn from this wheat won't feed us for one month," he says. Six months ago he gave the hand of his 13-year-old daughter, Bibi Gula, to settle an opium debt of $700, with roughly $1,500 cash thrown in. That's what they're living on now. At least his creditor agreed to let Gula stay home until she turns 15. "I'm not happy with what I did," Khan says. "Every daughter has ambitions to marry with dignity. I fear she'll be treated as a second-class wife and as a maid." Even worse is his worry that the same future may await his two younger daughters, 11 and 10. Angiza Afridi, 28, has spent much of the past year interviewing more than 100 families about opium weddings in two of Nangarhar's 22 districts. The schoolteacher and local TV reporter already had firsthand knowledge of the tragedy. Five years ago one of her younger aunts, then 16, was forced to marry a 55-year-old man to pay off an older uncle's opium debt, and three years ago an 8-year-old cousin was also given in marriage to make good on a drug loan. "This practice of marrying daughters to cover debts is becoming a bad habit," says Afridi. Even so, the results of her survey shocked her. In the two districts she studied, approximately half the new brides had been given in marriage to repay opium debts. The new brides included children as young as 5 years old; until they're old enough to consummate their marriages, they mostly work as household servants for their in-laws. "These poor girls have no future," she says. The worst of it may be the suicides. Afridi learned of one 15-year-old opium bride who poisoned herself on her wedding day late last year and an 11-year-old who took a fatal dose of opium around the same time. Her new in-laws were refusing to let her visit her parents. Gul Ghoti is on her first visit home since her wedding six months ago. She says it's a relief to be back with her father and mother in their two-room mud-and-brick house, if only temporarily. "My heart is still with my parents, brothers and sisters," she says. "Only my body is with my husband's family." She says she personally knows of two opium brides who killed themselves. "One of the girls had been badly beaten by her husband's brother, the other by her husband," she says. Ghoti says she's considered suicide, too, but Islam stopped her. "I pray that God doesn't give me a daughter if she ends up like me."

The terminal impact to patriarchy is nuclear holocaust

Spretnak 89 (Charlene, MA in English at Berkeley, “Exposing Nuclear Phallacies, p. 60)

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 a 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 multiple-warhead nuclear 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.

1AC - Positive Peace Add-On

War on Drugs and War on Terror sanitize the way we look at life as peace and conflict resolution

Cuomo 92 (Chris. Ph.D., 1992, University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Philosophy University of Cincinnati Hypatia Fall 1996.Vol.11, Iss. 4) M  
Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connections among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns. I propose that the constancy of militarism and its effects on social reality be reintroduced as a crucial locus of contemporary feminist attentions, and that feminists emphasize how wars are eruptions and manifestations of omnipresent militarism that is a product and tool of multiply oppressive, corporate, technocratic states.(2) Feminists should be particularly interested in making this shift because it better allows consideration of the effects of war and militarism on women, subjugated peoples, and environments. While giving attention to the constancy of militarism in contemporary life we need not neglect the importance of addressing the specific qualities of direct, large-scale, declared military conflicts. But the dramatic nature of declared, large-scale conflicts should not obfuscate the ways in which military violence pervades most societies in increasingly technologically sophisticated ways and the significance of military institutions and everyday practices in shaping reality. Philosophical discussions that focus only on the ethics of declaring and fighting wars miss these connections, and also miss the ways in which even declared military conflicts are often experienced as omnipresent horrors. These approaches also leave unquestioned tendencies to suspend or distort moral judgement in the face of what appears to be the inevitability of war and militarism.

**Representations of war as a bounded temporal event sanitize peace time militarism and produce a politics of crises that disable any possible resistance to structural violence**

**Cuomo 96** (Chris Cuomo - Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the Univerity of Georgia – 1996 )

Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states lead to crisis-based politics and analyses. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they distract attention from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the false belief that the absence of declared armed conflicts is peace, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, creates forms of resistance to militarism that are merely exercises in crisis control. Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declara­tions of war might actually keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism.Seeing war as necessarily embed­ded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state*.* Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies concerning war and military violence also enables consideration of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance*.* Forexample*,* investigatingthe ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; *ho*w the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests*;* the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances*.* It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war."
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Structural violence kills more than any other type

Pilisuk 1 (Marc, “GLOBALISM AND STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE” Peace, Conflict, and Violence:

Peace Psychology for the 21st Century. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.) CH

Limited material resources are not the only plight of poor people. Poverty inflicts psychological scars as well; it is an experience of scarcity amidst affluence. For many reasons, such as those discussed by Opotow (this volume), poverty produces the scorn of others and the internalized scorn of oneself. Indigence is not just about money, roads, or TVs, but also about the power to determine how local resources will be used to give meaning to lives. The power of global corporations in local communities forces people to depend on benefits from afar. Projected images of the good life help reduce different cultural values to the one global value of money. Meanwhile, money becomes concentrated in fewer hands. The world is dividing into a small group of “haves” and a growing group of paupers. This division of wealth inflicts a level of structural violence that kills many more persons than have died by all direct acts of violence and by war.

Structural violence is more damaging than nuclear war

Evangelista 5 (Matthew, Professor of International and comparative politics, Harvard University, “Peace studies: Critical Concepts in Political Science”, 2005, http://books.google.com/books?id=9IAfLDzySd4C&pg=PA41&lpg=PA41&dq=%22structural+violence%22+%22nuclear+war%22&source=bl&ots=m9wAXnUQqH&sig=4MnhVGRGJJ\_Z8aS5SSmTptgRqYM&hl=en&ei=YBJZSoSeKYuqswOQ9fjWBg&sa=X&oi=book\_result&ct=result&resnum=6, AD: 7/11/9) MT

But equally important is to recall that it is hardly possible to arrive at any general judgment, independent of time and space, as to which type of violence is more important. In space, today, it may certainly be argued that research in the Americas should focus on structural violence, between nations as well as between individuals, and that peace research in Europe should have a similar focus on personal violence. Latent personal violence in Europe may erupt into nuclear war, but the manifest structural violence in the Americas (and not only there) already causes an annual toll of nuclear magnitudes. In saying this, we are of course not neglecting the structural components of the European situation, (such as the big power dominance and the traditional exploitation of Eastern Europe by Western Europe) nor are we forgetful of the high level of personal violence in the Americas even though it does not take the form of international warfare (but sometimes the form of interventionist aggression).

1AC Poverty Advantage

The war on drugs & eradication policies pushes Afghan farmers into poverty

ICOS 6 (International Council on Security and Development, “Afghan Farmers Come to UK to Plead for the ir Livelihoods, <http://www.icosgroup.net/modules/press_releases/afghan_farmers>, date accessed:6/22/2010) AK

Following the international donors’ conference for Afghanistan’s reconstruction, which took place in London this week, a group of Afghan farmers has arrived in London today to urge the British government not to use violent strategies against their communities and their families in the coming months. Poppy crop eradication is part of the planned drug strategy by the UK – the lead country for counter-narcotics in Afghanistan – to curb the cultivation of opium in the country. During their visit, the farmers will also visit drug-users and communities affected by drug use in Blackburn on Saturday and will attend a meeting at the House of Commons on Monday.  “We have come to London to ask the British government to help us, and not to use violence against us and our families,” said Mr Akramullah Said, a farmer from Nangahar province. “We want the British people to understand that we are very poor people and that if our crops are destroyed we will be ruined. We are frightened about our future and our children’s lives. If our crops are destroyed we cannot feed our children. Surely there must be an alternative to this that can be found?”  Eradication of poppy crops poses a major threat to the future stability of Afghanistan because it destroys rural livelihoods without replacing them. This in turn presents a large security risk to the country and the region as confidence in the central government plummets. The eradication of crops which has been happening since 2001 has had no effect on the amounts of opium being produced in Afghanistan – the country still produces 87% of the world’s opium.  “Eradication is a very dangerous and destructive policy to pursue,” said Emmanuel Reinert, Executive Director of ICOS. “Drug policy is the core issue in Afghanistan’s security and the proposed “quick-fix” aggressive tactics should not be used,” he warned. “Drug policy has to be tackled in a comprehensive, ‘pro-poor’, development orientated way. Current approaches are totally out of touch with the reality of the security situation in Afghanistan. What Afghanistan needs is an intelligent response, not militaristic tactics that wage war on the poor farmers of Afghanistan.”  The Council warned that the British troops who are being deployed to Southern Afghanistan in April must under no circumstances be involved in crop eradication.  “The mandate of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force has no authority to destroy crops or to take military action against Afghan Farmers,” said Reinert. “Soldiers will also be put in life-threatening situations if they participate in crop-destruction campaigns because they could become the victims of increasing violence and instability as a result of the current approach to the drug issue.”

Poverty is already killing Afghani people- eliminating opium would destroy the country

Cordesman & Mausner 2010 (Anthony and Adam, “Is a “population-centric” Strategy Possible?”, <http://csis.org/publication/agriculture-food-and-poverty-afghanistan>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK

Poverty actually kills more Afghans than those who die as a direct result of the armed conflict either accidental, nor inevitable; it is both a cause and a consequence of a massive human rights deficit. The deficit includes widespread impunity and inadequate investment in, and attention to, human rights. Patronage, corruption, impunity and over-emphasis on short-term goals rather than targeted long-term development are exacerbating a situation of dire poverty that is the condition of an overwhelming majority of Afghans.

...According to the [report](http://unama.unmissions.org/Portals/UNAMA/human%20rights/Poverty%20Report%2030%20March%202010_English.pdf) published by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights ([OHCHR](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Pages/WelcomePage.aspx)), some 9 million Afghans – 36 per cent of the population – are believed to live in absolute poverty and a further 37 per cent live only slightly above the poverty line, despite an estimated injection of some $35 billion during the period 2002-2009. Afghanistan has the second highest maternal mortality rate in the world and the third highest rate of child mortality. Only 23 per cent of the population have access to safe drinking water, and only 24 per cent of Afghans above the age of 15 can read and write, with much lower literacy rates among women and nomadic populations.

1AC Poverty Advantage

This will push 80% of Afghanistan’s workforce into poverty

Christian Science Monitor 2010 (June 10, <http://ca.news.yahoo.com/s/10062010/20/afghanistan-opium-farmers-turn-poppies-saffron.html>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK

With at least 80 percent of Afghanistans workforce involved in agriculture, policymakers have long focused on rehabilitating the farming sector to provide profitable options other than poppies, which fuel the countrys opium trade. The United States has touted wheat as an alternative crop, but with a market price three times lower than opium, few farmers care to make the switch.

Poverty in Afghanistan leads to increased instability and terrorist recruitment

Xinhua 8 (international news agency, http://www.rawa.org/temp/runews/2008/09/28/poverty-unemployment-driving-afghanistan-towards-instability.html) GAT

Driving factors towards increasing instability, according to Afghans, is high rate of unemployment and poverty in the war-wrecked country. Many of those fighters joining Taliban insurgents are illiterate tribal people, young seminarians and low educated jobless youths. "If I fail to find job I would have no choice except to join Taliban or leave for Iran as I heard they (Taliban) pay more stipend than the government," said a jobless youth who was waiting for customer at a square in west of Kabul. Taliban outfit, according to him, pay 400 U.S. dollars while a government soldier receives some 200 U.S. dollars a month. Hundreds of jobless Afghans are seen waiting from dawn to dusk at Chawk Kota Sangi square west of Kabul to be hired. If anyone calls for a laborer, dozens would surround him. The job-seeking man who introduced himself Faiz Ali emphasized that "no one would commit suicide unless he or she is fed up with the miserable life." Though there is no exact statistic about the rate of unemployment in Afghanistan, it is said that some 40 percent of the country's 25 million populations are jobless and some 5 million Afghans live under poverty line in the war-battered nation. "High rate of unemployment has driven thousands of Afghan youth to the neighboring countries Pakistan and Iran to seek job or to Taliban rank to fight government and international troops based in Afghanistan," the 48-year old man stressed. **Xinhua**, Sep. 28, 2008 The war-torn and landlocked Afghanistan is largely dependent on international community's assistance to recover from over three decades of war and civil strife. Since the collapse of Taliban regime in late 2001 the international community has contributed more than 35 billion U.S. dollars for the rebuilding of the war-ravaged central Asian state. In the post-Taliban Afghanistan the per capita income has increased from 70 U.S. dollars in 2001 to 300 U.S. dollars in 2008,according to Aziz Shams, an official at the Ministry of Finance. Afghanistan, even though has made tremendous achievements in the fields of communication and road building, needs a long way to go to recover from war devastation and stand on its feet. Majority of Afghans have little access to clean water, job, job insurance and regular income to run their daily life smoothly. Increasing Taliban-led militancy, poor living conditions particularly in the countryside, and the sway of warlords coupled with corruption and poppy cultivation have enabled militants to challenge government and exploit the situation for their benefit. "Taliban militants come to our village almost every night and ask people to support them (Taliban) either by giving money or man," said a man from Barakibarak district of Logar province who did not want to be identified. He also said that the government has to protect the lives and properties of the citizens by eliminating Taliban insurgents from each corner of the country. Mostly proclaimed offenders and those at large have gathered under the umbrella of Taliban to hide their face and escape punishment, a person from southern Uruzgan province said. The 48-year old man who refused to be identified said that Taliban outfit pays 500,000 Afghanis (10,000 U.S. dollars) as reward for any group or individuals who attack a district headquarters. Many of those carry out suicide bombing, according to him, besides receiving money from their masters have been brain washed. "High rate of unemployment has driven thousands of Afghan youth to the neighboring countries Pakistan and Iran to seek job or to Taliban rank to fight government and international troops based in Afghanistan," the 48-year old man stressed. He also emphasized that daily long queue of visa seekers behind the embassies of Iran and Pakistan speaks of the living condition of people in the country and "Taliban would further benefit from the situation if the status quo goes unchecked."
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Instability in Afghan will easily spread to Central Asia

Reuters 9 (international news agency, <http://www.moveoneinc.com/blog/ar/asia/instability-may-spread-from-afghanistan-to-central-asia/>) ET

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.’ Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan said this year they had smashed Taliban-linked gangs in operations that involved armed clashes. But human rights groups say some Central Asian government are using the Islamist threat as an excuse to crack down on those refusing to adhere to the officially sponsored versions of Islam

1AC Poverty Advantage

Any conflict or instability in Central Asia could easily cause an escalatory war between the great powers

Peimani 2 (Hooman, independent consultant and international relations researcher, *Failed Transition, Bleak Future?: War and Instability in Central Asia and the Caucasus,* pp. 142) GAT

The impact of war and instability in the Caucasus or Central Asia will not be confined to the countries immediately affected. Any local conflict could escalate and expand to its neighboring countries, only to destabilize its entire respective region. Furthermore, certain countries with stakes in the stability of Central Asia and/or the Caucasus could well be dragged into such a conflict, intentionally or unintentionally. Regardless of the form or extent of their intervention in a future major war, the sheer act of intervention could further escalate the war, increase the human suffering, and plant the seeds for its further escalation. Needless to say, this could only further contribute to the devastation of all parties involved and especially of the “hosting” CA or Caucasian countries. In fact, certain factors could even kindle a military confrontation between and among the five regional and non-regional states with long-term interests in Central Asia and the Caucasus. This scenario could potentially destabilize large parts of Asia and Europe. The geographical location of the two regions as a link between Asia and Europe—shared to different extents by Iran, Turkey, and Russia—creates a “natural” geographical context for the expansion of any regional war involving those states to other parts of Asia and Europe. Added to this, Iran, China, Turkey, Russia, and the United States all have ties and influence in parts of Asia and Europe. They are also members of regional organizations such as the Economic Cooperation Organization (Iran and Turkey) or military organizations such as NATO (Turkey and the United States). These geographical, political, economic and military ties could help expand any conflict in which they are involved.

Nuclear war

Ahrari 1 (M. Ehsan, professor of national security and strategy at Armed Forces Staff College,  www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/Pubs/display.cfm?pubID=112) ET

South and Central Asia constitute a part of the world where a well-designed American strategy might help avoid crises or catastrophe. The U.S. military would provide only one component of such a strategy, and a secondary one at that, but has an important role to play through engagement activities and regional confidence-building. Insecurity has led the states of the region to seek weapons of mass destruction, missiles, and conventional arms. It has also led them toward policies which undercut the security of their neighbors. If such activities continue, the result could be increased terrorism, humanitarian disasters, continued low-level conflict and potentially even major regional war or a thermonuclear exchange. A shift away from this pattern could allow the states of the region to become solid economic and political partners for the United States, thus representing a gain for all concerned.

1AC Stability Advantage – Uniqueness

Continued DEA war on drugs ensures we will lose the war on terror

Carpenter 9 (Ted Galen, vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the libertarian Cato Institute, March 6, 2009, “Fight Drugs or Terrorists — But Not Both”, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=10027>)KFC

A proposed directive by General John Craddock, Nato's top commander, to target opium traffickers and "facilitators" in Afghanistan has provoked considerable opposition within the alliance. That resistance is warranted, since Craddock's proposal is a spectacularly bad idea. Implementing this proposal would greatly complicate Nato's mission in Afghanistan by driving Afghans into the arms of the Taliban and al-Qaida. US and Nato leaders need to understand that they can wage the war against radical Islamic terrorists in Afghanistan or wage a war on narcotics — but they can't do both with any prospect of success. The opium trade is a huge part — better than one-third — of the country's economy. Attempts to suppress it will provoke fierce opposition. Worse yet, opium grows best in the southern provinces populated by Pashtuns, a people traditionally hostile to a strong central government and any foreign troop presence. These same provinces produced the Taliban and more easily revert to supporting fundamentalist militias than their Tajik, Uzbek and Hazara neighbours to the north. Alternatives to opium offer little hope. More than 90% of the world's opium comes from Afghanistan. Taking on opium in Afghanistan means taking on the world's demand for opium. Opium purchases for medicinal uses and substitute crop programmes with wheat, saffron and pomegranates will not stanch the demand for illicit drug production. In fact, reducing the illegal harvest with these efforts only makes the black-market prices rise and encourages farmers to grow more. If the Cold War taught us anything, it is that you cannot fight economics. If the Cold War taught us anything, it is that you cannot fight economics. Proponents of a crackdown argue that a vigorous eradication effort is needed to dry up the funds flowing to the Taliban and al-Qaida. Those groups do benefit from the drug trade, but they are hardly the only ones. A UN report estimates that more than 500,000 Afghan families are involved in drug commerce. Given the network of extended families and clans in Afghanistan, it is likely that at least 35% of the country's population has a stake in the drug trade. Furthermore, Nato forces rely on opium-poppy farmers to provide information on the movement of enemy forces. Escalating the counter-narcotics effort risks alienating these crucial intelligence sources. Equally important, many of President Hamid Karzai's key political allies also profit from trafficking. These allies include regional warlords who backed the Taliban when that faction was in power, switching sides only when it was clear that the US-led military offensive in late 2001 was going to succeed. Targeting such traffickers is virtually guaranteed to cause them to switch sides yet again. Targeting drug traffickers also makes it impossible to achieve any "awakening" on par with the American success in Sunni areas of Iraq. We cannot fund local militias to keep the Taliban out. These militias already pay themselves from drug profits. These same drug profits will keep them loyal to Nato's enemies as long as the alliance remains committed to destroying their livelihood. Ted Galen Carpenter is vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, is the author of eight books on international affairs, including Smart Power: Toward a Prudent Foreign Policy for America (2008). David H. Rittgers is a legal policy analyst at the Cato Institute. More by Ted Galen Carpenter More by David Rittgers Nato leaders need to keep their priorities straight. The principal objective is to defeat radical Islamic terrorists. The drug war is a dangerous distraction from that goal. Recognising that security interests sometimes trump other objectives would hardly be unprecedented. For example, US officials eased their pressure on Peru's government regarding the drug-eradication issue in the early 1990s, when Lima concluded it was more important to induce farmers involved in the cocaine trade to abandon their alliance with the Maoist Shining Path guerrillas. The Obama administration should adopt a similarly pragmatic policy in Afghanistan and look the other way regarding drug trafficking. Alienating crucial Afghan factions in a vain attempt to disrupt the flow of drug revenues to the Taliban and al-Qaida is a strategy that is far too dangerous. This war is too important to sacrifice on the altar of drug-war orthodoxy.

1AC Stability Advantage – Terrorism Module (1/2)

Counter narcotic efforts already push resentful millions into the Taliban’s hands.

Hwang 9 (Inyoung, JUNE 09, 2009, “Afghanistan: Is counternarcotics undermining counterinsurgency?”, <http://news.medill.northwestern.edu/washington/news.aspx?id=133849>)KFC

As the drug trade strengthened the Taliban, U.S. officials sought to fight it. But they ran into obstacles because of the widespread corruption in the country and the argument that counternarcotics operations would distract military attention from the higher counterinsurgency mission. The biggest risk in U.S. efforts to end the opium trade is alienating Afghan peasants who often turn to the Taliban to protect their poppy farms. “We're driving them into the arms of the Taliban and Al Qaeda and sacrificing the broader mission,” Carpenter said. A landlocked country, stricken by decades of conflict, Afghanistan has a GDP per capita of $800, according to CIA figures, placing it in the bottom rung of poor countries. The country’s GDP in 2008 was $23 billion, excluding opium production. But opium is a key product and export for the country’s economy, and some claim fighting the drug trade only targets Afghan farmers by depriving them of their livelihood. Carpenter said it’s not coincidental that the Taliban and Al Qaeda have their greatest influence in Helmand and Kandahar because residents who depend on the drug trade “bitterly resent the Afghan government, NATO forces and U.S. presence” for trying to curb poppy cultivation. “One-third of the Afghan population is involved in some way with the drug trade,” he said. However, Susan Pittman, a spokeswoman for the State Department’s office of Immigration, Narcotics and Law Enforcement, downplays the problem, pointing to a different figure. Only 10 percent of Afghanistan’s agricultural land is used for poppy farming, she said. The question of how involved the military should be in disrupting the drug trade is a divisive one. Some experts and officials argue peace needs to be achieved first. For a counternarcotics policy to succeed, a functional state needs to exist first. But other experts point to how intertwined the insurgency movements and the drug trade are. The Afghan government can never gain legitimacy with a rampant, corrupt opium trade in the country.

**1AC Stability Advantage**

Further Talibanization of Afghanistan spillover in Pakistan, wars across Central Asia, and escalatory nuclear strikes against India and Israel

Morgan 6 (Stephen J, British Labour Party Exectutive Committee, *Electric Articles*) ET

Musharraf probably hopes that by giving de facto autonomy to the Taliban and Pashtun leaders now with a virtual free hand for cross border operations into Afghanistan, he will undercut any future upsurge in support for a break-away independent Pashtunistan state or a “Peoples’ War” of the Pashtun populace as a whole, as he himself described it. However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could no be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US. What is at stake in “the half-forgotten war” in Afghanistan is far greater than that in Iraq. But America’s capacities for controlling the situation are extremely restricted. Might it be, in the end, they are also forced to accept President Musharraf's unspoken slogan of «Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!

Failure to stop terrorism by risks nuclear terrorism- biggest impact 1- global depression, 2- magnitude, 3- security threat

Haas 6 ( Richard Haas, *Council of Foreign relations,* March 2006) ET

A nuclear attack by terrorists against the United States has the potential to make the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, look like a historical footnote. In addition to the immediate horrific devastation, such an attack could cost trillions of dollars in damages, potentially sparking a global economic depression. Although, during the 2004 presidential campaign, President George W. Bush and Democratic challenger Senator John F. Kerry agreed that terrorists armed with nuclear weapons worried them more than any other national security threat, the U.S. government has yet to elevate nuclear terrorism prevention to the highest priority. Despite several U.S. and international programs to secure nuclear weapons and the materials to make them, major gaps in policy remain.

1AC Terrorism Advantage

Destroying opium causes farmers to turn to the Taliban to avoid death

Walt 10 (Vivienne, April 1, “Afghanistan’s New Bumper Drug Crop: Cannabis”, <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1976867,00.html>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AJK

Worse, many believe the policies have helped stoke the Taliban's war against the coalition by uniting residents against the Afghan soldiers who destroyed their opium crops. "Eradicating marijuana and opium fields can breed resentment by people and be destabilizing," says John Dempsey, a rule-of-law adviser to U.S. and Afghan officials for the U.S. Institute of Peace. He cites the town of Marjah, in Helmand province, where U.S. forces rolled tanks over poppy fields in a major offensive in February, two years after Afghan forces destroyed the local farmers' opium crops. After those antidrug offensives, Dempsey says, "local residents felt they preferred the Taliban, because they let them grow opium." About 70% of the farmers surveyed by local U.N. workers in 20 largely Taliban-controlled provinces said they paid about 10% of their earnings to the local forces that controlled their areas. Dempsey believes farmers could be better persuaded to give up growing opium and cannabis if Western and Afghan officials introduced big incentives and subsidies for growing food crops and helped farmers sell them. One crucial problem, he says, is that the roads in southern Afghanistan are too dangerous for farmers to drive their crops to local markets. Groups of armed drug traffickers, meanwhile, travel through the countryside, buying opium and cannabis at the farm gates for cash. For many farmers in the area, making a living and staying alive — sadly — go hand in hand.

Crop eradication makes Afghan farmers dependant on the Taliban

Drug War Chronicle 9 (7/3/2009, <http://stopthedrugwar.org/chronicle/592/afghanistan_US_stops_opium_poppy_eradication>, date accessed: 6/22/2010)AJK

"The new counternarcotics strategy in Afghanistan which scales down eradication and emphasizes rural development and interdiction is exactly right," said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a drugs, development, and security expert with the Brookings Institution. "Under the prevailing conditions in Afghanistan, eradication has been not only ineffective; it has been counterproductive because it strengthens the bond between the rural population dependent on the illicit economy and the Taliban. Backing away from counterproductive eradication is not only a right analysis, it is also a courageous break on the part of the Obama administration with decades of failed counternarcotics strategy worldwide that centers on premature and unsustainable eradication," she added.

"This is clearly a positive, pragmatic step," said Ethan Nadelmann, executive director of the [Drug Policy Alliance](http://www.drugpolicy.org). "It seems that the Obama administration is so deeply invested in succeeding in Afghanistan that they're actually willing to pursue a pragmatic drug policy. This is an intelligent move," he added. "It is an implicit recognition that you are not going to eradicate opium production in this world so long as there is a market for it. Given that Afghanistan is the dominant opium producer right now, the pragmatic strategy is to figure out how to manage that production rather than to pursue a politically destructive and ineffective crop eradication strategy.

1AC Terrorism Advantage

The war on drugs makes it impossible to win the overall war

Carpenter 4 (Ted Galen, “How the Drug War in Afghanistan Undermines America’s War on Terror”, Nov 10, Foreign Policy Briefing, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb84.pdf> , date accessed: 6/21/2010) AJK

The war on drugs is interfering with the U.S. effort to destroy Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. U.S. officials increasingly want to eradicate drugs as well as nurture Afghanistan’s embryonic democracy, symbolized by the pro-Western regime of President Hamid Karzai. They need to face the reality that it is not possible to accomplish both objectives. An especially troubling indicator came in August 2004 when Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld stated that drug eradication in Afghanistan was a high priority of the Bush administration and indicated that the United States and its coalition partners were in the process of formulating a “master plan” for dealing with the problem.1 “The danger a large drug trade poses in this country is too serious to ignore,” Rumsfeld said. “The inevitable result is to corrupt the government and way of life, and that would be most unfortunate.”2

The DEA angers Afghanis and hurts the War on Terror.

Balko  9 (Radley, [a policy analyst](http://www.cato.org/people/balko.html) for the Cato Institute, January 23, 2009, http://reason.org/news/show/the-drug-wars-collateral-damag)SRH

America’s quest to rid the world of illicit drugs knows no boundaries—political or moral. Just months before September 11, we gave $43 million to Afghanistan—a way of compensating Afghan farmers hurt by the Taliban’s compliance with a U.S. request to crack down on that country’s opium farms (as it turns out, the Taliban had merely eradicated the farms in competition with the Taliban’s own producers). We don’t seem to have learned. The western world’s prohibition on opium makes poppies a lucrative crop for impoverished Afghan farmers, and is a valuable recruiting tool for insurgents and remnant Taliban forces. At the same time, we have DEA agents and U.S. and United Nations troops roving the country on search-and-destroy missions, setting Afghani livelihoods aflame before their very eyes—not exactly the way to build alliances. Former BBC correspondent Misha Glenny, author of a book on the global drug trade, explained last year in the Washington Post: In the past two years, the drug war has become the Taliban's most effective recruiter in Afghanistan. Afghanistan's Muslim extremists have reinvigorated themselves by supporting and taxing the countless peasants who are dependent one way or another on the opium trade, their only reliable source of income. The Taliban is becoming richer and stronger by the day, especially in the east and south of the country. The "War on Drugs" is defeating the "war on terror." But it isn’t just Afghanistan. The U.S. has a long history of turning a blind eye to human rights abuses and unintended consequences in the name of eradicating illicit drugs overseas. For example, between 2001 and 2003, the U.S. gave more than $12 million to Thailand for drug interdiction efforts. Over ten months in 2003, the Thai government sent out anti-drug “death squads” to carry out the summary, extra-judicial executions of as many as 4,000 suspected drug offenders. Many were later found to have had nothing to do with the drug trade at all. Though the U.S. State Department denounced the killings, the United States continued to give the same Thai regime millions in aid for counter-narcotics operations.

1AC Terrorism Advantage- Impacts

The war on drugs in Afghanistan decimates our ability to fight the important war

Carpenter 6 (Ted Galen, June 5, “Afghan Drug War Follies”, <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/2006/06/05/afghan-drug-war-follies/>, date accessed: 6/21/2010) AJK

The Associated Press [reports](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20060603/ap_on_re_mi_ea/dea_afghan_pilots) that 16 Afghan soldiers have just graduated from a new program at Fort Bliss that trained them to fly helicopters in drug eradication campaigns. They will now return to their homeland, the world’s top opium producer. Washington’s increasing pressure on the government of Afghan President Hamid Karzai to wage a vigorous war on drugs is the latest installment in a prohibitionist strategy that has failed for decades. The international drug war is a terrible policy wherever it is tried, but it is an especially unwise venture in Afghanistan. As a recent [Cato Institute policy study notes](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=2607), the drug trade accounts for more than a third of that country’s economic output. Regional warlords who originally backed the Taliban and Al Qaeda but switched their allegiance to the Karzai government derive much of their revenue from the opium trade. Even more important, hundreds of thousands of Afghan farmers base their livelihood on drug crops. They will not look kindly on the Karzai government if it tries to drive their families into destitution. U.S. policymakers need to keep their priorities straight. Our overriding objective in Afghanistan should be to eliminate the remaining Taliban and Al Qaeda forces. The drug war undermines that objective and may drive otherwise friendly Afghans into the arms of our enemies. There is a troubling correlation between the upsurge of violence in Afghanistan in recent months and the intensification of drug-eradication efforts during that same period. Indeed, the upsurge has been greatest in the main drug-producing provinces. Even those Americans who remain wedded to a prohibitionist policy as a general principle ought to realize that an exception needs to be made in Afghanistan. Otherwise, the Taliban-Al Qaeda insurgency will grow, and we will replicate the Iraq debacle in that country, too.

Failure to stop terrorism by risks nuclear terrorism- biggest impact 1- global depression, 2- magnitude, 3- security threat

Haas 6 ( Richard Haas, *Council of Foreign relations,* March 2006) ET

A nuclear attack by terrorists against the United States has the potential to make the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, look like a historical footnote. In addition to the immediate horrific devastation, such an attack could cost trillions of dollars in damages, potentially sparking a global economic depression. Although, during the 2004 presidential campaign, President George W. Bush and Democratic challenger Senator John F. Kerry agreed that terrorists armed with nuclear weapons worried them more than any other national security threat, the U.S. government has yet to elevate nuclear terrorism prevention to the highest priority. Despite several U.S. and international programs to secure nuclear weapons and the materials to make them, major gaps in policy remain.

Losing the war on terror causes loss of legitimacy of American power- destroys heg

Crenshaw 6 (Martha, Prof of Govt @ Wesleyan U, p. 5, 2-10-6, *Real Institute Elcano) ET*

Press coverage of the fifth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks was largely negative. For example, Frank Rich, writing in The New York Times, commented that the loss of unity within the United States and in the world is as much a cause for mourning as the attack itself.9 The Council on Foreign Relations update on ‘The Terror War and Remembrance’ reports on both optimistic and pessimistic assessments and concludes that although the question of ‘Is America winning or losing this fight?’ is on the minds of everyone, there is no simple answer.10 My critical assessment of official strategy is not meant to imply that there have been no successes, including extensive international cooperation in law enforcement and intelligence areas, arrests of many if not all important al-Qaeda leaders, disruption of numerous plots and efforts by the United Nations and other international bodies to promote norms that delegitimise terrorism. However, official American statements do not recognise that many of the means by which the ‘GWOT’ has been implemented have jeopardised the legitimacy of American leadership and made American hegemony seem less than benign. American power has become suspect.

1AC Terrorism Advantage- Impacts

And, hegemonic decline leads to transition wars – the impact is extinction

Nye 90 **(Joseph- Professor of Interntl Rel& former Dean of the Kennedy School @ Harvard, IR scholar, Bound To Lead, p.17) ET**

Perceptions of change in the relative power of nations are of critical importance to understanding the relationship between decline and war. One of the oldest generalizations about international politics attributes the onset of major wars to shifts in power among the leading nations. Thus Thucydides accounted for the onset of the Peloponnesian War which destroyed the power of ancient Athens. The history of the interstate system since 1500 is punctuated by severe wars in which one country struggled to surpass another as the leading state. If as Robert Gilpin argues, international politics has not changed fundamentally over the millennia, “the implications for the future are bleak. And if fears about shifting power precipitate a major war in a world with 50,000 nuclear weapons, history as we know it may end.

And, realism and power politics are inevitable – this means the United States will inevitably act to ensure its own security and so will foreign powers – the only question is whether we can back it up

Mearsheimer 5 (prof of poli sci @ u of Chicago *The Australian*, 18-Nov 5) ET

The question at hand is simple and profound: can China rise peacefully? My answer is no. If China continues its impressive economic growth over the next few decades, the United States and China are likely to engage in an intense security competition with considerable potential for war. Most of China’s neighbors, to include India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Russia, and Vietnam, will join with the United States to contain China’s power. To predict the future in Asia, one needs a theory of international politics that explains how rising great powers are likely to act and how the other states in the system will react to them. That theory must be logically sound and it must account for the past behavior of rising great powers. My theory of international politics says that the mightiest states attempt to establish hegemony in their region of the world, while making sure that no rival great power dominates another region. After laying out the theory, I will show its explanatory power by applying it to U.S. foreign policy since the country’s founding. I will then discuss the implications of the theory and America’s past behavior for future relations between China and the United States THE THEORY Survival is a state’s most important goal, because a state cannot pursue any other goals if it does not survive. The basic structure of the international system forces states concerned about their security to compete with each other for power. The ultimate goal of every great power is to maximize its share of world power and eventually dominate the system. The international system has three defining characteristics. First, the main actors are states that operate in anarchy, which simply means that there is no higher authority above them. Second, all great powers have some offensive military capability, which means that they have the wherewithal to hurt each other. Third, no state can know the intentions of other states with certainty, especially their future intentions. It is simply impossible, for example, to know what Germany or Japan’s intentions will be towards their neighbors in 2025. In a world where other states might have malign intentions as well as significant offensive capabilities, states tend to fear each other. That fear is compounded by the fact that in an anarchic system there is no night-watchman for states to call if trouble comes knocking at their door. Therefore, states recognize that the best way to survive in such a system is to be as powerful as possible relative to potential rivals. The mightier a state is, the less likely it is that another state will attack it. No Americans, for example, worry that Canada or Mexico will attack the United States, because neither of those countries is powerful enough to contemplate a fight with Uncle Sam. But great powers do not merely strive to be the strongest great power, although that is a welcome outcome. Their ultimate aim is to be the hegemon – that is, the only great power in the system.

\*\*Inherency\*\*

Eradication Awful- Human Rights

And, the US war on drugs currently consists of random assassinations without justice

Hornberger 9 (Jacob, Pres of Future of Freedom Foundation, Oct 28-9, *Future Freedom Foundation*, http://www.fff.org/blog/jghblog2009-10-28.asp ) ET

The U.S. government has now extended its assassination program to the drug war. According to the New York Times, the Pentagon now has an assassination list for suspected drug dealers in Afghanistan. No arrests. No hearings. No attorneys. No judges. No trials. Just kill them. Great! So now the occupation of Afghanistan has expanded not only to CIA drone assassinations but also now to Pentagon’s drug-war assassinations. U.S. officials are justifying the drug-war assassinations as part of their counter-insurgency operations in Afghanistan. They say that they’re only going to be assassinating those drug dealers whose drug trafficking is benefiting the terrorists.

I wonder how they make that determination, especially without judicial hearings and trials.Keep in mind that U.S. officials justify their occupation of Afghanistan as part of their overall “war on terrorism.” Keep in mind also that according to them, in the war on terrorism the entire world is a battlefield, including the United States.

And, the US officials use the war on drugs to openly assassinate people

Hornberger 9 (Jacob, Pres of Future of Freedom Foundation, Oct 28-9, *Future Freedom Foundation*, http://www.fff.org/blog/jghblog2009-10-28.asp ) ET

As part of their war on terrorism, U.S. officials claim the power to treat Americans as “enemy combatants,” which entails the power to ignore the rights and guarantees in the Bill of Rights for people suspected of committing the federal criminal offense of terrorism. That includes the power to arrest suspected terrorists, incarcerate them for life, torture them, and deny them due process of law. It also includes the power to assassinate suspected terrorists, a power that U.S. officials have exercised on “the battlefield” in such places as Yemen, where they assassinated an American citizen who happened to be traveling with a suspected terrorist, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. So far, they have not exercised the assassination power on that part of the battlefield that encompasses the United States, but they certainly now wield the post-9/11 power to do so.

War on drugs must end or congress will keep getting undermined

Hornberger 9 (Jacob, Pres of Future of Freedom Foundation, Oct 28-9, *Future Freedom Foundation*, http://www.fff.org/blog/jghblog2009-10-28.asp ) ET

And now they have extended their assassination power to the drug war. And without even bothering to ask Congress to enact a law giving them such power. Hey, this is the era of the war on terrorism. They don’t need no stinking assassination law. All they need is a presidential order to the CIA and the military to begin assassinating people. Will they apply their assassination power to suspected drug dealers elsewhere in the world? After all, doesn’t the sale of heroin everywhere likely put money into the pockets of drug producers in Afghanistan, given that that’s where 90 percent of the world’s heroin originates? We know that they are employing the power to assassinate suspected terrorists in different parts of the world. Time will tell whether they do the same with suspected drug dealers, including, of course, that part of the battlefield that encompasses the United States End the assassinations. End the occupations. End the war on terrorism. End the war on drugs. There is no other solution for restoring freedom, morality, peace, prosperity, and security to our nation.

Obama Policy Fails

Obama’s new policy hurts the Taliban – not the farmers.

Felbab-Brown 9 (Vanda, Fellow @ Foreign Policy, 21st Century Defense Initiative, September 2009, “The Obama Administration’s New Counternarcotics Strategy in Afghanistan”, <http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2009/09_afghanistan_felbabbrown.aspx>)KFC

In summer 2009, the Obama administration unveiled the outlines of a new counternarcotics policy in Afghanistan. The new policy represents a courageous break with previous misguided efforts there and thirty years of U.S. counternarcotics policies around the world. Instead of emphasizing premature eradication of poppy crops, the new policy centers on increased interdiction and rural development. This approach strongly enhances the new counterinsurgency policy focus on providing security to the rural population, instead of being preoccupied with the numbers of incapacitated Taliban and al Qaeda. In Afghanistan, somewhere between a third and a half of its GDP comes from poppy cultivation and processing and much of the rest from foreign aid, so the illicit poppy economy determines the economic survival of a large segment of the population. This is true not only of the farmers who cultivate opium poppy frequently in the absence of viable legal and illegal economic alternatives. But, as a result of micro- and macro-economic spillovers and the acute paucity of legal economic activity, much of the economic life in large cities is also underpinned by the poppy economy. After a quarter century of intense poppy cultivation, the opium poppy economy is deeply entrenched in the socio-economic fabric of the society. Islamic prohibitions against opiates notwithstanding, the poppy economy inevitably underlies Afghanistan’s political arrangements and power relations. Profits from taxing poppy cultivation and protecting smuggling rings bring substantial income to the Taliban. A recent CRS report (August 2009) estimates the income at $70-$100 million per year, which accounts for perhaps as much as half of Taliban income. But many other actors in Afghanistan profit from the opium poppy economy in a similar way: former warlords cum government officials; members of Afghanistan’s police; tribal chiefs; and independent traffickers. Moreover, the Taliban and many others who protect the opium poppy economy from efforts to suppress it derive much more than financial profits. Crucially, they also obtain political capital from populations dependent on poppy cultivation. Such political capital is a critical determinant of the success and sustainability of the insurgency since public support or at least acceptance are crucial enablers of an insurgency. Indeed, as I detail in my forthcoming book, Shooting Up: Counterinsurgency and the War on Drugs, along with providing order that the Afghan government is systematically unable to provide and capitalizing on Ghilzai Pashtun sentiments of being marginalized, protection of the poppy fields is at the core of the Taliban support. By not targeting the farmers, the new counternarcotics strategy is thus synchronized with the counterinsurgency efforts because it can deprive the Taliban of a key source of support. Its overall design also promises to lay the necessary groundwork for substantial reductions in the size and impacts of the illicit economy in Afghanistan.

Troops in Afgan can’t stop the opium cultivation.

Morgan 9 (Scott , Chronicle Blog, 04/30/2009, http://stopthedrugwar.org/chronicle\_blog/2009/apr/30/obama\_goes\_to\_war\_against\_afghan)

In a renewed effort to stamp out the Taliban by cutting off their cash flow, Obama is sending 20,000 troops into opium producing regions of Afghanistan. It's going to be a disaster. Jacob Sullum dug through this New York Times story and found several reasons why this plan will fail spectacularly: 1. Although the Taliban "often fade away when confronted by a conventional army," they "will probably stand and fight" to protect their revenue stream. 2. "The terrain is a guerrilla's dream. In addition to acres of shoulder-high poppy plants, rows and rows of hard-packed mud walls, used to stand up grape vines, offer ideal places for ambushes and defense." 3. "The opium is tilled in heavily populated areas...The prospect of heavy fighting in populated areas could further alienate the Afghan population." 4. "Among the ways the Taliban are believed to make money from the opium trade is by charging farmers for protection; if the Americans and British attack, the Taliban will be expected to make good on their side of that bargain." 5. Opium poppies are "by far the most lucrative crop an Afghan can farm." 6. "The opium trade now makes up nearly 60 percent of Afghanistan's gross domestic product, American officials say." 7. "The country's opium traffickers typically offer incentives that no Afghan government official can: they can guarantee a farmer a minimum price for the crop as well as taking it to market, despite the horrendous condition of most of Afghanistan's roads." 8. "Even if the Americans are able to cut production, shortages could drive up prices and not make a significant dent in the Taliban's profits." There's also the fact that there's enough opium buried somewhere in Afghanistan to supply the entire world for years. Sorry guys, eradication won't work. Stop trying it.

Obama Policy Fails

Current policy funds the Taliban

Paul 1 ( Ron, Rep, Oct 30, *Counter Punch*, http://www.counterpunch.org/paul1.html ) ET

Corruption associated with the drug dealers is endless. It has involved our police, the military, border guards and the judicial system. It has affected government policy and our own CIA. The artificially high profits from illegal drugs provide easy access to funds for rogue groups involved in fighting civil wars throughout the world. Ironically, opium sales by the Taliban and artificially high prices helped to finance their war against us. In spite of the incongruity, we rewarded the Taliban this spring with a huge cash payment for promises to eradicate some poppy fields. Sure.

WOD Fails

The war on drugs has failed, bringing with it attacks on liberty, privacy, and lives

Paul 1 ( Ron, Rep, Oct 30, *Counter Punch*, http://www.counterpunch.org/paul1.html ) ET

I would like to draw an analogy between the drug war and the war against terrorism. In the last 30 years, we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on a failed war on drugs. This war has been used as an excuse to attack our liberties and privacy. It has been an excuse to undermine our financial privacy while promoting illegal searches and seizures with many innocent people losing their lives and property. Seizure and forfeiture have harmed a great number of innocent American citizens.

Can’t solve overseas war on drugs before we solve domestic drug war

Paul 1 ( Ron, Rep, Oct 30, *Counter Punch*, http://www.counterpunch.org/paul1.html ) ET

Another result of this unwise war has been the corruption of many law enforcement officials. It is well known that with the profit incentives so high, we are not even able to keep drugs out of our armed prisons. Making our whole society a prison would not bring success to this floundering war on drugs. Sinister motives of the profiteers and gangsters, along with prevailing public ignorance, keep this futile war going. Illegal and artificially high priced drugs drive the underworld to produce, sell and profit from this social depravity. Failure to recognize that drug addiction, like alcoholism, is a disease rather than a crime, encourage the drug warriors in efforts that have not and will not ever work. We learned the hard way about alcohol prohibition and crime, but we have not yet seriously considered it in the ongoing drug war.

Drug war encourages government violence

Paul 1 ( Ron, Rep, Oct 30, *Counter Punch*, http://www.counterpunch.org/paul1.html ) ET

The drug war encourages violence. Government violence against nonviolent users is notorious and has led to the unnecessary prison overpopulation. Innocent taxpayers are forced to pay for all this so-called justice. Our eradication project through spraying around the world, from Colombia to Afghanistan, breeds resentment because normal crops and good land can be severely damaged. Local populations perceive that the efforts and the profiteering remain somehow beneficial to our own agenda in these various countries. Drug dealers and drug gangs are a consequence of our unwise approach to drug usage. Many innocent people are killed in the crossfire by the mob justice that this war generates. But just because the laws are unwise and have had unintended consequences, no excuses can ever be made for the monster who would kill and maim innocent people for illegal profits. But as the violent killers are removed from society, reconsideration of our drug laws ought to occur.

All out war doesn’t work- causes violence

Paul 1 ( Ron, Rep, Oct 30, *Counter Punch*, http://www.counterpunch.org/paul1.html ) ET

A similar approach should be applied to our war on those who would terrorize and kill our people for political reasons. If the drug laws and the policies that incite hatred against the United States are not clearly understood and, therefore, never changed, the number of drug criminals and terrorists will only multiply. Although this unwise war on drugs generates criminal violence, the violence can never be tolerated. Even if repeal of drug laws would decrease the motivation for drug dealer violence, this can never be an excuse to condone the violence. On the short term, those who kill must be punished, imprisoned, or killed. Long term though, a better understanding of how drug laws have unintended consequences is required if we want to significantly improve the situation and actually reduce the great harms drugs are doing to our society.

\*\* EU Relations\*\*

EU Rel

And, unless pressures like the war in Afghanistan are solved, Obama will not have enough energy to pursue relations with the EU

Maigard 10 ( Finn, May 2, http://eu.foreignpolicyblogs.com/2010/05/02/us-eu-relations-different-president-same-issues/ , *EU News* ) ET

On the other hand, Europe still perceives the transatlantic relation in Cold War terms. I.e. Europe defers to the US, believes European security depends on US protection, and believes a harmonious relationship with Washington is an end unto itself. In cases where US policies did bring about European criticism, such as the German and French criticism of the Iraq war, Europe was split. The “transatlantic rift” was of great concern in European capitols and measures were quickly taken to mend the relationship. European governments fear ganging up will damage the “special relationship” each country believes they enjoy with Washington. The report argues that this is an outdated perception of the transatlantic relationship, and that a complacent and deferential Europe is not the partner Washington is looking for. As Obama said during is first presidential trip to Europe; “We want strong allies. We are not looking to be patrons of Europe we are looking to be partners of Europe.”

Obama has a lot on his plate; economic instability, nuclear proliferation, Afghanistan and more. The ambiguous Europeans are hardly the ideal partner for this daunting agenda. Take for example Obama’s attempt to engage the Muslim world, and compare it with key EU members France and Germany instead suggesting a “privileged partnership” between the EU and Turkey. Or consider Europe’s incohesive reaction to the financial crisis or the great variations in Europe’s Afghanistan policy.

EU Rel- I/L

EU Relations are vital- america’s most feasible partner

Grare 8 ( Frederick- Carnegie endowment for international peace staff, *Centre for International Government Innovation*, Feb , working paper 28) ET

The United States is the most important partner for the European Union. The EU, in turn, is the most important organization in the world to which the United States does not belong. In terms of values and interests, economic interactions and human bonds, the EU and the U.S. are closer to one another than either is to any other major international actor. The U.S.-EU relationship is among the most complex and multi-layered economic, diplomatic, societal and security relationship that either partner has, especially if it is seen to encompass the relationships the U.S maintains with the EU’s 27 member states as well as its Brussels-based institutions. The networks of interdependence across the Atlantic have become so dense,

in fact, that they transcend “foreign” relations and reach deeply into our societies.

EU Rel Good- Bioterrorism

And, a strong EU-US alliance is key to preventing bioterrorism – an attack equivalent to nuclear war

Hamilton 9 (Daniel- prof of law @ u of Illinois-Champagne, Feb 9, *Atlantic Council of the US*, http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/bin/i/y/nato\_report\_final.pdf )ET

Biosecurity is perhaps the most dramatic example of the changing challenges we face. Bioterrorism is a first-order strategic threat to the transatlantic community, and yet neither our health nor our security systems are prepared for intentional attacks of infectious disease. Homeland security approaches that focus on guards, gates and guns have little relevance to this type of challenge. A bioterrorist attack in Europe or North America is more likely and could be as consequential as a nuclear attack, but requires a different set of national and international responses. Unless we forge new health security alliances and take other measures, an attack of mass lethality is not a matter of whether, but when. A great challenge of our century is to prevent the deliberate use of disease as a weapon from killing millions, destabilizing economies and disrupting societies. The grand security opportunity of our century is to eliminate massively lethal epidemics of infectious disease by ensuring that biodefense – humankind’s ageless struggle to prevent and defeat disease – is far more potent than attempts to create and deploy bio agents of mass lethality.10 This example underscores the need for the United States, Canada and European partners to advance a multidimensional strategy of societal resilience that goes beyond “homeland” security and relies not just on traditional tools but also on new forms of diplomatic, intelligence, counterterrorism, financial, economic and law enforcement cooperation; customs, air and seaport security; equivalent standards for data protection and information exchange; biodefense and critical infrastructure protection. It needs to begin with the transatlantic community, not only because European societies are so inextricably intertwined, but because no two continents are as deeply connected as the two sides of the North Atlantic. Our ultimate goal should be a resilient Euro-Atlantic area of freedom, security and justice that balances mobility and civil liberties with societal security.11 Such efforts, in turn, can serve as the core of more effective global measures. Europeans and Americans share a keen interest in building the societal resilience of other nations, since strong homeland security efforts in one country may mean little if neighboring systems are weak. In fact, 20th century concepts of “forward defense” should be supplemented by the broader notion of “forward resilience.” Elements of this initiative will need to be conducted bilaterally, and much of it through invigorated channels between North America and the EU, but other mechanisms and organizations, including NATO, can offer support in specific areas, as we outline later.

EU Rel Good- NATO (1/2)

Lack of European orientation makes Balkan crisis and the collapse of NATO inevitable  
Kober  8 (Stanley Kober, Ph.D., is a research fellow in foreign policy at the Cato Institute “Cracks in the Foundation: NATO’s New Troubles,”[http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/ pa-608.pdf](http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-608.pdf)) ET

But as NATO has expanded, Russia’s relations with China, in particular, have grown apace, leading initially to the formation of the Shanghai Five and then to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, which includes— in addition to Russia and China—Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan as full members, and India, Iran, Mongolia, and Pakistan as observer members. In other words, just as the Triple Entente gradually emerged in opposition to the Triple Alliance, so the SCO seems to be emerging in response to NATO expansion. And just as the Triple Entente insisted, at least in public, that it was not an alliance, so do the members of the SCO. But the membership of the SCO does not overlap with NATO, just as the membership of the Triple Alliance did not overlap with the Triple Entente, and SCO members conduct military exercises together just as NATO countries do.57 In short, the world is in danger of dividing just as Europe divided a century ago—a process that should have been foreseen by those who naively thought other countries would not respond to NATO expansion by taking their own corresponding measures.

If Turkey’s confidence in NATO’s guarantees were shaken, it could easily nuclearize

TERTRAIS 8 (Bruno, Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la recherche stratégique (FRS), DECEMBER “The Middle East’s Next Nuclear State” Strategic Insights, Center for Contemporary Conflict, December 6/20 http://www.nps.edu/Academics/centers/ccc/publications/OnlineJournal/2008/Dec/tertraisDec08.pdf) TBC

Like most Arab countries, Turkey has announced its intention to restart its civilian nuclear program. It already has a very significant nuclear infrastructure. Its main research center (Cekmece Nuclear Research and Training Center) has two modern (1986) pilot installations for conversion and fuel fabrication.[51] The involvement of several Turkish firms in the AQ Khan network indicates that there is industrial know-how in the country which could be of use to a uranium enrichment program. However, Ankara claims to be uninterested by enrichment.[52] The country operates two research reactors: a light-water 5 MWth reactor;[53] and a small Triga Mark- II unit, which is being converted to operated on LEU.[54] It also has a small waste treatment facility (Radioactive Waste Processing and Storage Facility). Scientists have made computer simulations of reprocessing with the Purex process.[55] Generally speaking, nuclear science and technology is very active in the country. Also, Turkey is one of the only States in the region to have started setting up the regulatory mechanisms needed for larger-scale nuclear programs, under the aegis of the Turkish Atomic Energy Commission (TAEK). Turkey is moderately worried about the Iranian nuclear program. It has generally good relations with its neighbor. It is covered by a formal nuclear guarantee, backed by a multilateral alliance, and has nuclear weapons on its territory (including for use by Turkish aircraft). However, Ankara may be losing its sense of confidence about NATO. At two occasions—1991 and 2003—its allies were perceived as hesitant to fulfill their security commitments. The new generation of Turkish officers do not trust NATO as much as the previous one.[56] In addition, political relations with the West have become more difficult because of Iraq, controversy about the 1915 events, and a European reluctance to give a clear perspective for entry into the European Union. Turkish public opinion has an extremely negative view of the United States.[57] (It is also opposed to the continued stationing of U.S. nuclear weapons.)[58] Ankara’s perception of the Western security guarantee will be a key for its future nuclear choices.[59] The military option would be an extreme one: a choice in that direction would require a deepening of the crisis in confidence with both the United States and Europe. Additionally, domestic power games may come into play: a nuclear program might be a way to consolidate the place of the military in the political decision-making process. Defiance vis-à-vis Iran is stronger in the so-called “kemalist” circles

EU Rel Good- NATO (2/2)

Turkey’s nuclearization would make Europe a powder keg for nuclear war and terrorism

SOKOLSKI 7 (JUNE 14TH The Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, http://www.npec-web.org/Presentations/20070616-Sokolski-Talk-AixEnProvence-Conference.pdf 6/20) TBC

One country that might disagree with this view, though, is Turkey. It is trying to figure out how to live with a nuclear weapons armed neighbor, Iran; is disappointed by its inability to be fully integrated into the EU; and is toying with getting its own nuclear capabilities. Whether or not Turkey does choose to go its own way and acquire a nuclear weapons-option of its own will depend on several factors, including Ankara’s relations with Washington, Brussels, and Tehran. To a very significant degree, though, it also will depend on whether or not the EU Members States are serious about letting Turkey join the EU. The dimmer these prospects look, the greater is the likelihood of that Turkey will chose to hedge its political, economic, and security bets by seeking a nuclear weapons-option of its own. This poses a difficult choice for the EU. Many key members are opposed to letting Turkey join the EU. There are arguments to favor this position. Yet, if Turkey should conclude that its interests are best served by pursuing such a nuclear weapons-option, it is almost certain to fortify the conviction of Egypt, Algeria, and Saudi Arabia to do the same. This will result in the building up a nuclear powder keg on Europe’s doorstep and significantly increase the prospect for nuclear terrorism and war.

EU Rel Good- Nuke War

And, lack of EU- US alliance, a nuclear war emerges

Glaser 93 (Charles, professor in the Elliott School of International Affairs and the Department of Political Science. *International Security,* Vol 18, No. 1, Summer 1993) ET

However, although the lack of an imminent soviet threat eliminate the most obvious danger, US security has not been entirely separated from the future of Western Europe. The ending of the cold war has brought many benefits, but has not eliminated the possibility of major power war, especially since such a war could grow out of a smaller conflict in the east. And, although nuclear weapons have greatly reduced the threat that a European hegemon would pose to U.S. security, a sound case nevertheless remains that a major European war could threaten U.S. security. The united states could be drawn into such a war, even if strict security suggested it should stay out. A major power war could escalate to a nuclear war that, especially if the United States joins, could include attacks against the American homeland. Thus, the United States should not be unconcerned about Europe’s future.

\*\*Karzai Impacts\*\*

Karzai- Democracy Module

Karzai credibility key to democracy

National Post 9 [November 3, pg A14, Lexis] KLS

The West has rushed to legitimize the election results. Yesterday, U.S. President Barack Obama called Mr. Karzai to congratulate him, something he had refused to do after August's disputed result. The UN has also signed off on Mr. Karzai's win, as has the country's domestic election office. Mr. Obama even told reporters in the Oval Office that he had extracted a pledge from the re-elected Mr. Karzai to go "boldly and forcefully forward" to end corruption and speed the pace at which Afghan military and police are taking over national security from NATO forces, including Canada's. But it is not Mr. Karzai's legitimacy in Western eyes that will determine the ultimate success or failure of efforts to build Afghanistan into a functioning democracy with a self-sufficient economy. Democracy and success cannot be imposed from above and from outside; they must come from the people of a country. The best the West can do is maintain internal stability while Afghans work out for themselves how best to structure their affairs. And it is not clear if the Afghan people will give enough support to Mr. Karzai and the Afghan parliament to achieve those desirable goals. Mr. Karzai now must work doubly hard to maintain the support of his nation's Western allies while also attempting to win credibility with his own citizens. Over the next year or two, he must show tremendous progress, particularly toward rooting out his own corrupt officials, or he risks pulling all the progress that has been made in the past eight years down on his head and turning NATO nations off the idea of sending their troops to defend his country.

Democracy solves environment – accountability, information flow and markets.

Li and Reuveny 7 [Quan, Professor of Political Science at Penn State and Rafael, Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana, Vol. 24, No. 3, University http://cmp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/3/219] KLS

Moving to the view that democracy reduces the level of environmental degradation, one set of considerations focuses on the institutional qualities of democracy. The responsiveness argument is that democracies are more responsive to the environmental needs of the public than are autocracies due to their very nature of taking public interests into account (Kotov and Nikitina, 1995). It is also argued that democracies comply with environmental agreements well, since they respect, and respond to, the rule of law (Weiss and Jacobsen, 1999). The freedom of information channel is offered by Schultz and Crockett (1990) and Payne (1995). They theorize that political rights and greater freedom for information ﬂows help2 to promote the cause of environmental groups, raise public awareness of problems and potential solutions, and encourage environmental legislation to curtail environmental degradation. Democracies also tend to have market economies, which further promotes the ﬂow of information as economic efﬁciency and proﬁts requires full information. Hence, unlike the above argument, this channel expects that proﬁt-maximizing markets will promote environmental quality (Berger, 1994).

Democracy solves environment – less war, famines and more responsibility.

Li and Reuveny 7 [Quan, Professor of Political Science at Penn State and Rafael, Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana, Vol. 24, No. 3, University http://cmp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/3/219] KLS

A second set of considerations on the positive role of democracy on environmental quality focuses on the effects of democracy on human life and crisis situations. The famines argument (Sen, 1994) observes that famines tend to promote environmental degradation because they divert attention away from longer-term environmental concerns. Since famines typically do not occur in democracies, argues Sen, environmental quality is expected to be higher in democracies than in autocracies. The human life argument (Gleditsch & Sverdlop, 2003) suggests that since democracies respect human life more than autocracies, they are more responsive to life-threatening environmental degradation. A related argument, the war channel, reasons that to the extent that democracies engage in fewer wars, they should also have a higher level of environmental quality (Gleditsch & Sverdlop, 2003), since war often destroys the environment of the warring parties (Lietzmann & Vest, 1999).

Impacts- Heg/Terrorism

Afghanistan instability leads to terrorism, nuclear attacks and loss of US leadership

Engelhardt 9 [Tom, Founder of the American Empire Project , October 4, Asian Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South\_Asia/KK04Df01.html] KLS

Now, Afghanistan has become the first domino of our era, and the rest of the falling dominos in the 21st century are, of course, the terrorist attacks to come, once an emboldened al-Qaeda has its "safe haven" and its triumph in the backlands of that country. In other words, first Afghanistan, then Pakistan, then a mushroom cloud over an American city. In both the Vietnam era and today, Washington has also been mesmerized by that supposedly key currency of international stature, "credibility".

**Loss of US leadership means nuclear war**

**Khalilzad 95** [Zalmay, RAND analyst and now U.S. ambassador to Iraq, The Washington Quarterly]

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Impacts- Jirga Scenario

Karzai needs all the political capital to push reconciliation through the Jirga

Carlstrom 10 ( Greg, Aljazeera reporter, *Aljazeera,* June 3-10, http://english.aljazeera.net/news/asia/2010/06/20106618450763838.html) ET

The Taliban has shown slight interest in dialogue with Kabul, and several high-ranking members were reportedly holding quiet talks with the Karzai government last year. But the February arrest of Mullah Abdul Ghani Baradar, Omar's deputy, has sparked a leadership crisis within the organisation and stalled that dialogue. Kai Eide, the former head of the United Nations mission in Afghanistan, has said that Baradar's arrest hurt the prospect of talks with the Taliban. Hezb-i-Islami Hezb-i-Islami ("Islamic Party") is often called a "Taliban" group, but it actually predates the latter by more than a decade. The party was founded in 1975 by Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, who would later serve a brief stint as prime minister of Afghanistan; it played a key role in helping to expel the Soviets from AfghanistanThe movement eventually split in two. One branch, a non-violent political party, now controls more than a dozen seats in the Afghan parliament and claims to be independent from Hekmatyar. The other remained loyal to Hekmatyar; it's often referred to as the Hezb-i-Islami Gulbuddin (or HiG, for short), and claims to command several thousand fighters in eastern Afghanistan. Of the three insurgent groups, HiG is the one most willing to publicly talk about negotiations with Kabul. Representatives of Hekmatyar's movement met with Afghan officials in March and presented a 15-point "peace plan", which calls for the withdrawal of foreign forces, a cease-fire and a prisoner release. General Michael Flynn, the head of US intelligence in Afghanistan, has called Hekmatyar "absolutely salvageable". But HiG leaders have been talking for years about reconciliation with Kabul, with little to show for it. Hekmatyar publicly spurned last week's peace jirga, and members of his organisation tell Al Jazeera they won't negotiate until foreign forces leave. And any talk of rehabiliating Hekmatyar is deeply unwelcome to many Afghan citizens who suffered through decades of human rights abuses committed by Hekmatyar's militia, most notably his incessant rocketing of Kabul in 1994

No reconciliation means economic fragmentation, cultural rifts

Castillo 6/24 [Graciana del, Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, 2010, Project Syndicate http://www.ittefaq.com/issues/2010/06/25/news0032.htm]

This policy change is a necessary parallel to the military action now taking place. It is also a belated recognition that the "development as usual" policies followed in Afghanistan up to now have failed. Indeed, as has been painfully demonstrated, the old policies were never going to be enough to galvanize Afghan public support, particularly for a new military "surge." Eight years ago, Afghanistan embarked on four distinct transitions: a security transition away from violence and insecurity; a political transition toward a society based on participatory government and the rule of law; a social transition from tribal and ethnic confrontations toward national reconciliation; and an economic transition to transform a war-torn and unstable economy into a viable one in which people can make a decent and legal living. Because economic reconstruction takes place amid this multi-pronged transition, what has been happening in Afghanistan is fundamentally different from normal development processes. The current Afghan situation reflects the failure until now to make national reconciliation - rather than optimal development policies - the bedrock priority of the government and the international community.

Impacts- Jirga Scenario

Aff solves- American withdrawal key to reconciliation

Rasgotra 6/11 [ Maharajakrishna, president, ORF Centre for International Relations, Hindu News http://www.hindu.com/2010/06/12/stories/2010061265111400.htm] KLS

The withdrawal of American forces from Afghanistan is inevitable; the sooner it comes, the better for all concerned. An honourable way of achieving it with peace and stability in Afghanistan is still available. President Obama should convene a conference in Kabul, attended by heads of state or government of all countries sharing borders with Afghanistan, as well as China, India, Russia, Britain, France and the U.N. Secretary General. The conference should give credible guarantees for Afghanistan's integrity, independence and sovereignty, and for immunity against interference or intervention by any of its neighbours and, indeed, any other power. The result should be formally endorsed by the U.N. Security Council, which should also station in Afghanistan an adequate peace-keeping force for a sufficient period to allow the Afghan Army and police to assume full responsibility for internal and external security. The conference should then convert itself into a consortium for aiding Afghanistan's rapid economic development over 10-15 years.

Impacts- Jirga Scenario – Iran Nukes

<insert Jirga I/L from above Page>

Jirga good- ensures no tyrannical rulers and stable Iraq government

Hughes 10 (Michael, Geopolitical Journal, *The Huffington Post*, June 14) ET

Since the Pashtuns are divided between Pakistan and Afghanistan, it makes sense to include Islamabad in the process, who would have accepted the King's rule. Pakistan's former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Iftikhar Ahmed Sirohey relayed to me that stability will come after the "invaders" leave and a Zahir Shah-like government is implemented. As far as the current regime, Admiral Sirohey was fairly blunt: "Karzai has been imposed on them hence he will survive a day after his external escort is removed." However, God save us if Admiral Sirohey's prophecy is realized because for all Karzai's defects, he's much more preferable than his would-be successor, the Tajik warlord Mohammad Qasin Fahim, who's even more corrupt, has the blood of many Afghans on his hands from previous civil wars, and his ascendance would just fuel the next one. Nearly a decade has passed since the U.S. bypassed the king, and at this instant national unity and government legitimacy seem like pipe dreams. Ironically, Zahir Shah had introduced a series of reforms in the 1960s and - unlike now - Afghanistan was progressing toward a sound democratic society, including the development of private enterprise and competitive free markets, as opposed to the corruption and no-bid contracts we see today. All is not lost... yet. King Zahir Shah's royal blood still courses through the well-respected Mohammadzai clan, along with the bloodline of another beloved ruler - King Amanullah Khan. This clan would not only unite the country long term, but can have an immediate impact in Kandahar because it's the Mohammadzai's homeland and their strong influence can instantly win local hearts and minds. It's time we allow the Afghans to select their own leader via another loya jirga of tribal elders with significant involvement of the Zahir Shah and Amanullah Khan families, and without the intervention of foreign interlopers. Although it may seem like an affront to our Jeffersonian sensibilities, the jirga will be a hell of a lot more representative than the Afghan government's idea of self-determination.

Continued Afghan instability prompts Iranian nuclearization

Foer 4 [Frank, Senior Editor of the New York Times December 14, The Bellow http://bellows.blogspot.com/2004\_12\_12\_archive.html] KLS

There are several points worth making on the Iranian situation. First, wouldn't it have been nice if we'd paid some attention to this crisis in the making? Second, trouble in Iran is collateral damage in the continuing Iraq insurgency (and in continuing Afghanistan instability). How much stronger would our position be if we'd taken Iraq with appropriate strength and quickly pacified the country. With decisive victories in Iraq and Afghanistan we have Iran surrounded, both by democracies and by victorious troops. Instead, Iran has the option of assisting the insurgents, nickel and diming our troops to death, and diminishing everyday the will of Americans to take on another military venture should one prove desirable but not absolutely necessary. What do we do? Having put ourselves in this situation, I think the best solution is diplomatic. Not only is invading off the table, but from the sound of things a tactical strike against Iran's nuclear facilities would also have more costs than benefits. It seems to me we should work with Europe, and perhaps try to win assistance from Russia or China, to stall Iran's nuclear development as long as possible, and shine an international light on opposition crackdowns. In the meantime, we need to throw everything we have into establishing safe, prosperous, and secure nations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The longer a power vacuum persists in those regions, and the stronger Iran is allowed to become, the more we invite Iran to directly assert its influence, a move that could have catastrophic effects.

Impacts- Jirga Scenario- Iran Nukes

Iranian nuclearization ignites Middle Eastern war- 28 million dead in 21 days, 33 million to follow, global economy destroyed- extinction

Walker 7 [Martin Senior Director of the Global Business Policy Council November 22 Middle East Times http://www.metimes.com/Opinion/2007/11/22/analysis\_a\_mideast\_nuclear\_war/4411/ ] KLS

He has now turned his laser-like research and forensic intelligence skills to studying the real implication of the endless diplomatic minuet at the United Nations over Iran's nuclear ambitions. In the real world, this matters mainly because an Iranian nuclear capability would transform the power balance in the wider Middle East, and leave the region and the rest of us living under the constant prospect of a nuclear exchange between Iran and Israel. This would mean, Cordesman suggests, some 16 million to 28 million Iranians dead within 21 days, and between 200,000 and 800,000 Israelis dead within the same time frame. The total of deaths beyond 21 days could rise very much higher, depending on civil defense and public health facilities, where Israel has a major advantage. It is theoretically possible that the Israeli state, economy and organized society might just survive such an almost-mortal blow. Iran would not survive as an organized society. "Iranian recovery is not possible in the normal sense of the term," Cordesman notes. The difference in the death tolls is largely because Israel is believed to have more nuclear weapons of very much higher yield (some of 1 megaton), and Israel is deploying the Arrow advanced anti-missile system in addition to its Patriot batteries. Fewer Iranian weapons would get through. The difference in yield matters. The biggest bomb that Iran is expected to have is 100 kilotons, which can inflict third-degree burns on exposed flesh at 8 miles; Israel's 1-megaton bombs can inflict third-degree burns at 24 miles. Moreover, the radiation fallout from an airburst of such a 1-megaton bomb can kill unsheltered people at up to 80 miles within 18 hours as the radiation plume drifts. (Jordan, by the way, would suffer severe radiation damage from an Iranian strike on Tel Aviv.) Cordesman assumes that Iran, with less than 30 nuclear warheads in the period after 2010, would aim for the main population centers of Tel Aviv and Haifa, while Israel would have more than 200 warheads and far better delivery systems, including cruise missiles launched from its 3 Dolphin-class submarines. The assumption is that Israel would be going for Iran's nuclear development centers in Tehran, Natanz, Ardekan, Saghand, Gashin, Bushehr, Aral, Isfahan and Lashkar A'bad. Israel would also likely target the main population centers of Tehran, Tabriz, Qazvin, Isfahan, Shiraz, Yazd, Kerman, Qom, Ahwaz and Kermanshah. Cordesman points out that the city of Tehran, with a population of 15 million in its metropolitan area, is "a topographic basin with mountain reflector. Nearly ideal nuclear killing ground." But it does not end there. Cordesman points out that Israel would need to keep a "reserve strike capability to ensure no other power can capitalize on Iranian strike." This means Israel would have to target "key Arab neighbors" - in particular Syria and Egypt. Cordesman notes that Israel would have various options, including a limited nuclear strike on the region mainly inhabited by the Alawite minority from which come the ruling Assad dynasty. A full-scale Israeli attack on Syria would kill up to 18 million people within 21 days; Syrian recovery would not be possible. A Syrian attack with all its reputed chemical and biological warfare assets could kill up to 800,000 Israelis, but Israeli society would recover. An Israeli attack on Egypt would likely strike at the main population centers of Cairo, Alexandria, Damietta, Port Said, Suez, Luxor and Aswan. Cordesman does not give a death toll here, but it would certainly be in the tens of millions. It would also destroy the Suez Canal and almost certainly destroy the Aswan Dam, sending monstrous floods down the Nile to sweep away the glowing rubble. It would mean the end of Egypt as a functioning society. Cordesman also lists the oilwells, refineries and ports along the Gulf that could also be targets in the event of a mass nuclear response by an Israel convinced that it was being dealt a potentially mortal blow. Being contained within the region, such a nuclear exchange might not be Armageddon for the human race; it would certainly be Armageddon for the global economy. So in clear, concise and chillingly forensic style, Cordesman spells out that the real stakes in the crisis that is building over Iran's nuclear ambitions would certainly include the end of Persian civilization, quite probably the end of Egyptian civilization, and the end of the Oil Age. This would also mean the end of globalization and the extraordinary accretions in world trade and growth and prosperity that are hauling hundreds of millions of Chinese and Indians and others out of poverty.

\*\*NATO Alliance \*\*

NATO Relations K2 Troops

NATO relations K2 Troops

Loatay 09 (Writer for Afghanistan, Pakistan and India, http://loatay.com/u-s-nato-war-in-afghanistan-antecedents-and-precedents-2/, 12/13/09)

On December 4 “NATO’s top official said…that at least 25 countries will send a total of about 7,000 additional forces to Afghanistan next year ‘with more to come,’ as U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton sought to bolster allied resolve.” [4] In attendance at the NATO meeting in Brussels were also an unspecified number of foreign ministers of non-NATO nations providing troops for the Afghan war, top military commander of all U.S. and NATO forces General Stanley McChrystal and Afghan Foreign Minister Rangeen Dadfar Spanta. 7,000 more NATO troops with “more to come” would, added to some 42,000 non-U.S. soldiers currently serving with NATO and 35,000 U.S. forces doing the same, mean at least 85,000 troops under NATO command even without the 33,000 new U.S. troops headed to Afghanistan. The bloc’s largest foreign deployment before this was to Kosovo in 1999 when at its peak the Alliance-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) consisted of 50,000 troops from 39 nations. [5] The combined U.S. and NATO forces would represent a staggering number, in excess of 150,000 soldiers. By way of comparison, as of September of this year there were approximately 120,000 U.S. troops in Iraq and only a small handful of other nations’ personnel, those assigned to the NATO Training Mission – Iraq, remaining with them. Among NATO member states Italian Defense Minister Ignazio La Russa recently announced an increase of 1,000 troops, bringing the nation’s total to almost 4,500, 50% more than had previously been stationed in Iraq. Poland will send another 600-700 troops which, added to those already in Afghanistan, will constitute the largest aggregate Polish military deployment abroad in the post-Cold War era and the highest number of troops ever deployed outside Europe in the nation’s history. Britain will provide another 500 troops, with its total rising to close to 10,000. Bulgarian Defense Minister Nikolay Mladenov said last week that “there is a strong possibility that the country will increase its military contingent in Afghanistan.” [6] To indicate the nature of the commitments new NATO member states shoulder when they join the Alliance and what their priority then becomes, three days earlier Mladenov, speaking of budgetary constraints placed on the armed forces because of the current financial crisis, affirmed that “We may cut down some other items of the army budget, but there will always be enough money for missions abroad.” [7] Washington has also pressured Croatia, which became a full member of the bloc this past April, to supply more troops and Prime Minister Jadranka Kosor hastened to pledge that “Croatia, being a NATO member, would fulfill its obligations.” [8] The Czech republic’s defense minister, Martin Bartak, spoke after the Obama troop surge speech earlier this week and threatened the Czech parliament by stating “it will have to be explained to allies why the Czech Republic does not want to take part in the reinforcements while Slovakia and Britain, for instance, will reinforce their contingents….” [9] Slovakia has announced that it will more than double its forces in Afghanistan. The parliament has just renewed for another year the deployment of the nation’s almost 4,500 troops in Afghanistan, the maximum allowed by the Bundestag, although discussions are being held to increase that number to 7,000 after a conference on Afghanistan in London on January 28. German armed forces in the country are engaged in their nation’s first ground combat operations since World War II.

Internal- NATO k2 Peace

NATO k2 European Peace

RPD 10( Romania’s Permanent Delegation to NATO business, http://www.nato.mae.ro/index.php?lang=en&id=22427, 6/11/10)

According to the NATO 1999 Strategic Concept of the Alliance and reflected in the summit and ministerial communiqués, NATO has an important consultative and, also, decision-making role in the area of conventional arms control, due to the inextricable link between security and arms control. NATO highly values the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), which represents a "cornerstone of European security" and imposes for the first time in European history legal and verifiable limits on the force structure of its 30 signatory states which stretch from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains. At the Strasbourg-Kehl Summit on 4 April 2009, the Alliance emphasized the importance to preserve the CFE Treaty viability. In particular, the Heads of State and Government stressed that "the current situation, where NATO CFE Allies implement the Treaty while Russia does not, cannot last indefinitely”. In this context, it has been recalled that the Alliance has offered a constructive set of parallel actions designed to overcome the current impasse in the CFE problem. These actions include, on the one hand, steps by NATO Allies on ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty, and on the other hand, the outstanding commitments of Russia on Republic of Moldova and Georgia. NATO also attaches great importance to various international instruments, such as those including confidence and security building measures (Vienna Document), promoting mutual trust and transparency (Open Skies Treaty) or proposing humanitarian demining goals (Ottawa Convention on anti-personnel mines). Romania attaches great importance to these issues and plays an active role in the discussions in NATO, in the NATO-Russia Council and with the EAPC countries.

NATO impacts- Pakistan Nukes

Afganistan is NATO’s top priority- Citizen Protection

Eurasia Review 10 ( Eurasia Review, http://www.eurasiareview.com/201006102998/nato-chief-says-afghanistan-remains-top-priority.html)

NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen opened here Thursday a two-day meeting of NATO defence ministers stressing that the Alliane's mission in Afghanistan is the highest priority.   "Our aim is to help Afghanistan stand on its feet as a sovereign country that can defend itself against terrorism. Because a stable Afghanistan means a safer world," he said in opening remarks. Rasmussen also mentioned missile defence, for which Allies are already developing a system to protect troops "We will discuss all that today with an eye to a decision on whether to do it, which will be taken this November in Lisbon," he said. Speaking of the financial environment, he said, "we must ensure that tax payers get value for the money that is spent on defence. But our job is to guarantee that our citizens are defended. Which means spending enough on defence and spending smart." He also noted that meetings would take place later on with the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the NATO-Georgia Commission.

Civilian causalities are the Taliban’s biggest support- they blame the US military

Jaffe 9 (Greg, Washington Post Staff Writer, *Washington Post*, May 8—9) ET

The truth of what happened in Farah may be less important than what the Afghan people believe took place in the remote western region. Gates said that a cornerstone of the Taliban campaign is to blame civilian deaths on U.S. troops. And he suggested that the best way to counter the enemy's strategy would be to reduce civilian casualties throughout the country. "Even if the Taliban create these casualties or exploit them, we need to figure out a way to minimize them and hopefully make them go away," he said. The difficulty of the civilian casualty issue was evident in Farah, where anti-American protests erupted Thursday. The Associated Press reported that Afghan police wounded one demonstrator.

Increased Taliban power causes pakistan nuclear war that goes nuclear

Gregorian 1(Vartan, president of Carnegie Corporation of New York *NY Times* ,11/15/01) ET

After Sept. 11, with options and allies in short supply, Pakistani leader Pervez Musharraf agreed to cooperate with the United States against the Taliban. Both countries now face the thorny issue of the Pashtuns. Wiping out the Taliban won't end the prospect of Pashtunistan -- it may even energize it. If a government dominated by the Northern Alliance denies the Pashtuns power in Afghanistan proper, they will exert power elsewhere. Taliban forces could retreat into Pakistan's Northwest Frontier Province and form alliances with their Pashtun cousins. If, on the other hand, Pashtuns were to become a dominant power in Afghanistan in the post-Taliban era, Pakistan could face a revival of Afghan interest in expanding into Pakistani territory. Pakistan cannot afford any movement that threatens to fragment it, and it cannot withstand simultaneous challenges in Kashmir and Afghanistan. Nor can it afford a civil war between disappointed fundamentalists and disappointed nationalists -- particularly given its possession of nuclear weapons.

Pre-emptive strike by India ensures nuclear confrontation

Ricks 1 (Thomas, Washington Post Staff Writer, *Washington Post*, Oct 21-1) ET

The prospect of Pakistan being taken over by Islamic extremists is especially worrisome because it possesses nuclear weapons. The betting among military strategists is that India, another nuclear power, would not stand idly by, if it appeared that the Pakistani nuclear arsenal were about to fall into the hands of extremists. A preemptive action by India to destroy Pakistan's nuclear stockpile could provoke a new war on the subcontinent. The U.S. military has conducted more than 25 war games involving a confrontation between a nuclear-armed India and Pakistan, and each has resulted in nuclear war, said retired Air Force Col. Sam Gardiner, an expert on strategic games.

NATO impacts- Pakistan Nukes

And, the impact is extinction

Fai 1 (Dr. Ghulam Nabi, executive director of the Kashmiri American Council,  *The Washington Times*, 8 July 2001) ET

The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan.  It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe.  The United States would enjoy no sanctuary.

This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view.  The Director of Central Intelligence, the Department of Defense, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries.  Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles. Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations.  Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

\*\*Opium Brides\*\*

A2: Hegemony Solves

Empirically denied – the US led invasions was premised off emancipation and has only caused more harm for women.

Rawa News 8 (5/27, http://www.rawa.org/temp/runews/2008/05/27/alarming-rise-of-suicides-among-afghan-women\_9375.html) PJ

Greater freedom for the women of Afghanistan was one of the promises of the 2001 U.S.-led invasion. U.S. and Afghan officials say there have been significant improvements, noting that some two million women and girls are now attending school, something that was forbidden under the extremist Taliban government. But despite Western efforts, many Afghan women say their lives have not improved significantly and an increasing number of women are committing suicide by burning themselves to death as a way to escape physical, sexual and psychological abuse. Mandy Clark reports from Kabul. Badly burnt and barely alive in a shabby Kabul hospital, a 15 year old girl lies in agony. The burn unit surgeon, Dr. Sarwani Sahab says these types of injuries are becoming more common among young Afghan women. "In Afghanistan, young girls, maybe from 18 to 35, is a big problem for self-burning here," said Dr. Sahab. The girl is from Kandahar province and insists she was burnt by a lantern but doctors believe it was a failed suicide attempt. They say her chance of survival is 50-50. This young girl's story is becoming increasingly common. An Afghan women rights group say that last year, almost 500 women chose death or disfigurement to a life of despair by setting themselves on fire to escape forced marriages, slavery or sexual and other types of abuse. For those who live through this form of suicide attempt, the scarring can be a death sentence in itself. The survivors who leave this ward cannot return home because of the shame they brought on their family. Some will live the rest of their lives on the streets or if they're lucky, they may find a safe house. There are other women who brave the wrath of society and try to help these young burn victims. Many risk their own lives to do so. Political activist, Malalai Joya is one of them and agreed to speak with VOA. She was elected as a member of the Afghan parliament in 2005 but was kicked out of government. She says it was because of her views. Security around Joya is tight, it has to be; she has survived four assassination attempts because of her fight for women's rights. "They burn themselves in many cases because they prefer to die than have this hell life," Joya. "It is so sad for me, it is impossible, I cannot find the words to show, to express my suffer, my sadness." But her work is having an impact. Razia is another burn victim. Razia gives only her first name. She says her failed suicide bid bought her freedom. She tells how a warlord from her village threatened to kill her if she did not allow him to marry her 13-year-old daughter. As a war widow, she had no one to protect her. Razia says she hoped if she died, an orphanage would take in her children. But she survived. A women's group found her in the hospital and offered her and her children a safe house. She says she was dead at that time, but God gave her a new life. Afghan officials are quick to point out that women now do have greater freedom and opportunities since the fall of the extremist Taliban regime. They say some two million women and girls are now getting an education - something that was forbidden under the Taliban. But, women's rights advocate Palwasha Hassan says not enough work has been done to help Afghan women. However, she says people should not lose heart. "I think we cannot lose this opportunity and say 'ok, in Afghanistan nothing can be changed because we have a traditional system and this and that.' You have to start from where you can so if this is the opportunity, it should not be missed," said Hassan. Abuse against women and suicide attempts to escape it are all too frequent problems in the strict traditional societies of South Asia and the Middle East. But, in Afghanistan, the ouster of the Taliban regime was supposed to change that. Many Afghan women are still waiting for that to happen.

.

Discourse Solvency

The discourse we use functions to map out logics of domination and solve oppression.

Cuomo 2 (Chris, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies at the University of Cincinnati, "On Ecofeminist Philosophy", Ethics and the Environment, 7(2) 2002, Indiana University Press) PJ

Talk of a logic of domination is a way of identifiying the values embedded in culture's unjust hierarchies, and mapping the effects of such hierarchies, and such logics, is a crucial project for moral philosophv. Ecofeminists have shown that this is true because different forms of exploitation and domination are connected conceptually, but also because gender, race, class, and "nature" comingle in reality-in identities, economies, social institutions, and practices. Analyses of complex and interwoven systems of domination are therefore key to understanding social truths, and nearly any interface of nature and culture. Warren's Ecofeminist Philosophy shows that the clear and persuasive presentation of such analyses was one of the primary projects of twentieth-century ecofeminist philosophy . This project was political as well as philosophical, for to identify the hidden lines of influence and power that shape patterns of injustice and impairment is to point toward strategies for ethical engagement and improvement.

Opium Brides – Environment/Rights/Turn

America’s war on drugs is detrimental to the environment and women’s rights

Lance 8 (Jennifer, staff writer, 5/7, http://redgreenandblue.org/2008/05/07/us-drug-war-policies-spur-sale-of-afghan-child/) PJ

The US Government’s Drug War has spurred many social and environmental consequences throughout the world. Widespread aerial herbicide spraying aimed at eradication has caused environmental damage from Central America to Central Asia. Recently, I learned you can add the sale of child brides in Afghanistan to the list of social ills caused by the Drug War. A bumper crop of Afghan opium was produced in 2007, which is expected to be repeated in 2008. Despite these record poppy crops, farmers are deeply in debt. The average Afghan poppy grower’s per capita income is about $300, and farmers have to borrow money for seeds, fertilizer, food, and basic necessities from traffickers. The farmers are unable to pay their debts when their crops are eradicated, or they are pressured by local governments and westerners to stop growing. Westerners don’t keep promises to provide free seeds for substitute crops, and creditors demand child wives in payment for debts. The growers’ daughters are called “opium flowers“, and moneylenders seek them out in case of crop failure or family emergency. It is a traditional Afghan custom for a family to pay off a debt by marrying a daughter to a relative of the creditor. Now the practice is being used to pay off debts to drug traffickers. Mr Isamuddin, 68, stopped growing poppies because of a government crack down; further up the valley helicopters sprayed the poppy fields with insecticide. He explained, “”If people here cannot earn enough to feed their families, they will start growing opium again.” Even though production of Afghan opium is high, world demand has not increased largely. Afghanistan is accused of stockpiling opium, and the US supports aerial spraying programs for eradication. Afghan and British officials oppose aerial spraying, as it would increase support for the Taliban for fear the herbicide would poison growers and their families. The Bush administration supports expansion of eradication programs, whereas Afghanistan wants to emphasize long-term crop substitution for opium poppy plants. One goal of the drug war is increase prices in order to deter usage, only the ones profiting from such prohibition are the drug traffickers. The farmers have tried other crops, such as wheat, but poppies bring in 10 times the amount and are hardier than grains. It is the only reliable cash crop they know. Opium growers ask for advances on their crops from the drug traffickers, which they are then unable to pay. Sayed Shah was forced to pay his debt to a trafficker with the marriage of his 9-year-old daughter. According to Newsweek: Shah borrowed $2,000 from a local trafficker, promising to repay the loan with 24 kilos of opium at harvest time. Late last spring, just before harvest, a government crop-eradication team appeared at the family’s little plot of land in Laghman province and destroyed Shah’s entire two and a half acres of poppies… “I never imagined I’d have to pay for growing opium by giving up my daughter,” says Shah…”It’s my fate,” the child says. Poppy eradication causes many Afghan daughters to be turned into child brides. Whether a farmer loses his crop to Drug War eradication or his substitute wheat crop fails, US policies should not be causing such practices to continue in Central Asia. “Until the end of my life I will feel shame because of what I did to my daughter,” said a former poppy grower. “I still can’t look her in the eye.”

Opium Brides Extensions

Opium eradication forces farmers to give their daughters in place of loans.

Rawa News 8 (3/31, http://www.rawa.org/temp/runews/2008/03/31/afghanistan-opium-brides-pay-the-price.html) PJ

As Afghanistan battles to check growing poppy production, there thrives a disturbing trend behind the scene, where daughters of poppy producers pay the price for the unpaid loans. Termed as "opium brides", the daughters of poor poppy farmers are often given to drug traffickers if their fathers are unable to pay the loan taken for growing the illicit crop because of the official action. In a report in its upcoming issue, Newsweek takes the case of an illiterate poor farmer in Laghman Province who borrowed US$ 2000 from a local traffickers promising to pay back with 24 kilos of opium at harvest time. But officials destroyed his two and half acre poppy farm. Unable to pay, he fled but was located by the trafficker and then village elders decided that he should give his 10-year old daughter to 45-year old trafficker to settle the debt. ''It is my fate,'' she told the magazine. She had desired to be become a teacher. Afghan call these girls ''loan brides'' and their number is increasing since the opium eradication programme began. The practice, explains the magazine, began with the dowry a bridegroom's family traditionally pays to the bride's father in tribal Pashtun society. These days the amount ranges from US$3000 or so in poorer places like Laghman and Nangarhar to US$8000 or more in Helmand, Afghanistan's No 1 opium-growing province. All the same, local farmers were quoted as saying that a man can get killed for failing to repay a loan. No one, the magazine says, knows how many debt weddings take place in Afghanistan, where 93 per cent of the world's heroin originates. But Afghans say the number of loan brides keeps rising as poppy-eradication efforts push more farmers into default. "This will be our darkest year since 2000," says Baz Mohammad, 65-year old former opium farmer in Nangarhar was quoted as saying. ''Even more daughters will be sold this year.'' The old man lives with the anguish of selling his own 13-year-old daughter in 2000, after Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed Omar banned poppy growing. "Lenders never show any mercy," he said. The local farmers are quoted by Newsweek as saying more than one debtor has been bound hand and foot, then locked into a small windowless room with a smoldering fire, slowly choking to death. While law enforcers predict yet another record opium harvest in Afghanistan this spring, the magazine says most farmers are struggling to survive. An estimated 500,000 Afghan families support themselves by raising poppies, according to the UN Office on Drugs and Crime. Last year, those growers received an estimated USD one billion for their cropsabout USD 2,000 per household. With at least six members in the average family, opium growers' per capita income is roughly US$ 300. The real profits go to the traffickers, their Taliban allies and the crooked officials who help them operate.

These opium dowries are tantamount to slavery.

Morrissey 08 (Ed, writer for Hot Air, 3/31, http://hotair.com/archives/2008/03/31/opium-brides-slavery-for-afghan-women/)

The poppy-eradication effort in Afghanistan will upset a very delicate economic situation, and it has to do with the complete lack of infrastructure in the war-torn country. American agriculture excels because of the many systems we have built to support it — storage, transportation, compensation, and so on. We can have produce to market in hours, and we can rotate crops and grow crops that quickly perish because we have storage systems that keep it all fresh for sale. Afghanistan has none of that. They don’t have any significant refrigeration systems, and most farmers are too poor to own their own. Roads and trucks are uncommon. Even if the farmers grew vegetables in place of poppies, they couldn’t reliably get it to market in any condition for sale — and in the winter, they could not store any excess. They would starve before the next planting season. Poppies, on the other hand, allow farmers to almost grow cash. The opium doesn’t spoil, and a good harvest acts just like cash in the bank. Farmers squirrel it away and just bring kilos to market for quick returns when needed. Opium makes the most economic sense while Afghanistan remains infrastructurally backward. Unfortunately, the eradication policies and war have created debt issues for farmers. They have sold their future crops at discounts to lenders who claim not to charge interest, as Islam requires, but who in reality have created vigorish akin to something at which a Mafia shylock might blush. When the crops fail, they get their pound of flesh — or more literally, about 100 pounds of it. This is nothing less than slavery. Families have bartered for dowries in many cultures, including those in the West, but this goes beyond that. If we want the people of Afghanistan to find stability and prosperity without opium, we have to begin by halting the slave trade and addressing the infrastructure issues of that nation

Opium Brides Impact

Masculine conceptions of international relations cause the worst form of violence including exploitation, environmental destruction, and militarism that results in endless violence

Zalewski 98 (Marysia Zalewski, Reader in the Centre for Women’s Studies, and Jane Parpart, professor of Gender Studies at University of Dalhousie, 98 [The 'Man' Question in International Relations, Westview Press, Boulder, p86])

Whereas we think it important to avoid what Halliday calls "precipitate totalization," [9](http://www.questia.com/reader/action/gotoDocId/98143646) we also think it worthwhile to recognize the very real connections between the domination of masculine paradigms in intellectual debate, on the one hand, and personal insecurity in the late twentieth century, the development of industrial capitalism, and ecological destruction, on the other. The recognition of these connections is nothing new; both Peterson and Tickner unpackage IR in this way ( Peterson 1992, 32; Tickner 1992). However, the relation between these connections and the dispute between realist and liberal forms of masculinity must also be recognized (see Chapter 1).

The shift from hierarchical to spatial world orders that occurred after the Middle Ages created an international realm in which the hypermasculinity of the warrior developed and finally flourished as realist hypermasculinity within the discipline of international relations. The intellectual response to conservatism from the Enlightenment produced a conception of reason that laid the foundations of the "rational man" of the following centuries of capitalist development. Finally, the liberal conception of progress as the natural outgrowth of increasing rationality produced the critical liberal conception of the gradual mastery of man over nature. The consequences are readily itemizable: (1) realist hypermasculinity is responsible for the emergence and eventual militarization of the state system with its imagery of protector/protected, inside/outside, and order/anarchy--a situation in which security for the few is bought at the cost of insecurity of the many ( Luckham 1983); (2) liberal masculinity's notions of competition, individuality, and rational economic man has meant prosperity for the few and exploitation of the many ( Wallerstein 1974; Amin 1974); (3) liberal conceptions of progress have fostered a split between man and nature where nature is to be dominated and is consequently responsible for the widespread degradation of the global environment ( Crosby 1986); (4) both liberal and realist conceptions of masculinity have been responsible for the fostering of the belief in the discovery of predictable regularities through which "science" can reveal eternal truths about "man" and "nature." This has allowed (hu)manity to ignore the myriad warning signs of imminent catastrophe ( Peterson 1992; Tickner 1992).

\*\*Poverty\*\*

WOD 🡪 poverty

The war on drugs harms the stability of Afghanistan, causes farmers to turn to the Taliban, and creates a corrupt cycle of debt

Rubin & Zakhilwal 5 (Barnett and Omar, “A War on Drugs, or a War on Farmers?”, <http://www.cic.nyu.edu/peacebuilding/oldpdfs/Farmers.pdf>, date accessed:6/22/2010) AK  
Two days after his inauguration as Afghanistan's first popularly elected president, Hamid Karzai gave an impassioned speech to officials and community leaders from all over the country. The drug trade, he said, posed a greater threat to Afghanistan than the Soviet invasion, civil war, or foreign interference. Yet while the Karzai government is determined to eliminate narcotics, it is resisting U.S. pressure for a massive crop eradication effort. As the chancellor of Kabul University, former finance minister Ashraf Ghani, recently wrote, "Today, many Afghans believe that it is not drugs, but an ill- conceived war on drugs that threatens their economy and nascent democracy." Last November, after a still-unidentified aircraft sprayed herbicide on opium poppy (and everything else, including children) in villages of eastern Afghanistan, President Karzai called in the ambassadors of the U.S. and U.K. to protest. Both countries denied involvement. Since then, under pressure from Mr. Karzai, U.S. allies, and the U.S. military, the administration is considering reallocating the $152 million already programmed for aerial eradication. That would be a change in the right direction, if the administration adds these funds to the $120 million it had allocated to alternative livelihoods for rural communities, a mere 15% of a total program of $778 million. The administration's program not only has lopsided priorities; it is a threat to U.S. objectives and the stability of Afghanistan. It focuses resources on the wrong end of the value chain, the raw material. The program's "five pillars" (eradication, interdiction, law enforcement, alternative livelihoods, and public information) contain no provision for macro-economic support as part of a plan to wipe out the largest sector of one of the poorest economies. Eradication, the largest part of the program (38%) attacks farmers who voted for President Karzai and sometimes provide intelligence to U.S. forces. Eradication would take place while the country tries to carry out parliamentary and provincial elections. It is hard to find Afghans who support this strategy, but we have found one group that does: drug traffickers. Strangely enough for a Republican administration, the administration's anti-drug policy tries to use force against the profit motive, rather than use the profit motive to support policy. The result is the enrichment of traffickers, warlords and terrorists at the expense of poor farmers. The Afghan opium economy involves three groups: poor farmers, who use cash from opium futures contracts to feed their families over the winter; landowners and traders, who rent land and provide loans against the future harvest; and protectors, including officials, warlords and terror groups, who oversee the trade and export. In the latter two groups are major smugglers and officials. The latter group, not farmers, threatens Afghanistan. Final demand for this addictive product varies little with price. But the demand by middlemen is highly elastic, as opiates, raw or refined, have a shelf-life of years. From his discussions with farmers in Eastern Afghanistan, one of the authors (Zakhilwal) found that poor farmers have sold off their stocks to buy necessities, while those with adequate wealth have hoarded half of the 2004 harvest and about 30% from 2003. Mid-level traders have stored 80% of the 2004 opium for resale at higher prices. Traders welcomed U.S. calls for crop eradication. After three massive harvests, prices had fallen from $600 to $90 per kilo, but after announcement of eradication they jumped to $400. Prices settled back to $300 for current sales, but futures prices went to $400 for delivery in two months and $500 for three months. Traders are confident that by April 2005 the price will reach $1,000 per kilo. Then they will sell. The higher price will signal that it is profitable to grow opium in remote areas with lower yields, leading to the migration, not elimination, of the crop, as in the Andes. Sustained efforts against those high on the value chain, however, would be far more effective. Destruction of laboratories and stocks, and disruption of wholesale markets would lead to panic sell-offs, lowering prices and exposing product to interdiction. It would also lower the price paid to farmers, sending the right market signal for next year's planting. But while interdiction, not eradication, is therefore the right focus for law enforcement, it too will backfire without actual -- not just promised -- economic development. Rural communities need alternatives to the credit, employment and cash incomes that opium provides. U.S. and Afghan officials have launched development efforts in opium-growing provinces, but many are on the margin of survival. They cannot shift their economic activities based on tiny handouts or vague promises. Some of the poor in rural communities have migrated to Pakistan, saying they cannot survive in Afghanistan without opium. An attack on the farmers' livelihoods will lead some to flee and others to fight. It will then be too late for either the government or international aid providers to enter their villages to promote alternative livelihoods. The narcotics industry now equals 60% of legal economic activity. It produces the country's main export. Without macroeconomic support to sustain effective demand and the balance of payments, the currency will crash, prices will soar, and the urban population will suffer along with the rural communities. Such conditions would be as unpropitious for stabilizing the country as the entrenchment of the narco-economy. Counter-narcotics must start by helping those whose political support the government and the U.S. need. This requires far more aid to rural communities and a program of support to effective demand and the balance of payments. Law enforcement should attack the real enemies of our effort at the top of the drug trade. This will send the right market and political signals. Using force against the interest of our allies and the laws of the market risks undoing the good we have done.

WOD 🡪 poverty

The war on drugs will make everyone join the Taleban

Albone & Billet 7 (Tim and Claire, “Ruined poppy farmers join ranks with the Taleban”, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article1444124.ece>, date accessed:6/22/2010) AK   
“The people are unhappy with this eradication campaign; if it goes on they will all join the Taleban,” Dilbar, a poppy farmer in Helmand province, told The Times. The prospect of such a surge in Taleban numbers is bad news for the 5,000 British troops based in Helmand and 1,400 more heading there after the announcement by Des Browne, the Defence Secretary. The fiercest fighting since the Taleban were overthrown in 2001 came last year, with more than 4,000 people killed, and intelligence reports predict a new offensive this spring.

WOD devastates Afghani farmers

Slater 2010 (Meredith, “Will This Attempt to Eradicate Afghanistan’s Poppies Be Any Different?”, Global Poverty, <http://globalpoverty.change.org/blog/view/will_this_attempt_to_eradicate_afghanistans_poppies_be_any_different>, date accessed:6/22/2010) AK  
 Poppy farmers in Afghanistan have always had it rough. Economic instability, scarce land and the general absence of rule of law in the Afghan countryside have made poppy cultivation far from a stable line of work. Yet national and international campaigns to eradicate poppy farming have consistently failed. Now the Obama administration has a new approach — but will it succeed? The Taliban opium ban from 2000-2001 caused the virtual (if temporary) elimination of the country's opium economy. But it also pushed poppy farmers deep into debt and caused many to lose their land and flee their homes. And by November 2001, the collapse of the economy and the scarcity of other sources of revenue forced many of the country's farmers to revert back to growing opium anyway. The next year, the Afghan government made a renewed attempt at eradication by offering poppy farmers up to $500 per acre of destroyed poppies. Yet according to UN estimates, that same acre can earn a poppy farmer more than $6,000 — so what would be the benefit to them? Plus, most farmers who did opt into the deal never saw their cash. The international community hasn't had a much better track record. U.S., U.K. and NATO efforts to crack down on opium cultivation throughout the mid-2000s often caused raw opium prices to skyrocket, simply encouraging some Afghan farmers to continuing planting opium poppies. For others, the chemical spraying and bulldozing of their poppy fields caused them to lose everything they had, often pushing desperately poor farmers to join the Taliban.

WOD 🡪poverty

500,000 farmers raise poppies to support themselves; it’s their only option

Yousafzai 8 (Sami, March 29, <http://www.newsweek.com/2008/03/29/the-opium-brides-of-afghanistan.html>, “The Opium Brides of Afghanistan”, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK  
While law enforcers predict yet another record opium harvest in Afghanistan this spring, most farmers are struggling to survive. An estimated 500,000 Afghan families support themselves by raising poppies, according to the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. Last year those growers received an estimated $1 billion for their crops—about $2,000 per household. With at least six members in the average family, opium growers' per capita income is roughly $300. The real profits go to the traffickers, their Taliban allies and the crooked officials who help them operate. The country's well-oiled narcotics machine generates in excess of $4 billion a year from exports of processed opium and heroin—more than half of Afghanistan's $7.5 billion GDP, according to the UNODC.

Opium is the only feasible crop for farmers

Durham 9 (Major Jan R., 4/5/2009, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA502865>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK  
Farmers: The foundation of the opium economy is made up of 2.4 million farmers and day-laborers23 who share an estimated 20 percent of the profits. 24 While some farmers grow poppy to finance their “upward social mobility,”25 the majority cultivate it out of a lack of legitimate substitutes because often opium “provides the only access to land, credit, water and employment”26 for many farmers and laborers. As the largest segment of Afghan society (78 percent live in rural areas and the majority of that population is engaged in agriculture)27 farmers are different from the other groups in another important way as well. In the same manner that the general populace is the center of gravity in counterinsurgency operations, the rural farmer is the center of gravity for counterdrug operations by virtue of his role in the opium economy and his numbers. Because the Afghan farmer remains the political prize in both counterinsurgency and counterdrug contexts, counterdrug operations must be designed to wean, not force, the Afghan farmer away from opium to legal alternatives to prevent driving him to the Taliban and other armed groups for protection against eradication

Poverty Impacts- War

Widespread poverty in Afghanistan risks a failed state

Chan 8 (ching Li, July 24, “Afghanistan’s war on poverty”, <http://www.globalenvision.org/2008/07/24/afghanistans-war-poverty>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK

For a country that [has received billions of dollars in international assistance since 2002](http://www.cfr.org/publication/16020/ahadi.html), some may be surprised to hear that many Afghans still don't have access to clean drinking water, sewage systems, electricity. As of this year, the World Bank says ["only 13% of Afghans have access to safe drinking water, 12% to adequate sanitation, and just 6% to electricity."](http://www.worldbank.org.af/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/SOUTHASIAEXT/AFGHANISTANEXTN/0,,contentMDK:20154015~menuPK:305990~pagePK:1497618~piPK:217854~theSitePK:305985,00.html) "What puzzles poorer Afghans," writes a BBC correspondent, "is [why so many basic problems haven't been solved, despite the billions of dollars of international aid](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7451165.stm)."

So, where has the billions of aid dollars gone? One Afghan schoolteacher told BBC to [look at the lavish lifestyle of corrupt officials.](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7451165.stm) "Go and see who owns these expensive houses in (the suburb of) Wazir Akbar Khan and who is driving land cruisers," he says. "Karzai should ask these officials how they got so rich overnight, instead of making empty promises again and again." Afghanistan is considered one of the world's most corrupt countries. [It ranked 172 out of 179 countries last year](http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1726620,00.html?xid=feed-yahoo-full-world-related) on Transparency International's corruption-perceptions index. Karzai's government insists they're trying to tackle corruption, but, as [this Q&A between BBC.com readers and Afghan villagers reveals](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/6763865.stm), people still feel like this government is letting them down. Many, including [Afghanistan's former NATO commander](http://www.theglobalreport.org/?section=archives&cat_id=119&article_id=3419), think the country still risks becoming a failed state. U.S. Presidential candidate Barack Obama called Afghanistan's situation "precarious and urgent" during a high-profile visit there last week.

Poverty causes war in Afghanistan

BBC 9 (BBC News, Wed 18, “Afghans ‘blame poverty for war’”, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/8363151.stm>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK

Poverty and unemployment are overwhelmingly seen as the main reasons behind conflict in Afghanistan, according to a survey in that country. British aid agency Oxfam - which questioned 704 Afghans - said seven out of 10 respondents blamed these factors. Taliban violence was seen as less important than government weakness and corruption, according to the poll. Oxfam said the survey showed that the country needed more than military solutions.

Poverty is more deadly than war in Afghanistan

Zeenews 10 (“Poverty deadlier than United Nations: Afghanistan is one of the poorest countries in the world and poverty kills more

Afghans than war, according to a new report issued by the human rights division of the UN. "Poverty actually kills more Afghans than those who die as a direct result of the armed conflict," Norah Niland, Representative of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in Afghanistan said. "Poverty deprives two-thirds of the Afghan population from living a decent and dignified life. This includes the inability to enjoy their most basic and fundamental rights, such as getting an education or having access to health services," he added. The top UN human rights official in the country stressed that the root cause of poverty in Afghanistan was human rights violation that took the shape of patronage, corruption, impunity and opting for short-term solutions over long-term developmental goals.

Poverty Impacts- Root Cause

Poverty is the cause of conflicts and disease outbreaks- outweighs all

Rice 6 (susan, fellow at the Brookings Institute ass sec of state for foreign affairs, *The National Interest Spring 6*) ET

When American s see televised images of bone-thin children with distended bellies, their humanitarian instincts take over. They don’t typically look at unicef footage and perceive a threat that could destroy our way of life. Yet global poverty is not solely a humanitarian concern. In real ways, over the long term, it can threaten U.S. national security. Poverty erodes weak states’ capacity to prevent the spread of disease and protect the world’s forests and watersheds—some of the global threats Maurice Greenberg noted in the Winter 2005 issue. It also creates conditions conducive to transnational criminal enterprises and terrorist activity, not only by making desperate individuals potentially more susceptible to recruitment, but also, and more significantly, by undermining the state’s ability to prevent and counter those violent threats. Poverty can also give rise to the tensions that erupt in civil conflict, which further taxes the state and allows transnational predators greater freedom of action. Americans can no longer realistically hope that we can erect the proverbial glass dome over our homeland and live safely isolated from the killers—natural or man-made—that plague other parts of the world. Al-Qaeda established training camps in conflict-ridden Sudan and Afghanistan, purchased diamonds from Sierra Leone and Liberia, and now targets American soldiers in Iraq. The potential toll of a global bird-flu pandemic is particularly alarming. A mutated virus causing human-to-human contagion could kill hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans. Today, more than half the world’s population lives on less than $2 per day, and almost 1.1 billion people live in extreme poverty, defined as less than $1 per day. The costs of global poverty are multiple. Poverty prevents poor countries from devoting sufficient resources to detect and contain deadly disease. According to the World Health Organization (who), low- and middle-income countries suffer 90 percent of the world’s disease burden but account for only 11 percent of its health care spending. Poverty also dramatically increases the risk of civil conflict. A recent study by the uk’s Department for International Development showed that a country at $250 gdp per capita has on average a 15 percent risk of internal conflict over five years, while a country at $5,000 per capita has a risk of less than 1 percent. War zones provide ideal operational environs for international outlaws. If in the old days the consequences of extreme poverty could conveniently be confined to the far corners of the planet, this is no longer the case. The end of U.S.-Soviet competition, the civil and regional conflicts that ensued, and the rapid pace of globalization have brought to the fore a new generation of dangers. These are the complex nexus of transnational security threats: infectious disease, environmental degradation, international crime and drug syndicates, proliferation of small arms and weapons of mass destruction, and terrorism. Often these threats emerge from impoverished, relatively remote regions of the world. They thrive especially in conflict or lawless zones, in countries where corruption is endemic, and in poor, weak states with limited control over their territory or resources. The map of vulnerable zones is global—including parts of the Caribbean, Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, the Caucasus, and Central, South and East Asia. Fifty-three countries have an average per capita gdp of less than $2 per day. Each is a potential weak spot in a world in which effective action by states everywhere is necessary to reduce and combat transnational threats.

\*\*Stability Stuff\*\*

Stability Advantage – I/L – WOD Leads to Taliban

DEA agents cause the populace to turn to the Taliban

Whitlock 9 (Craig, WP writer, October 24, 2009, “Afghans oppose U.S. hit list of drug traffickers”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/23/AR2009102303709.html>)KFC

"Extrajudicial killing is not something you want to see," Lemahieu said. "Let's be very, very clear. Don't expect the military to do the job of a police officer. It won't work." Afghanistan's nascent judicial system, however, has struggled to enforce the law against traffickers. And when it does win convictions, cases can still fall apart. In April, five traffickers who had been sentenced to long prison terms received pardons from President Hamid Karzai, who said he intervened "out of respect" for their family members. One defendant was the nephew of Karzai's campaign manager. "We have some people, powerful people, inside and outside government, who can freely smuggle drugs," said Nur al-Haq Ulumi, a member of the Afghan parliament from Kandahar. "If we had an honest government, the government could track down and arrest these people -- everybody knows this." But Ulumi said it would make things worse if coalition troops began to kill drug dealers. "Already, people feel that foreigners didn't really come here to reconstruct our country," he said. "They think the foreigners just came here to kill us." Ahmad Big Qaderi, director general of prosecutions for the Criminal Justice Task Force, which oversees narcotics cases and is financed largely by the U.S. government, said NATO forces needed to trust his agency to prosecute drug dealers. "We should go through the Afghan legal channels to convict criminals," he said. "We have professional staff here and all the mechanisms to prosecute the big fishes."

The war on drugs will make everyone join the Taliban

Albone & Billet 7 (Tim and Claire, “Ruined poppy farmers join ranks with the Taleban”, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article1444124.ece>, date accessed:6/22/2010) AK

“The people are unhappy with this eradication campaign; if it goes on they will all join the Taleban,” Dilbar, a poppy farmer in Helmand province, told The Times. The prospect of such a surge in Taleban numbers is bad news for the 5,000 British troops based in Helmand and 1,400 more heading there after the announcement by Des Browne, the Defence Secretary. The fiercest fighting since the Taleban were overthrown in 2001 came last year, with more than 4,000 people killed, and intelligence reports predict a new offensive this spring.

Stability Advantage – I/L – WoD Leads to Taliban

Destroying opium causes farmers to turn to the Taliban to avoid death

Walt 10 (Vivienne, April 1, “Afghanistan’s New Bumper Drug Crop: Cannabis”, <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1976867,00.html>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK

Worse, many believe the policies have helped stoke the Taliban's war against the coalition by uniting residents against the Afghan soldiers who destroyed their opium crops. "Eradicating marijuana and opium fields can breed resentment by people and be destabilizing," says John Dempsey, a rule-of-law adviser to U.S. and Afghan officials for the U.S. Institute of Peace. He cites the town of Marjah, in Helmand province, where U.S. forces rolled tanks over poppy fields in a major offensive in February, two years after Afghan forces destroyed the local farmers' opium crops. After those antidrug offensives, Dempsey says, "local residents felt they preferred the Taliban, because they let them grow opium." About 70% of the farmers surveyed by local U.N. workers in 20 largely Taliban-controlled provinces said they paid about 10% of their earnings to the local forces that controlled their areas. Dempsey believes farmers could be better persuaded to give up growing opium and cannabis if Western and Afghan officials introduced big incentives and subsidies for growing food crops and helped farmers sell them. One crucial problem, he says, is that the roads in southern Afghanistan are too dangerous for farmers to drive their crops to local markets. Groups of armed drug traffickers, meanwhile, travel through the countryside, buying opium and cannabis at the farm gates for cash. For many farmers in the area, making a living and staying alive — sadly — go hand in hand.

Crop eradication makes Afghan farmers dependant on the Taliban

Drug War Chronicle 9 (7/3/2009, <http://stopthedrugwar.org/chronicle/592/afghanistan_US_stops_opium_poppy_eradication>, date accessed: 6/22/2010)AK

"The new counternarcotics strategy in Afghanistan which scales down eradication and emphasizes rural development and interdiction is exactly right," said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a drugs, development, and security expert with the Brookings Institution. "Under the prevailing conditions in Afghanistan, eradication has been not only ineffective; it has been counterproductive because it strengthens the bond between the rural population dependent on the illicit economy and the Taliban. Backing away from counterproductive eradication is not only a right analysis, it is also a courageous break on the part of the Obama administration with decades of failed counternarcotics strategy worldwide that centers on premature and unsustainable eradication," she added. "This is clearly a positive, pragmatic step," said Ethan Nadelmann, executive director of the [Drug Policy Alliance](http://www.drugpolicy.org). "It seems that the Obama administration is so deeply invested in succeeding in Afghanistan that they're actually willing to pursue a pragmatic drug policy. This is an intelligent move," he added. "It is an implicit recognition that you are not going to eradicate opium production in this world so long as there is a market for it. Given that Afghanistan is the dominant opium producer right now, the pragmatic strategy is to figure out how to manage that production rather than to pursue a politically destructive and ineffective crop eradication strategy."

Stability Advantage – I/L – WoD Leads to Taliban

The drug war increases Taliban recruitment

Bandow 4 (Doug, “Solving Afghanistan’s Opium Problem, October 20th, San Diego Union-Tribune, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=2858> , date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK

Afghanistan's presidential elections came off with little violence but some damaging controversy. President Hamid Karzai's 15 opponents charged vote fraud. Whether the election is perceived as legitimate is only the second most important issue facing the war-torn nation. Most critical is whether the Bush administration risks undermining the fight against al-Qaeda and the Taliban in an attempt to suppress drug production. Unfortunately, Afghanistan has become a global Opiates 'R' Us. [Doug Bandow](http://www.cato.org/people/bandow.html) is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and a former special assistant to President Ronald Reagan. [More by Doug Bandow](http://www.cato.org/people/doug-bandow) In a nation where the average wage is a $2 a day, heroin and opium trafficking produced revenues last year estimated at $2.3 billion annually - as much as 60 percent of Afghanistan's official annual GDP. Opium has become the perfect export from a land enveloped by chaos and war. The United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime has attempted to craft a positive spin: "The establishment of democracy in Afghanistan and the Government's measures against cultivation, trade and abuse of opium have been crucial steps toward solving the drug problem." The fundamentalist Taliban took power in 1996 and banned use of all intoxicants, including opiates. However, Kabul had no objection to people selling drugs to infidels. Following the Taliban's ouster, the new government outlawed opium production. But chaos meant that the poppy fields were replanted and smuggling revived. Regime change, though necessary for security purposes, did not provide Afghan households with a new income. Moreover, Hamid Karzai rules little more than Kabul. Even a successful election won't help much. Poppy production has spread to 28 of 32 provinces, and the Afghan government figures that about 30 percent of families are involved in the trade. Until now, controlling opium trafficking has not been the top U.S. priority in Afghanistan. Although the Defense Department is careful to appear cooperative, U.S. forces have largely ignored drug trafficking unrelated to enemy action. The Taliban is involved in drug trafficking, but so are many of Karzai's (and America's) local warlord allies. The poppy traders "are the guys who helped us liberate this place in 2001," one U.S. official told The New York Times. Unfortunately, even the return of stability and prosperity won't eliminate the drug trade. Observed the UNODC, "Given the current opium prices within Afghanistan, it is also clear that no other crop can compete with opium poppy as a source of income." Which leaves interdiction. Interdiction in regions run by warlords and where the Taliban and al-Qaeda are active. To his credit, House International Relations Committee Chairman Henry Hyde, R-Ill., says "I do not want our military forces, already tasked with vital counterterrorism and stability operations, to become Afghanistan's anti-narcotics police." That, he says, should be the job of "Afghan police, army and judicial authorities we are helping to build." Yet there is no functioning Afghan state. How is a government that is unable to secure its capital city going to squelch poppy production in distant provinces? U.S. forces, just 18,000 in the entire country, already are badly stretched. But Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld says Washington and its allies are developing a "master plan" to combat opium production. Robert B. Charles, assistant secretary of state for international narcotics and law enforcement affairs, promises: "We intend to be very aggressive, very proactive." He adds, "If the penalties are high enough, they will not grow heroin poppies. But if Washington penalizes its erstwhile allies, it risks driving them back to the Taliban. Indeed, drug producers are suspected to have staged the bomb attack on the private security firm DynCorp, which has been training anti-narcotics police. The Karzai government claimed that the same forces attempted to assassinate vice presidential candidate Ahmed Zia Masood.

Eradication increases the number of farmers who defect to the Taliban

Durham 9 (Major Jan R., 4/5/2009, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA502865>, date accessed: 6/22/2010) AK

Eradication Doesn’t Work: Eradication is counterproductive and actually strengthens the opium trade while hampering U.S. and Afghan efforts to stamp it out. This approach has proven ineffective not only in Afghanistan, but in other parts of the world. Eradication can produce short-term supply reductions, but they are not usually sustainable and often result in a series of unintended consequences that work to increase the motivation for the average Afghan farmer to continue growing poppy. Continuing eradication will increasingly alienate the rural population from the government, strengthen insurgent groups, and increase the time and resources needed to bring this problem to a manageable level.

Stability Advantage – WoD Trades-off With WoT

The war on drugs makes it impossible to win the overall war

Carpenter 4 (Ted Galen, “How the Drug War in Afghanistan Undermines America’s War on Terror”, Nov 10, Foreign Policy Briefing, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb84.pdf> , date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK

The war on drugs is interfering with the U.S. effort to destroy Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. U.S. officials increasingly want to eradicate drugs as well as nurture Afghanistan’s embryonic democracy, symbolized by the pro-Western regime of President Hamid Karzai. They need to face the reality that it is not possible to accomplish both objectives. An especially troubling indicator came in August 2004 when Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld stated that drug eradication in Afghanistan was a high priority of the Bush administration and indicated that the United States and its coalition partners were in the process of formulating a “master plan” for dealing with the problem.1 “The danger a large drug trade poses in this country is too serious to ignore,” Rumsfeld said. “The inevitable result is to corrupt the government and way of life, and that would be most unfortunate.”2

The DEA angers Afghanis and hurts the War on Terror.

Balko  9 (Radley, [a policy analyst](http://www.cato.org/people/balko.html) for the Cato Institute, January 23, 2009, http://reason.org/news/show/the-drug-wars-collateral-damag)SRH

America’s quest to rid the world of illicit drugs knows no boundaries—political or moral. Just months before September 11, we gave $43 million to Afghanistan—a way of compensating Afghan farmers hurt by the Taliban’s compliance with a U.S. request to crack down on that country’s opium farms (as it turns out, the Taliban had merely eradicated the farms in competition with the Taliban’s own producers). We don’t seem to have learned. The western world’s prohibition on opium makes poppies a lucrative crop for impoverished Afghan farmers, and is a valuable recruiting tool for insurgents and remnant Taliban forces. At the same time, we have DEA agents and U.S. and United Nations troops roving the country on search-and-destroy missions, setting Afghani livelihoods aflame before their very eyes—not exactly the way to build alliances. Former BBC correspondent Misha Glenny, author of a book on the global drug trade, explained last year in the Washington Post: In the past two years, the drug war has become the Taliban's most effective recruiter in Afghanistan. Afghanistan's Muslim extremists have reinvigorated themselves by supporting and taxing the countless peasants who are dependent one way or another on the opium trade, their only reliable source of income. The Taliban is becoming richer and stronger by the day, especially in the east and south of the country. The "War on Drugs" is defeating the "war on terror." But it isn’t just Afghanistan. The U.S. has a long history of turning a blind eye to human rights abuses and unintended consequences in the name of eradicating illicit drugs overseas. For example, between 2001 and 2003, the U.S. gave more than $12 million to Thailand for drug interdiction efforts. Over ten months in 2003, the Thai government sent out anti-drug “death squads” to carry out the summary, extra-judicial executions of as many as 4,000 suspected drug offenders. Many were later found to have had nothing to do with the drug trade at all. Though the U.S. State Department denounced the killings, the United States continued to give the same Thai regime millions in aid for counter-narcotics operations.

It’s impossible to win the war on drugs and the war on terror @ the same time

Longley 10 (Robert, About.com, <http://usgovinfo.about.com/cs/waronterror/a/afghanpoppy.htm>, date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK

According to the ODCP, the "challenging security situation" in Afghanistan has complicated the task of fighting a war against drugs and war on terrorism at the same time. As the terrorists lose ground, the opium poppy growers win, and much of the money from Afghanistan's opium sales goes right back to the terrorists.m"Poppy cultivation in Afghanistan is a major and growing problem," said John Walters, Director of the ODCP. "Drug cultivation and trafficking are undermining the rule of law and putting money in the pocket of terrorists. The drug trade is hindering the ability of the Afghan people to rebuild their country and rejoin the international community. It is in the interest of all nations, including our European partners, to help the Karzai government fight the drug trade."

Stability Advantage – Heg Module

Losing the war on terror causes loss of legitimacy of American power- destroys heg

Crenshaw 6 (Martha, Prof of Govt @ Wesleyan U, p. 5, 2-10-6, *Real Institute Elcano) ET*

Press coverage of the fifth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks was largely negative. For example, Frank Rich, writing in The New York Times, commented that the loss of unity within the United States and in the world is as much a cause for mourning as the attack itself.9 The Council on Foreign Relations update on ‘The Terror War and Remembrance’ reports on both optimistic and pessimistic assessments and concludes that although the question of ‘Is America winning or losing this fight?’ is on the minds of everyone, there is no simple answer.10 My critical assessment of official strategy is not meant to imply that there have been no successes, including extensive international cooperation in law enforcement and intelligence areas, arrests of many if not all important al-Qaeda leaders, disruption of numerous plots and efforts by the United Nations and other international bodies to promote norms that delegitimise terrorism. However, official American statements do not recognise that many of the means by which the ‘GWOT’ has been implemented have jeopardised the legitimacy of American leadership and made American hegemony seem less than benign. American power has become suspect.

And, hegemonic decline leads to transition wars – the impact is extinction

Nye 90 (Joseph- Professor of Interntl Rel& former Dean of the Kennedy School @ Harvard, IR scholar, Bound To Lead, p.17) ET

Perceptions of change in the relative power of nations are of critical importance to understanding the relationship between decline and war. One of the oldest generalizations about international politics attributes the onset of major wars to shifts in power among the leading nations. Thus Thucydides accounted for the onset of the Peloponnesian War which destroyed the power of ancient Athens. The history of the interstate system since 1500 is punctuated by severe wars in which one country struggled to surpass another as the leading state. If as Robert Gilpin argues, international politics has not changed fundamentally over the millennia, “the implications for the future are bleak. And if fears about shifting power precipitate a major war in a world with 50,000 nuclear weapons, history as we know it may end

Stability Advantage – Drug war K2 Terror War

US k2 WOD

Abandoning the WOD key to win the WOT

Peirce 1 (Neal, “Can’t win war on terror fighting a war on drugs”, November 4, Houston Chronicle, <http://www.commondreams.org/views01/1104-07.htm>, date accessed: 6/23/2010) AK

If we expect to win the war on terrorism, we have to call off the war on drugs. There are three reasons: We can't afford both. The drug war feeds terrorist networks and diverts law enforcement from focusing on immense new perils. The drug war was failing anyway. If we want to reduce drug dependency and the crime associated with it, then intensive treatment programs will be far more effective. Sadly, official Washington isn't admitting any of these truths. House Speaker Dennis Hastert, R-Ill., has gone so far as to declare that "by going after the illegal drug trade, we reduce the ability of terrorists to launch attacks against the United States." First flaw in the argument: If our primary goal is Osama bin Laden and his Middle East-based network, choking off drug demand here (even if we could) wouldn't help much. Virtually all the heroin flowing out of Afghanistan goes to Europe, not the United States. But there's a larger flaw: What makes America's drug market so lucrative to suppliers in Latin America and elsewhere is our efforts to keep it illegal. Black markets always generate huge profits and networks of brutal, underground operators. Ties to terrorists are inevitable. "We have spent a half-trillion dollars on the drug war since 1990 and we are less safe and less healthy than ever," says Kevin Zeese, president of Common Sense for Drug Policy and long-term opponent of the prevailing national policy. Zeese, like most reformers, favors a legally controlled market that would focus on treatment and remove the hyperprofits of today's illegal trade. He charges the drug war actually "blinded our government to terrorism," citing reports in Boston news media that FBI agents in the '90s actually apprehended Raed Hijazi, an admitted al-Qaida member. Hijazi, according to the reports, provided the agents with information on the Boston area terrorist cell later involved with the Sept. 11 hijackings. But the FBI was reportedly interested only in information Hijazi had on heroin trafficking. Such incidents suggest that even if our federal, state and local governments found enough cash to fight a simultaneous war on drugs and war on terrorism, split agendas could mean that we end up losing both struggles. In a contorted way, one can argue America could "afford" to lose the war on drugs. Through the 1990s, times were good, government budgets sufficiently elastic, and the criminal justice system was kept busy. City neighborhoods may have been devastated, but there was little political outcry because the millions who got incarcerated tended to be politically less potent -- the poor and minorities. But terrorism is different. It's not some social choice (alcohol is OK, marijuana or crack get you prison, etc.). Rather, terrorism is a grim, undeniable force. Fed by global poverty and religious extremism, it could well be the most frightening, multifaceted threat to the lives, homes, cities and livelihoods of Americans since the Civil War. The harsh fact -- especially for state and local governments -- is that resources are finite. Every cop who isn't chasing a kid selling cocaine on a city street is a cop who could be guarding a subway station, a stadium or public plaza. Every detective not tied up in drug cases can be checking leads on potential assaults on city water reservoirs or local power stations. "Every dollar spent intercepting cocaine, heroin or marijuana," suggests Zeese, "is a dollar that could be spent intercepting bombs." Or take the federal Drug Enforcement Administration. Every DEA agent who isn't involved in a futile effort to stop an easily replaceable drug shipment from entering the United States can be investigating terrorist cells or working to prevent bioterrorism or nuclear terrorism. Yes, nuclear terrorism, which almost surely will be tried against us in the coming years. It is time to get serious, and deal with dire threats first. Instinctively, some federal agencies are shifting already. The FBI has changed its focus to terrorism. The Coast Guard has reportedly switched close to three-fourths of its personnel and boats from drug interdiction to antiterrorist patrols. Sharp moves in priority are also reported at the Customs Service, Public Health Service and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. But until we flip our drug policy, putting prevention and treatment first, and stop pursuing the millions of drug users in our own population, we'll have neither the resources nor the focus to pursue the very real terrorist threat that we face.

\*\*SOLVENCY\*\*

The DEA and US military are the backbone of the drug war- removing theme ends it

Soldier of Fortune 10 (<http://www.sofmag.com/wp/2010/06/marines-dea-afghan-police-nab-drug-kingpin-in-early-morning-raid/>, date accessed: 6/23/2010) AK

Four other simultaneous hits in Marjah, the DEA, 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment and the Counter Narcotic Police of Afghanistan netted other high-value targets and seized narcotics, weapons and explosives as evidence. The evidence was substantial against the primary target, and six other men arrested during the raids. Approximately 2,344 kilograms of opium, 16 kilograms of heroin, 27 kilograms of morphine, 5 kilograms of suspected methamphetamine, 3 kilograms of hash, 5 kilograms of poppy seeds, 65 kilograms of marijuana seeds, 502 pounds of homemade explosives, more than two tons of ammonium chloride, other HME making chemicals and weapons and cash were seized as evidence. For two months, DEA special agents from the Kabul Country Office Strike Force partnered with investigators from the Afghan Ministry of Interior’s Counter Narcotic Police Sensitive Investigative Unit to build solid cases against multiple terrorist and drug traffickers in Marjah. Confidential informants, made several buys under surveillance to secure evidence to arrest and indict the narco-terrorist suspects. The DEA and their confidential sources were gathering intelligence in Marjah prior to the Feb. 13, Operation Moshtarak push to clear the area of Taliban insurgency by Marines of Regimental Combat Team 7 in the fertile, opium-growing belt of the Helmand River Valley. Leading up to the February clearing mission, DEA informants identified 21 pages worth of IED emplacements, Taliban commanders and their headquarters, and pinpointed other threats that the DEA shared with the Marines and the intelligence community. The information was found to be very helpful in avoiding IEDs, according to a DEA special agent. “I think it’s good. The DEA is getting the intel to prosecute targets on opium producers and distributors. We all know they are linked to the Taliban or are Taliban,” said Staff Sgt. Stephen Vallejo, platoon sergeant, 2nd Plt., Alpha Company, 1/6. “That gives us the foot in the door to prosecute guys in our AO (area of operation) that we really wouldn’t know about,” added the 28-year-old from Kansas City, Kan. The Taliban and drug trafficking have long been connected. The Taliban uses the rich and illicit poppy growing fields in Helmand province to fund the insurgency through the profits from the byproduct of poppy opium. Local farmers have long grown the crop because they have been forced to, and because it has proven to be the best way to take care of their family, though be it illegal, explained a DEA agent. It was Vallejo’s company who led the foot patrol, from Patrol Base Littlefoot, under the cover of darkness, to the primary target’s compound where informants said they could find the Taliban high-value drug kingpin. Combined with the Marine patrol were two DEA Special Agents; one was the case leader on the entire case from the DEA’s Kabul Country Office Strike Force, and one special agent from the Foreign Advisory Support Team and a team of Afghan Counter Narcotic Police National Interdiction Unit. A Marine dog handler and his patrol drug-detection canine helped complete the search of the compound. The team of Afghan NIU agents armed with automatic weapons, search-and-arrest warrants led the forced entry in to the compound. The DEA and Marine dog handler and his canine followed directly behind them. The rest of the Marines from Alpha Company surrounded and secured the outside of the compound, and was ready to provide additional firepower if DEA and NIU required assistance inside. Soon after the NIU team entered the compound, a bearded man confronted them. He initially resisted the commands to surrender. While the NIU attempted to detain the man, the DEA agents and dog handler and his dog went building to building clearing each room and possible hiding spots for Taliban fighters. Still unaccounted for was the primary target. Credible sources reported he had spent the night in the compound. With one detainee secured, the NIU and DEA and the Marine canine team continued to search and clear into the main living area of the compound through a second entrance. Because women and children were present the Afghans took the lead in the main living area. They were quickly whisked into a separate room because of cultural sensitivities and the search continued. Moments later radio chatter from the 1/6 Marines from first squad, who were securing the perimeter, said they had detained a man who attempted to flee the compound. The quick action of the Marines had secured the DEA’s most wanted man in Marjah. With flexi cuffs on, the man was turned over to the NIU, who brought him back into the compound and continued to search for evidence and drugs. “They definitely see the value in the rule of law for the country,” said one of the DEA F.A.S.T. special agents, who wished to remain anonymous due to the nature of undercover work he does. “The reason I’m doing this, is you know the drug traffickers and the Taliban are both connected. The Taliban are getting their financing from the drugs,” said a special investigator with the SIU. “The case worked. We arrested the guys and got the seizure.” “This is all task and purpose,” said Sgt. Patrick Main, 1st Squad Leader, 2nd Platoon, 1/6. “If we’ve got to set a cordon [perimeter] for the DEA, or another squad, or ourselves, it’s pretty much the same.” Main underplayed the importance of their part of the mission because his Marines’ cordon nabbed the primary target as he attempted to escape. This was a joint operation with Marine forces, explained the Afghan special investigator through a translator.

DEA/ US K2 WOD

The DEA drives the drug war in Afghanistan- moins them it would collapse

Holton 10 (Chuck, <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/world/2010/April/DEA-Agents-Target-Afghanistans-Narco-Insurgency/>, date accessed: 6/23/2010) AK

AFGHANISTAN -- The Drug Enforcement Administration started fighting the illegal drug trade in 1973. Its main focus: keeping drugs out of the U.S. However, in recent years, the agency has expanded its mission to tracking drugs to their source - a strategy which puts them at the center of the War on Terror. DEA FAST Teams Five years ago, fewer than a dozen DEA agents were responsible for covering all of Afghanistan. Today, there are nearly 100 agents.  That's because the fight there is against a narco-insurgency, meaning the Taliban receive a large part of their funding from illegal drug activity. Chuck Holton recently returned from Afghanistan.  Click play for his report.  Also, [watch Holton's comments on the situation in Afghanistan here](http://downloads.cbn.com/cbnnewsplayer/cbnplayer.swf?aid=15361). As the U.S. military works to defeat the enemy and minimize collateral damage, the DEA is using its Foreign Deployed Assistance and Support, or FAST, teams to help hunt for Taliban drug kingpins. "We do basically all the types of operations we would do back home," said one DEA official, who spoke with CBN News on condition of anonymity for security reasons. "Whether a search warrant, an arrest warrant, seizure of drugs, any type of counternarcotics law enforcement, we train our Afghan counterparts in those same kind of missions. "We are not military. We are law enforcement," he explained. "So what we do is when we come over to Afghanistan - what gives us the ability to function and work in this country -- is going along with our Afghan counterparts." "We are there to advise and mentor and train them in counternarcotics law and procedures," he said. "And we're really starting to see some good effects come from that." Early Morning Raid CBN News traveled along with one of the DEA FAST teams on an early morning raid near Kandahar along with Navy SEALS and members of the Afghan National Army. The target: an Afghan drug runner who supports the insurgency with profits from illegal narcotics. A search of the compound yielded drugs and bomb making materials, which were gathered up and destroyed. The men detained on site were taken to face trial before an Afghan tribunal. The average sentence for those convicted is 20 years in prison.

The DEA drives the drug war in Afghanistan- taking them away would solve

Bowman 9 (Tom, July 24, NPR, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=111174481>date accessed: 6/23/2010) AK

The Drug Enforcement Administration is beefing up its presence in Afghanistan, sending dozens more agents to go after caches of opium that are a main source of money for Taliban insurgents. The DEA is also drawing up a list of the top 10 or 20 narco-traffickers in Afghanistan, and plans to work with Afghan officials to track them down and arrest them. "One year ago, we had 13 personnel in Afghanistan working counternarcotics," says Jay Fitzpatrick, a DEA assistant regional director who is based in the Afghan capital of Kabul. "We're in the process of increasing the number of personnel to 81. We hope to be at that ceiling by December." The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime estimates that the Taliban make hundreds of millions of dollars off the burgeoning opium trade in Afghanistan, as much as $400 million, that helps them buy weapons and pay local Afghan citizens, who need a job and might not necessarily agree with Taliban ideology. Military officers call them "$10 Tabies" because they are only in it for the money. "The money from narcotics is very critical to the insurgents," Fitzpatrick says. The DEA's increased presence is all part of a U.S. government effort to move away from poppy crop eradication, which was seen as unduly harming farmers, and moving instead to mid-level drug operators, drug labs and high-level traffickers. Richard Holbrooke, President Obama's special envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, talked about that shift just last week. "This administration set out to reverse the counternarcotics program by de-emphasizing crop eradication and emphasizing interdiction," Holbrooke told The Associated Press. "The forces in the south are actually making that a reality. It's a historic change if it's successful, and the first indications were very, very promising."

DEA/ US K2 WOD

The DEA & US military are taking charge of the WOD in Afghanistan

Washington Times 10 (<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/02/dea-official-says-better-cooperation-caused-opium-/?page=1>, april 2nd, date accessed: 6//23/2010) AK

Opium seizures in Afghanistan soared 924 percent last year because of better cooperation between Afghan and international forces, the top U.S. drug enforcement official said Thursday. The Taliban largely funds its insurgency by profits from the opium trade, making it a growing target of U.S. and Afghan anti-insurgency operations. Afghanistan produces the raw opium used to make 90 percent of the world's heroin. The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration now has 96 agents in the country who joined with Afghan counterparts and NATO forces in more than 80 combined operations last year, acting DEA administrator Michele Leonhart told reporters in Kabul. "That is the success of bringing the elements, civil, military Afghan partners together," Ms. Leonhart said. She did not give figures for total amounts of drugs seized but said the increase was 924 percent between 2008 and 2009. The United Nations reported 50 tons of opium was seized in the first half of last year. International groups estimate that only about 2 percent of Afghanistan's drug production was blocked from leaving the country in 2008 for markets in Central Asia and Europe. Ms. Leonhart said eradication efforts had already scored some success in the south, with opium cultivation down more than 30 percent in Helmand province that is responsible for half of Afghanistan's total production. She said the DEA was working with U.S. forces moving into the Taliban heartland, including "significant operations" in Helmand, where the poppy harvest season is in full-swing. Such operations place the Afghan government and its foreign allies in a bind because eradicating poppy fields risks driving angry farmers, for whom opium poppy is a cheap, hardy, low-risk crop, into the arms of the insurgents because they fear the loss of their livelihood. Efforts to replace opium with other crops such as wheat and vegetables haven't scored wide success because profits for the farmers are much lower than for poppies.

DEA/US K2 WOD

The DEA & US military are key to the war effort

Braun 9 (Michael, <http://counterterrorismblog.org/2009/05/counter_narco-terrorism_succes.php>, date accessed: 6/23/2010) AK

BC Nightly News reported yesterday evening (May 4, 2009) on a successful counter narco-terrorism operation involving U.S. Army Special Forces working shoulder-to-shoulder with a U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) Foreign-deployed Advisory and Support Team (FAST), Afghan Army Commandos and Counter-Narcotics Police/Afghanistan (CNPA) officers. Notice that I used the term 'counter narco-terrorism operation' rather than 'counter-narcotics operation', because in Afghan virtually every aspect of the drug trade is unequivocally linked to the Taliban and the insurgency. I've reported before on a 2002 study by Professor James Fearon of Stanford University, which clearly paints an accurate picture of the important role the opium and heroin trade plays in the success, or failure, of the Taliban. Dr. Fearon studied 128 insurgencies and civil wars from 1945 to 2000 and found that they lasted on average about 8.5 years as I recall. He found that 17 of the 128 lasted about five times longer than the other 111, somewhere between 40 to 50 years. The common thread among the 17 was that anti-government forces all generated contraband revenue, most often through their involvement in one or more aspects of the global drug trade. The estimates of just how much contraband revenue the Taliban generates from their involvement in the Afghan based opium and heroin trade varies widely, but falls somewhere between $100 million to $500 million dollars annually. The reality of the situation is that figure could be even greater. The bottom line: we are not getting out of Afghanistan until we defeat the Taliban or bring them to a negotiated peace; and we will not defeat the Taliban or bring them to the peace table until we get the narcotics trade in check in Afghanistan. So how do we fight 21st century warfare in Afghanistan, the quintessential example of aymetric warfare, and win? It can be witnessed in the NBC Nightly New episode last evening. The raid started out as a bust, but quickly turned into a resounding success when the narcotics agents, both DEA and Afghan, persisted with thier search and found over three tons of morphine base buried behind one of the compounds that was identified by a DEA source of information. Our military are not the experts when it comes to counter-narcotics or counter narco-terrorism operations designed to identify and bring to justice those responsible for the opium and heroin trade in Afghanistan, or anywhere else for that matter. Nor should they be; they've got more than enough on their plate. However, U.S. Special Forces, the experts in fighting unconventional warfare, teamed with DEA Special Agents who our Special Forces have trained, make up a very formidable force that can, when coupled with our Afghan partners, significantly contribute to defeating the Taliban. These joint teams have reportedly been involved in a number of operations over the past few months similar to the one covered by last evening's NBC Nightly News episode. Large caches of drugs and clandestine laboratories have been destroyed as a result of the raids, and large caches of weapons, including suicide vests and IED bomb making materials, have also been located right along side the drugs. I've also read that over 60 Taliban have been killed while defending these locations. What is not being reported is that the DEA Special Agents and their partners are undoubtedly collecting tremendous evidence that will certainly lead to complex criminal drug conspiracy indictments in the United States and in Afghanistan. Those responsible for this activity will ultimtley pay a steep price, if they haven't already paid with their lives. I couldn't help but notice the determination etched on the faces of the DEA Special Agents in the video, something I witnessed many times over the 23 years I spent in the Agency. They were on the hunt, and hunting is what DEA Special Agents live for, whether they're searching for a drug cache ouside Kabul, Afghanistan, or taking down a methamphetamine laboratory outside Cabool, Missouri. This is what DEA brings to our warfighters in Afghanistan, subject matter experts who possess a unique tradecraft honed by many years of success at identifying and dismantleing the world's most notorious drug trafficking cartels from top to bottom. The DEA cannot operate in Afghanistan without the support of our U.S. Military, and our military will not succeed unless they take on the narcotics trade in a meaningful way. It looks to me like we're headed in the right direction.

A2: SQUO Solves

Squo is failing

Sullivan 9 ( Andrew, Van Hoffman Award Nominee, 27-Mar., *The Atlantic*, http://andrewsullivan.theatlantic.com/the\_daily\_dish/2009/03/the-drug-war-and-afghanistan.html ) ET

What to do about the opium flowing out of Afghanistan has always been a knotty element of US policy regarding Afghanistan. How much of a priority should it be? (Simply put, if you attack the the opium trade, warlords and locals get pissed off and join or support the other side.) Asked about the priority of drug fighting in the Afghanistan review, Holbrooke, as he was leaving the briefing, said "We're going to have to rethink the drug problem." That was interesting. He went on: "a complete rethink." He noted that the policymakers who had worked on the Afghanistan review "didn't come to a firm, final conclusion" on the opium question. "It's just so damn complicated," Holbrooke explained. Did that mean that the opium eradication efforts in Afghanistan should be canned? "You can't eliminate the whole eradication program," he exclaimed. But that remark did make it seem that he backed an easing up of some sort. "You have to put more emphasis on the agricultural sector," he added.

\*\*Terrorism/ Taliban Resurgence\*\*

I/L

The war on drugs will make everyone join the Taliban

Albone & Billet 7 (Tim and Claire, “Ruined poppy farmers join ranks with the Taleban”, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article1444124.ece>, date accessed:6/22/2010) AJK

“The people are unhappy with this eradication campaign; if it goes on they will all join the Taleban,” Dilbar, a poppy farmer in Helmand province, told The Times. The prospect of such a surge in Taleban numbers is bad news for the 5,000 British troops based in Helmand and 1,400 more heading there after the announcement by Des Browne, the Defence Secretary. The fiercest fighting since the Taleban were overthrown in 2001 came last year, with more than 4,000 people killed, and intelligence reports predict a new offensive this spring.

I/L

The war on drugs harms the stability of Afghanistan, causes farmers to turn to the Taliban, and creates a corrupt cycle of debt  
Rubin & Zakhilwal 5 (Barnett and Omar, “A War on Drugs, or a War on Farmers?”, <http://www.cic.nyu.edu/peacebuilding/oldpdfs/Farmers.pdf>, date accessed:6/22/2010) AJK

Two days after his inauguration as Afghanistan's first popularly elected president, Hamid Karzai gave an impassioned speech to officials and community leaders from all over the country. The drug trade, he said, posed a greater threat to Afghanistan than the Soviet invasion, civil war, or foreign interference. Yet while the Karzai government is determined to eliminate narcotics, it is resisting U.S. pressure for a massive crop eradication effort. As the chancellor of Kabul University, former finance minister Ashraf Ghani, recently wrote, "Today, many Afghans believe that it is not drugs, but an ill- conceived war on drugs that threatens their economy and nascent democracy." Last November, after a still-unidentified aircraft sprayed herbicide on opium poppy (and everything else, including children) in villages of eastern Afghanistan, President Karzai called in the ambassadors of the U.S. and U.K. to protest. Both countries denied involvement. Since then, under pressure from Mr. Karzai, U.S. allies, and the U.S. military, the administration is considering reallocating the $152 million already programmed for aerial eradication. That would be a change in the right direction, if the administration adds these funds to the $120 million it had allocated to alternative livelihoods for rural communities, a mere 15% of a total program of $778 million. The administration's program not only has lopsided priorities; it is a threat to U.S. objectives and the stability of Afghanistan. It focuses resources on the wrong end of the value chain, the raw material. The program's "five pillars" (eradication, interdiction, law enforcement, alternative livelihoods, and public information) contain no provision for macro-economic support as part of a plan to wipe out the largest sector of one of the poorest economies. Eradication, the largest part of the program (38%) attacks farmers who voted for President Karzai and sometimes provide intelligence to U.S. forces. Eradication would take place while the country tries to carry out parliamentary and provincial elections. It is hard to find Afghans who support this strategy, but we have found one group that does: drug traffickers. Strangely enough for a Republican administration, the administration's anti-drug policy tries to use force against the profit motive, rather than use the profit motive to support policy. The result is the enrichment of traffickers, warlords and terrorists at the expense of poor farmers. The Afghan opium economy involves three groups: poor farmers, who use cash from opium futures contracts to feed their families over the winter; landowners and traders, who rent land and provide loans against the future harvest; and protectors, including officials, warlords and terror groups, who oversee the trade and export. In the latter two groups are major smugglers and officials. The latter group, not farmers, threatens Afghanistan. Final demand for this addictive product varies little with price. But the demand by middlemen is highly elastic, as opiates, raw or refined, have a shelf-life of years. From his discussions with farmers in Eastern Afghanistan, one of the authors (Zakhilwal) found that poor farmers have sold off their stocks to buy necessities, while those with adequate wealth have hoarded half of the 2004 harvest and about 30% from 2003. Mid-level traders have stored 80% of the 2004 opium for resale at higher prices. Traders welcomed U.S. calls for crop eradication. After three massive harvests, prices had fallen from $600 to $90 per kilo, but after announcement of eradication they jumped to $400. Prices settled back to $300 for current sales, but futures prices went to $400 for delivery in two months and $500 for three months. Traders are confident that by April 2005 the price will reach $1,000 per kilo. Then they will sell. The higher price will signal that it is profitable to grow opium in remote areas with lower yields, leading to the migration, not elimination, of the crop, as in the Andes. Sustained efforts against those high on the value chain, however, would be far more effective. Destruction of laboratories and stocks, and disruption of wholesale markets would lead to panic sell-offs, lowering prices and exposing product to interdiction. It would also lower the price paid to farmers, sending the right market signal for next year's planting. But while interdiction, not eradication, is therefore the right focus for law enforcement, it too will backfire without actual -- not just promised -- economic development. Rural communities need alternatives to the credit, employment and cash incomes that opium provides. U.S. and Afghan officials have launched development efforts in opium-growing provinces, but many are on the margin of survival. They cannot shift their economic activities based on tiny handouts or vague promises. Some of the poor in rural communities have migrated to Pakistan, saying they cannot survive in Afghanistan without opium. An attack on the farmers' livelihoods will lead some to flee and others to fight. It will then be too late for either the government or international aid providers to enter their villages to promote alternative livelihoods. The narcotics industry now equals 60% of legal economic activity. It produces the country's main export. Without macroeconomic support to sustain effective demand and the balance of payments, the currency will crash, prices will soar, and the urban population will suffer along with the rural communities. Such conditions would be as unpropitious for stabilizing the country as the entrenchment of the narco-economy. Counter-narcotics must start by helping those whose political support the government and the U.S. need. This requires far more aid to rural communities and a program of support to effective demand and the balance of payments. Law enforcement should attack the real enemies of our effort at the top of the drug trade. This will send the right market and political signals. Using force against the interest of our allies and the laws of the market risks undoing the good we have done.

**Terrorism Impacts- Nukes Spillover**

Further Talibanization of Afghanistan spillover in Pakistan, wars across Central Asia, and escalatory nuclear strikes against India and Israel

Morgan 6 (Stephen J, British Labour Party Exectutive Committee, *Electric Articles*) ET

Musharraf probably hopes that by giving de facto autonomy to the Taliban and Pashtun leaders now with a virtual free hand for cross border operations into Afghanistan, he will undercut any future upsurge in support for a break-away independent Pashtunistan state or a “Peoples’ War” of the Pashtun populace as a whole, as he himself described it. However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could no be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US. What is at stake in “the half-forgotten war” in Afghanistan is far greater than that in Iraq. But America’s capacities for controlling the situation are extremely restricted. Might it be, in the end, they are also forced to accept President Musharraf's unspoken slogan of «Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!

\*\*NEG STUFF\*\*

\*\*Case\*\*

Neg- Inherency

Not Inherent – Obama is already scrapping the program

Youngers 10 (Coletta, AlterNet, May 11 2010, http://www.alternet.org/drugs/146823/is\_obama\_serious\_about\_ending\_the\_war\_on\_drugs?page=1)IM

In March 2009, U.S. Special Envoy Richard Holbrooke described the opium poppy eradication effort in Afghanistan as "the most wasteful and ineffective program that I have seen in 40 years." He bluntly stated that the U.S. government had wasted millions of dollars on a counterproductive program that generates political support for the Taliban and undermines nation-building efforts. And in his trip to Peru this past April, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs Arturo Valenzuela noted that the fundamental problem is not coca cultivation itself, but poverty and inequality. That isn't to say that there are no new developments. Important domestic reforms have begun. Following Holbrooke's statements, the United States suspended funding for opium poppy eradication in Afghanistan. In its proposed fiscal year 2011 budget for assistance to Latin America, the Obama administration has shifted some resources from military to economic programs. Yet for now, given its other foreign policy priorities, the White House has little enthusiasm for taking on the entrenched "drug war" bureaucracy or in expending political capital in pushing for reform of international drug policy. This change in approach, however, may already be on shaky ground. According to Vanda Felbab-Brown, a fellow at the Brookings Institution, "Voices for eradication are strong in the United States. The Obama administration has failed to prepare Congress and the international community for how long it takes for rural development to take place and consequently for the likely outcome that — despite a good policy — we may not see deep reductions in poppy cultivation in Afghanistan for several years."

Obama can’t continue the policy much longer – losing key support

Washington Post 10 (June 10 2010, http://www.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2010/06/public\_remains\_unfriendly\_on\_a.html)IM

Today's news that the U.S. military operation in Kandahar will take longer than expected lands amid the American public's least friendly outlook on the war in Afghanistan since 2007, according to the latest Washington Post-ABC News poll. Overall, 53 percent say the war is not worth its costs, a new high in Post-ABC polling. That includes 41 percent who feel that way strongly, matching the previous high in August 2009. The public divides nearly evenly on how things are going there, with 42 percent saying the U.S. is winning and 39 percent losing; 12 percent say neither side has an edge. Views on the war are similar to those in an April Post-ABC poll, but support lags far behind its level in December following President Obama's announcement of a new strategy for the conflict. Republicans, who are the strongest backers of the war, continue to shift against it, with the overall share supportive of the war dipping from 69 percent in April to 62 percent now and the percentage strongly supportive dropping below 40 percent for the first time. Among Democrats, two-thirds consider the war not worth its costs, as do 53 percent of independents. It is unlikely that Obama will be able to continue his strategy much longer without losing critical support. Following his suspension last year, the permanent removal can’t be far behind. Republicans are most optimistic about the current state of affairs in Afghanistan, with six in 10 saying the U.S. is winning the war there. Independents are about evenly split (40 percent say winning, 41 percent losing) and nearly half of Democrats (48 percent) say the U.S. is losing compared with a third (33 percent) who think America is winning.

Not inherent – Obama has already abandoned the eradication policy

Drug War Chronicle 10 (May 11 2010, http://stopthedrugwar.org/chronicle/5920/afghanistan\_US\_stops\_opium\_poppy\_eradication)IM

Thousands of US Marines poured into Afghanistan's southern Helmand province this week to take the battle against the Taliban to the foe's stronghold. But in a startling departure from decades of US anti-drug policy, eradicating Helmand's massive opium poppy crop will not be part of their larger mission. US envoy to Pakistan and Afghanistan Richard Holbrooke told members of the G-8 group of industrialized nations Saturday that attempting to quash the opium and heroin trade through eradication was counterproductive and bad policy. Instead, the US would concentrate on alternative development, security, and targeting drug labs and traffickers. Afghan anti-drug artwork, Nejat Center, Kabul "Eradication is a waste of money," Holbrooke told the Associated Press during a break in the G-8 foreign ministers meeting on Afghanistan. "The Western policies against the opium crop, the poppy crop, have been a failure. It might destroy some acreage, but it didn't reduce the amount of money the Taliban got by one dollar. It just helped the Taliban, so we're going to phase out eradication," he said. "The farmers are not our enemy; they're just growing a crop to make a living. It's the drug system," Holbrooke continued. "So the US policy was driving people into the hands of the Taliban." The Taliban insurgents are estimated to earn tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars a year from the opium and heroin trade, which generates multiple streams of income for them. Taliban commanders tax poppy farmers in areas under their control, provide security for drug convoys, and sell opium and heroin through smuggling networks that reach around the globe. As late as last year, US policymakers supported intensifying eradication efforts, with some even arguing for the aerial spraying of herbicides, as has been done with limited success, but severe political and environmental consequences in Colombia.

No Solvency

The only way to solve is to provide subsidies, train farmers, use mycoherbicides and ensure the continued presence of military forces

**ACD 9** (Dr. Rachel Ehrenfeld, director – American Center for Democracy, Oct. 1 2009, http://frontpagemag.com/2009/10/01/winning-the-war-in-afghanistan-by-rachel-ehrenfeld/)IM

An effective solution for the escalating violence, devastating corruption, crime and growing radicalization in Afghanistan has been available for a while, but previous administrations failed to implement it. The Obama Administration should initiate a new policy that includes drug eradication while providing the farmers with subsidies and skills for viable economic alternatives. The Administration should fund the final studies necessary to implement the innovative and safe poppy eradication method that previous U.S. governments spent significant resources developing. This entails the use of mycoherbicides, naturally occurring fungi that control noxious weeds. Unlike chemical controls now in use to eradicate illicit plants such as coca shrub in Colombia, mycoherbicides assail only the targeted plant, rendering its cultivation uneconomical. These fungi continue to live in the soil, preventing the future growth of the opium poppy plant, but are harmless to other crops, people and the environment. On Dec. 29, 2006, then President George W. Bush signed Public Law 109/469, of which Section 1111 requires the Office of National Drug Control Policy to conduct an efficacy study of mycoherbicides’ use on the opium poppy and coca shrub. Yet, the one-year study was never conducted. President Obama should immediately authorize the completion of the study. The use of mycoherbicides in Afghanistan, combined with adequate enforcement by the military, will diminish the production of heroin. It will also cut off the Taliban’s and the warlords’ hefty money supply, which in addition to funds from the Saudis and the Gulf States, fuels political corruption and the war. This strategy would free up the $150 to $200 billion now used to fight the drug trade and its byproducts–crime, addiction, diseases, accidents, etc.–in the U.S., and make these funds available to help fight terrorism directly. Unfortunately, while the Obama administration is considering a new policy to stabilize Afghanistan, it has already shifted focus from the War on Drugs to the War on Drug Traffickers. Instead of eradicating the opium crops in Afghanistan, the Administration is now targeting Taliban-linked traffickers and drug labs. But focusing on the criminal elements alone will do little to stop opium cultivation, or boost the economy, if only because there are very few alternatives for most Afghan farmers. Afghan opium production accounts for 97% of the country’s per-capita annual GDP, or $303 of $310. Implementing this new strategy, while subsidizing the Afghan economy until other crops and industries can replace the illegal heroin trade, seems a better way for America to succeed in fighting the Taliban and the endemic corruption. It would also free up resources for an array of social and governmental reforms, which should be clearly defined and strictly supervised. With no heroin to fund terrorism and subvert the economies and political systems of Afghanistan and Pakistan, the American agenda could take a huge leap forward.

No solvency – Britain and NATO will continue the eradication process

Drug War Chronicle 10 (May 11 2010, http://stopthedrugwar.org/chronicle/5920/afghanistan\_US\_stops\_opium\_poppy\_eradication)IM

That notion was opposed by the Afghan government of President Hamid Karzai, as well as by the US's NATO partners, particularly Britain, which supports expanded manual eradication of the poppy fields. On Sunday, Afghan counternarcotics minister General Khodaidad disputed Holbrooke's claims that eradication was a failure, telling the Canadian Press that Afghanistan had achieved "lots of success" with its anti-drug strategy, which relies heavily on manual eradication of poppy fields. Still, he said he was open to the new American strategy. "Whatever program or strategy would be to the benefit of Afghanistan, we welcome it," Khodaidad said. "We are happy with our policy... so I'm not seeing any pause or what do you call it, deficiency, in our strategy. Our strategy's perfect. Our strategy's good." Britain and US are at odds over opium field eradication plans. According to the London newspaper The Independent, British officials said Sunday they would continue to fund manual eradication in areas under their control. Those officials downplayed any dispute, however, saying details remained to be worked out.

Squo Solves

Obama will pull troops in the SQUO – too much political pressure

The Nation 9 (John Nichols, Nov. 16 2009, http://www.thenation.com/democrats-obama-get-out-afghanistan)IM

The California Democratic Party speaks with a loud voice in national politics. It is, by any reasonable measure, the biggest party in the biggest state in the nation. And it is a well-organized, forward-looking organization that since the 1950s has had a tradition of delivering vital messages from the base to national Democratic leaders. Indeed, in the 1960s, California Democrats were among the first and loudest critics of President Lyndon Johnson's decision to expand the war in Vietnam, and they played an influential role in its end. They were not merely opposed to the war; they were worried, wisely, that committing resources, governing energy and political capital to an unwise and unnecessary war would undermine the ability of an otherwise popular Democratic president to deliver on his ambitious domestic agenda. With their history and their heft in mind, it is reasonable to say that when California Democrats take a strong stand on a contentious issues, it matters -- both as a signal with regard to popular sentiment within the party and as an indicator of the issues that could cause political headaches for a Democratic president. So what does the California Democratic Party have to say about the global conflict that many believe could be for Barack Obama's presidency what Vietnam was for Lyndon Johnson's? "End the U.S. Occupation and Air War in Afghanistan." That was the title of a resolution endorsed over the weekend by the 300-member executive board of the California party. The resolution calls for establishing "a timetable for withdrawal of our military personnel" and seeks "an end to the use of mercenary contractors as well as an end to air strikes that cause heavy civilian casualties." This could signal the end of Obama’s war in Afghanistan.

Obama can’t continue his policies in Afghanistan – pullout is inevitable in the SQUO, due to political pressures

**Cole 9** (Juan, poli sci @ U of Michigan, Nov. 25 2009, http://www.juancole.com/2009/11/obama-vows-to-finish-job-heroin-trade.html)IM

In the midst of the state visit to Washington of Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, President Barack Obama at a brief news conference announced that he was going to “finish the job” in Afghanistan. He cautioned, however, that down the road, Afghanistan would have to provide for its own security. As for the strong divide in the US public over the Afghanistan War, Obama said, “I feel confident that when the American people hear a clear rationale for what we’re doing there and how we intend to achieve our goals, that they will be supportive.” Rumors in Washington, broken by McClatchy on Monday, say that Obama with send 34,000 additional troops and will announce the move next Tuesday. Prime Minister Singh had the day before pressured Obama to stay the course in Afghanistan, warning that a Taliban victory had the potential for destabilizing Pakistan and India. Whether Obama can ‘finish the job’ in Afghanistan depends on what he defines the job as. If it is to build a 21st century Afghan state and crush the Taliban and other Muslim political movements in the Pashtun areas, then I am extremely skeptical. If it is to prop up a shaky but just all right Afghan government and military before pulling out, then his odds of success, while still bad, do rise. As for Obama’s hope that the US public will rally around the flag, I wouldn’t count on it over the medium to long term. His Democratic base is tired of war and of our quasi-martial-law state of siege. If he wants their support, he has to fight an extremely abbreviated war. So I think it is entirely possible that Obama will be 0 for 2 if he escalates in Afghanistan. And it is extremely dangerous for him to go on alienating his base, which wants peace and prosperity, with policies that make rightwing Republicans happy– coddling bankers in a jobless recovery and an escalation of an eight-year-old, increasingly unpopular war. The rightwing Republicans will vote for these measures in Congress, but put the blame on Obama for them, and benefit from Democratic disillusionment in 2012.

Squo Solves

Pullout inevitable- squo solves

BBC 10( BBC New, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/8639029.stm> , 4/)

Nato foreign ministers, and their partners in the international coalition in Afghanistan, have been meeting in the

Estonian capital Tallinn. They endorsed a plan to gradually transfer security and governance powers to Afghan authorities. The US and Nato have 126,000 troops there, rising to 150,000 by August. US President Barack Obama has said that the US aims to begin pulling troops out of Afghanistan in 2011. But at the heart of Nato's strategy is creating the right conditions to allow the Afghan government to take full control. July summit "As of today, we have a road map which will lead towards transition to Afghan lead [control], starting this year," Mr Rasmussen said. Nato says it now has a road map leading to transition "We agreed the approach we will take to transition. We set out a process, the conditions that will have to be met, and what we will do to make those conditions happen." Mr Rasmussen said that the transition must not only be "sustainable but irreversible". The BBC's Nick Childs - who is at the meeting in Estonia - says that Nato does not like talking about withdrawal or exit strategies for Afghanistan, especially when there are still key concerns about the relationship with the Afghan government and the performance of Afghan forces. Western allies have long seen a self-sufficient Afghan armed forces, with some support from Nato, as the key to ensuring Afghanistan's long-term stability. Mr Rasmussen said earlier this week that 450 military and police trainers were still needed to help build up the Afghan security forces. He said he hoped that the Afghan government and other donor countries would endorse the plan at a conference to be held in the Afghan capital, Kabul, in mid-July. The framework for security and development would also need to be approved by Afghan President Hamid Karzai. Nato holds its next summit in November and officials say they hope the process could be launched by then. The coalition is currently engaged in an operation to drive the Taliban out of strongholds in the south of the country. In the latest fighting, two US soldiers and five Taliban insurgents were killed in a gun battle in Logar province near Kabul, Nato officials say. They say that a Taliban commander was also killed in the fighting, which took place on Thursday night. A Nato statement said that the fighting began during a joint military search operation in the Puli Alam district, following intelligence reports that "insurgent activity" was taking place there. "As the combined force approached the compound they began receiving hostile fire from different points, including heavy machine gun fire," the statement said. It said that a search of the compound later unearthed automatic rifles and material for making roadside bombs. The latest deaths bring the total of foreign troops killed in Afghanistan this year to 168, according to the icasualties.org website.

\*\*CPs\*\*

**Alternative Crops CP- Solvency**

Saffron is more profitable than opium- it would solve

Peter 2010 (Tom, June 10, “Why some Afghanistan opium farmers turn from poppies to saffron”, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100610/wl_csm/306779_1>, date accessed: 6/22/2010)AK

Eight years after getting out of the poppy business, Hajji Ibrahim says he doesn’t miss it. The farmer here in[western Afghanistan](http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100610/wl_csm/306779_1) used to employ 10 guards to protect his land from roving addicts and warlords. Harvesting the poppies was so strenuous that, though women often help with such work, he says those in his family could not help. Still, it was difficult to find a crop that produced returns like poppies. After the [fall of the Taliban](http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100610/wl_csm/306779_1) forced him to find other options, however, he planted a small, 300- square-meter (3/4 of acre) patch of saffron. It was easy to cultivate, so women could tend to it, and it was 20 percent more profitable than poppies. “As I balanced all the pros and cons of growing saffron or poppies, there were many benefits for saffron – mostly, it is not against [Islamic law](http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100610/wl_csm/306779_1),” says Mr. Ibrahim, who now devotes a sizable 30,000 square meters (7.4 acres) of his land to saffron. With at least 80 percent of Afghanistan’s workforce involved in agriculture, policymakers have long focused on rehabilitating the farming sector to provide profitable options other than poppies, which fuel the country’s[opium trade](http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100610/wl_csm/306779_1). The United States has touted wheat as an alternative crop, but with a market price three times lower than opium, few farmers care to make the switch. Saffron sells high on the international market and can be grown on otherwise unused fields. But it is nowhere near the perfect substitute for opium – farmers have struggled to effectively process and market saffron well enough to be competitive in the international market. As a result, Ibrahim says that before more of his neighbors devote their fields to saffron, they will have to see that it is a reliable source of income. That will not happen without better processing facilities. $2,000 per kilogramIn Herat, where a dry climate makes it one of the best saffron-growing regions in Afghanistan, currently 300 hectares of farmland are devoted to the purple flower â€“ a number that should grow by about 100 hectares per year, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. Though thatâ€™s less than one percent of the regionâ€™s active agricultural land, US officials say saffron is one of the three most important crops in the province, the others being wheat and grapes. The plant is the most expensive spice in the world by weight and can sell for $2,000 to $3,000 per kilogram, whereas most of the food grown in the region is consumed by farmers or sold at local markets for a modest profit. Saffron has the potential to generate $100 million of income a year for Herat alone if the region can devote 5,000 to 7,000 hectares of farmland to the flower, says M. Hashim Astami, an independent saffron and natural resource expert in Herat. Saffron also grows on land that is traditionally too dry for other crops, so it would not replace anything currently being cultivated in the region or reduce food production. On top of that, the [growing season](http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100610/wl_csm/306779_1) is in October and November when other plants do not need water, so canals are full and there is ample water to irrigate the saffron fields.

Saffron is a profitable substitute for opium

Ghafour 4 (Hamida, April 4, “Afghan farmers turn to saffron as replacement for their opium crops”, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/1458504/Afghan-farmers-turn-to-saffron-as-replacement-for-their-opium-crops.html>, date accessed: 6/22/2010)AK

The Romans used it to scent their baths and Francis Bacon wrote that "it makes the English sprightly". Now, saffron - the most expensive spice in the world - could become an antidote to Afghanistan's opium production, and Britain's drug problem. About 400 farmers in the western province of Herat have begun to grow the spice - which retails for about £4 a gram in the UK - as a substitute crop for poppies, the opium sap of which produces heroin. When the saffron is harvested in the autumn, the farmers can expect to reap about $200 (£108) a kilogram (2.2lb). While less than the $300 they would make from a kilogram of illegally grown poppies, it is 100 times more than they would make from wheat, corn or oranges. Abdul Samed, a former poppy farmer, is looking forward to harvesting his saffron, grown on an acre of land. "Saffron is slowly improving our lives and it is not difficult work," he said. "Our country is getting better every day. I know farmers here who are growing poppy, but I am trying to encourage them to grow saffron. If I make a profit I will share it with other neighbours so that they see how good it can be."

Legalizing Opium CP- Solvency

Legalizing opium solves

Aslan 8 (Resa- author of the international bestseller No god but God, Dec 19, http://www.thedailybeast.com/blogs-and-stories/2008-12-19/how-opium-can-save-afghanistan/, *The Daily Beas* ) ET

Afghanistan may be one the poorest countries in the world, but by legalizing and licensing opium production it could conceivably become the Saudi Arabia of morphine. It is a measure of just how great a failure the counter-narcotics strategy in Afghanistan has been that, after six consecutive years of record growth in poppy production, including a staggering 20 percent increase last year alone, American and U.N. officials are actually patting themselves on the back over a 6 percent decline in 2008. “We are finally seeing the results of years of effort,” said Antonio Maria Costa, who heads the United Nations’ Office on Drugs and Crime.

Just eliminating the drug war won’t stop the Taliban – legalization will

Farrell 9 (Paul, WSJ, Marketwatch, Oct. 13 2009, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/end-the-war-on-drugs-start-the-legalization-2009-10-13?pagenumber=1)IM

Yes, I said "when." Eventually it could happen. Think of states like California. They're facing a $42 billion deficit. They see their $14 billion marijuana crop as a new source of tax revenue. Legalize it. Tax it. Psychologist Anne Wilson Schaef saw the trend coming a couple decades ago: We're a "Nation of addicts ... our society is deteriorating at an alarming rate." Why? We refuse to face the real problem: Demand. Legalizing it will. Till then we're losing the war. In a "nation of addicts" it doesn't matter if drugs are legal or not ... where the drugs come from ... who gets hurt ... nor if we have to waste hundreds of billions fighting ineffective wars to protect suppliers ... a corrupt Afghan government, the source of 95% of the world's heroin ... or Mexico, the main traffic route for wholesalers feeding America's addicts ... or Big Pharma the biggest pusher for prescription drug addicts. When a "nation of addicts" needs a fix, they always find it. If Big Pharma can capture part of the market share that's now going to competing Mexican and Afghan drug warlords, then they can feed their shareholders addiction to earnings, feed their CEOs' addiction for megamillion paychecks, while capitalizing on the American addicts need for a fix. We just need to end our moralistic charade, decriminalize and control all illicit drugs. Plus it'll generate new tax revenues. You can bet this opportunity is being actively explored deep inside Big Pharma, purely for economic reasons, and secretly, of course, like the tobacco industry's studies of carcinogens in cigarettes. So if I were back at Morgan Stanley preparing a securities report on the implications of expanding Big Pharma's market share when more drugs are legitimized, there are three studies that must be highlighted: Like Afghanistan: Narcotics is a cash crop. Unfortunately, Washington and the Pentagon fail to see that we're feeding our disease, matching our addiction to illegal drugs here in America (demand) with the entrepreneurial spirit of Afghan government bureaucrats, farmers, Mexican traffickers and the Taliban (suppliers), while misusing our military. The Washington Post says "the drug war has become the Taliban's most effective recruiter," a source of financing making them "richer and stronger by the day."

Opium Brides – Alt Cause – Sold for Addiction/Opium Bad

Farmers sell their daughters not to survive, but to feed their addiction

Callimachi 9 (Rukmini, AP writer, http://www.thestar.com/news/world/article/677255) PJ

In dozens of mountain hamlets in this remote corner of Afghanistan, opium addiction has become so entrenched that whole families – from toddlers to old men – are addicts. Cut off from the rest of the world by glacial streams, the addiction moves from house to house, infecting entire communities. From just one family years ago, at least half the people of Sarab, population 1,850, are now addicts. Afghanistan supplies nearly all the world's opium, the raw ingredient used to make heroin, and while most of the deadly crop is exported, enough is left behind to create a vicious cycle of addiction. There are at least 200,000 opium and heroin addicts in Afghanistan – 50,000 more than in the much bigger, wealthier U.S., according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and a 2005 survey by the U.N. A new survey is expected to show even higher rates of addiction, a window into the human toll of Afghanistan's back-to-back wars and desperate poverty. Unlike in the West, the close-knit nature of communities here makes addiction a family affair. Instead of passing from one rebellious teenager to another, the habit passes from mother to daughter, father to son. It's turning villages like this one into a landscape of human depradation. Except for a few soiled mats, Beg's house is bare. He has pawned all his family's belongings to pay for drugs. "I am ashamed of what I have become," says Beg, an unwashed turban curled on his head. "I've lost my self-respect. I've lost my values. I take the food from this child to pay for my opium,'' he says, pointing to his 5-year-old grandson, Mamadin. "He just stays hungry.''

\*\*2AC Answers\*\*

2AC AT: Alternative Crops

Poppy is the most profitable

Chivers 2010 (C.J., May 22, NYT, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/23/world/asia/23poppy.html>, date accessed:6/24/2010) AK

Many Afghan farmers say they grow poppy because it earns them significantly more income than any other crop, and because opium, which is nonperishable in the short term, can be brought to market anytime after harvest, making it an ideal product in the uncertainties of a conflict zone. Still, several farmers said in interviews that they were willing to plant other crops in the fall, perhaps wheat, and avoid the new risks and perennial turbulence of the opium trade. To do so, they said, they would need seeds, fertilizer, agricultural equipment or money. “If the government of Afghanistan will help us next year, we will not grow poppy,” said Obidullah, 50, who said he cultivated about six acres of opium-producing poppy this year. Like many Afghans, he uses only one name.

Only poppies will grow

Gall 6 (Carlotta, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/17/international/asia/17poppy.html?_r=1>, date accessed: 6/24/2010) AK

The farmers in this village say they have little choice. They live on land reclaimed from the desert. Nothing grows in the salty earth except the hardy poppy plant. They have to pump water for irrigation from a well nearly 100 yards deep, they say, and only high-priced opium makes the effort cost-effective. They would lose money if they tried to grow wheat or melons, they said. "If they destroy the poppy we will have to leave the country," said another farmer, Pahlawan, 24, who uses only one name. "What else can we do in the desert?"

Alternatives to opium fail

Dixon 3 (Robyn, LA Times, <http://www.opioids.com/afghanistan/opium-economy.html>, date accessed: 6/24/2010) AK

We know growing opium is against Islam, but we have to do it," said Ashrafy, 38. "I was the only person left here not growing it, and there was no mullah telling me to stop." The United Nations estimates that half of Ghor's farmers don't earn enough to cover basic needs. So exhortations to plant alternatives seem doomed when a grower can make about $5,200 from an acre of opium but $121 from an acre of wheat. Ashrafy and his brother support 35 relatives, including the widows and children of two other brothers killed in the country's long wars. Last year, Ashrafy grew wheat, but it provided only half of what the family needed. "If I don't grow [opium]," he said, "I'm sure we'll die because we cannot grow enough wheat for ourselves."

Only poppies will grow- 3 reasons

Glaze 7 (John, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub804.pdf>, date accessed: 6/23/2010) AK

The high rate of return on investment from opium poppy cultivation has driven an agricultural shift in Afghanistan from growing traditional crops to growing opium poppy. Despite the fact that only 12 percent of its land is arable, agriculture is a way of life for 70 percent of Afghans and is the country’s primary source of income. 10 During good years, Afghanistan produced enough food to feed its people as well as supply a surplus 3 for export. Its traditional agricultural products include wheat, corn, barley, rice, cotton, fruit, nuts, and grapes. However, its agricultural economy has suffered considerably from years of violent conflict, drought, and deteriorating infrastructure. In recent years, many poor farmers have turned to opium poppy cultivation to make a living because of the relatively high rate of return on investment compared to traditional crops. Consequently, Afghanistan’s largest and fastest cash crop is opium. Opium. Opium poppy is a hardy, drought-resistant plant easily grown in most parts of Afghanistan, with a growing cycle that conveniently spreads the farmer’s workload throughout the year. Opium poppy is usually planted between September and December and flowers after approximately 3 months. The flower’s petals then fall away, leaving the plant’s seed capsule containing an opaque, milky sap known as opium (see Figure 1). Harvested between April and July, the plump seed capsules are then lanced, allowing the opium sap to ooze
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The Taliban forces farmers to grow opium

Manson 9 (Katrina, <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSSP435802._CH_.2400> , date accessed: 6/23/2010) AK

The Taliban force us to grow poppy, so if there are any Taliban in the area then nobody dares to grow wheat," said a farmer, who did not want to be named. "I know poppy is really bad but we don't have enough power to grow wheat crops on our own. If we get any help from the government then we will grow wheat."

Ending the drug war ensures the collapse of classes

Drug Policy Alliance 1( http://www.drugpolicy.org/about/position/race\_paper\_econ.cfm)

The U.S. "war on drugs" is big business -- a multi-billion dollar public/private venture that radically inflates the value of illegal drugs and is used to criminalize the poorest people of color, trapping them in a vicious cycle of addiction, unemployment and incarceration: $27 billion for interdiction and law enforcement, $1.3 billion for Plan Colombia in 2000. $9.4 billion in 2000 to imprison close to 500,000 people convicted of non-violent drug offenses, 75% of whom are Black. $80 to $100 billion in lost earnings. Untold billions in homeless shelters, healthcare, chemical dependency and psychiatric treatment, etc. It is rarely acknowledged that Black women are the fastest growing segment of the prison population and that Native American prisoners are the largest group per capita.(1) Approximately five million people -- including those on probation and parole -- are directly under the surveillance of the criminal justice system. To deliver up bodies destined for profitable punishment, the political economy of prisons relies on racist practices in arrest, conviction, and sentencing patterns. Black and brown bodies are the human raw material in a vast experiment to conceal the major social problems of our time. The racialized demographics of the victims of the "war on drugs" will not surprise anyone familiar with the symbiotic relationship between poverty and institutionalized white supremacy. Economic inequality and political disenfranchisement have been inextricably intertwined since the Trans-Atlantic slave trade. The racist enforcement of the drug laws is just the latest strategy to sustain the status quo. As political economist John Flateau graphically puts it: "Metaphorically, the criminal justice pipeline is like a slave ship, transporting human cargo along interstate triangular trade routes from Black and Brown communities; through the middle passage of police precincts, holding pens, detention centers and courtrooms; to downstate jails or upstate prisons; back to communities as unrehabilitated escapees; and back to prison or jail in a vicious recidivist cycle."(2) From Plantation to Prisons: Where Does the Money Go According to the United Nations International Drug Control Program, the international illicit drug business generates as much as $400 billion in trade annually. Profits of this magnitude invariably lead to corruption and complicity at the highest levels. Yet the so-called war on this illegal trade targets economically disadvantaged ethnic minorities and indigenous people in the U.S., Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Myanmar, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam. Putting aside the question of legality, there is no evidence of a "trickle-down effect." These substantial profits are not enriching the low level players who constitute the vast majority of drug offenders. To the contrary, the black market drug economy undermines non-drug-related businesses and limits the employability of its participants. Discussing the "legal apartheid" that keeps the developing world poor, Peruvian economist, Fernando De Soto observes that "[t]he poor live outside the law . . . because living within the law is impossible: corrupt legal systems and warped rules force those at the bottom of the world economy to spend years leaping absurd hurdles to do things by the book."(3) "In a criminalized economy, the risk of imprisonment is almost 'a form of business license tax.'" (4) Who is profiting? In the United States, prison architects and contractors, corrections personnel, policy makers and academics, and the thousands of corporate vendors who peddle their wares at the annual trade-show of the American Corrections Association - hawking everything from toothbrushes and socks to barbed-wire fences and shackles. And multi-national corporations that win tax subsidies, incentives and abatements from local governments -- robbing the public coffers and depriving communities of the kind of quality education, roads, health care and infrastructure that provide genuine incentives for legitimate business. The sale of tax-exempt bonds to underwrite prison construction is now estimated at $2.3 billion annually.(5) Last year, the Wackenhut Corrections Corporation - which manages or owns 37 prisons in the U.S., 18 in the U.K and Australia and has one under contract in South Africa -- tried to convert a former slave plantation in North Carolina into a maximum security prison to warehouse mostly Black prisoners from the nation's capital. Promising investors to keep the prison cells filled these corporations dispatch "bed-brokers" in search of prisoners - evoking images of 19th century bounty-hunters capturing runaway slaves and forcibly returning them to the cotton fields. Corporations that appear to be far removed from the business of punishment are intimately involved in the expansion of the prison industrial complex. Prison construction bonds are one of the many sources of profitable investment for leading financiers such as Merrill Lynch. MCI charges prisoners and their families outrageous prices for the precious telephone calls which are often the only contact inmates have with the free world. Many corporations whose products we consume on a daily basis have learned that prison labor power can be as profitable as third world labor power exploited by U.S.-based global corporations. Both relegate formerly unionized workers to joblessness, many of which wind up in prison. Some of the companies that use prison labor are IBM, Motorola, Compaq, Texas < CONTINUED NO TXT RMVED>
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Drug Policy Alliance 1

<CONTINUED NO TEXT REMOVED>Instruments, Honeywell, Microsoft, and Boeing. But it is not only the hi-tech industries that reap the profits of prison labor. Nordstrom department stores sell jeans that are marketed as "Prison Blues," as well as t-shirts and jackets made in Oregon prisons.(7) Racism & Poverty: The Free Market and Prison Economies Today there are over 2 million people incarcerated in the United States. Studies demonstrated that two-thirds of state prisoners had less than a high school education and 1/3 were unemployed at the time of arrest. Over the past decade states have financed prison construction at the expense of investment in higher education. At the same time, access to education in prison has been severely curtailed. Officially, 8.3% of working-age Blacks in the U.S. are unemployed(9) but taking into account the "incarceration effect," the rate is significantly higher.(10) Research confirms the obvious - the positive relationship between joblessness or low wages and recidivism. The stigma of prison has been codified in laws and licensing regulations that bar people with criminal records from countless jobs and opportunities, effectively excluding them from the legitimate workforce and forcing them into illegal ventures. As economists Western and Petit point out, "[T]he penal system can be viewed as a type of labor market institution that systematically influence's men's employment . . .[and has a] pervasive influence . . . on the life chances of disadvantaged minorities." (11) Like slavery, the focused machinery of the "war on drugs" fractures families, as it destroys individual lives and destabilizes whole communities. It targets Native Americans living on or near reservations and urban minority neighborhoods, depressing incomes and repelling investment. "The lost potential earnings, savings, consumer demand, and human and social capital . . . cost black communities untold millions of dollars in potential economic development, worsening an inner-city political economy already crippled by decades of capital flight and de-industrialization." (12) The Case for Racial and Economic Justice This reality is not the result of unintended consequence from otherwise well-reasoned policies. It is the logical, inevitable consequence of " tough-on-crime" laws and punitive sentencing polices that elected leaders and public officials embrace to avoid addressing the pressing social problems caused by institutionalized racism and political and economic exclusion. By incarcerating high proportions of low income Black, Latino and Native American residents and maintaining surveillance over them for even longer periods of time, the "war on drugs" and its criminal justice apparatus perpetuate a social segregation policy that intentionally isolates historically disadvantaged racial and ethnic minorities and communities, ensuring a capital divestment policy that builds neither social capital nor economic infrastructure. According to the United States Department of State's 2000 report to the United Nations Commission on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), "discrimination in the criminal justice system" is a "principal causative factor" hindering progress toward ending racial discrimination in [U.S.] society. If the United States takes seriously its mandates of equality and peace with justice, then the "war on drugs" and the prison industrial complex must be dismantled and reparation made for the devastation they have wrought. Decimated communities must be rebuilt and enriched and barriers torn down in order to guarantee Blacks and other ethnic minorities a fair playing field. Only then can the United States begin to acknowledge responsibility for the damning impact of slavery and its perpetuation through the institutionalization of racism and poverty.
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1. Opium is decreasing now- continuing to fight the war on terror just angers off Afghani farmers

Join Together 2010 (http://www.jointogether.org/news/headlines/inthenews/2010/afghan-opium-production-down.html, Afghan Opium Production Down, American Forces Hopeful, May 27, date accessed: 6/21/2010)AK

**A combination of poor growing conditions and government and military interdiction contributed to decreased opium production in Afghanistan this year**, the [New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/23/world/asia/23poppy.html)reported May 22. American officials hope that a bad year, coupled with aid and incentives, could push Afghanistan's farmers to move off the poppy crop, which help fund the Taliban opposition. "If the government of Afghanistan will help us next year," said one farmer, Obidullah, "we will not grow poppy." Weather and willpower might not be enough to kill production, however. Poppy is still the most profitable crop in Afghanistan, and short supply has driven up prices, encouraging many farmers to stick with the risk. And **while the opium trade is technically illegal in Afghanistan, the American military is not authorized to enforce local laws**. Moreover, as one officer noted**, attacking farmers would do little to win over** the hearts and minds of **the populace necessary to rebuild the country.**

2. A) The drug war undermines the overall war and drains our economy

Farrell 7 **(**Paul, Sep 3, Market Watch, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-lost-war-the-war-on-drugs-is-undermining-america?pagenumber=2, date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK .   
America's 'Lost War on Drugs' **Today America's 30-year "War on Drugs" is a** miserable **failure.** But **worse yet, it's now undermining our "War on Terror."** In its latest issue, Foreign Policy magazine released the "Third Terrorist Index," based on the collective opinions of 100 experts. It concluded that **"instead of treating the demand** for illegal drugs **as a market, and addicts as patients, policymakers** the world over [including the Pentagon] **have boosted the profits of drug lords and fostered narcostates** that would frightened Al Capone."Afghanistan is one example. According to the United Nations' Office on Drugs and Crime, **Afghanistan now supplies 95% of the world's poppy crop and opium production. According to** the B**BC** News**, it has "soared to frightening record levels,"** largely **because we took our eye off the Taliban and marginalized Afghanistan to attack Iraq**. Illegal narcotics traffic from Afghan's cash crop exploded 57% in 2006. Our politicians and our military are virtually helpless to stop this expanding contagion that matches America's addiction for illegal drugs (demand) with the entrepreneurial spirit of Afghan farmers, politicians, war lords and the Taliban (supply). America has had **a "War on Drugs"** since the Nixon administration**, based on prohibition and criminalizing drugs. That policy has drained hundreds of billions** from our economy**, driven drug traffic underground, and raised the price on a commodity that otherwise would cost pennies.** Domestically and internationally our "**War on Drugs" policies** are not only a dismal failure**, they produce the exact opposite result.** Worse yet, **our failed drug policies are sabotaging our "War on Terror" in Afghanistan.** As the **Washington Post reported, "The drug war has become the Taliban's most effective recruiter in Afghanistan,"** reinvigorating Muslim extremists**.** Thanks to our obstinate adherence to failed drug policies plus minimal alternatives for Afghan farmers**, we are playing into the Taliban's hand and they're "becoming richer and stronger by the day."**

B) War on Terrorism key to democracy- list of impacts

Diamond, 95,[Larry Diamond, “Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and instruments, issues and imperatives : a report to the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict”, December 1995, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/di.htm]

Terrorism and immigration pressures also commonly have their origins in political exclusion, social injustice, and bad, abusive, or tyrannical governance. Overwhelmingly, the sponsors of international terrorism are among the world's most authoritarian regimes: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Sudan. And locally within countries, the agents of terrorism tend to be either the fanatics of antidemocratic, ideological movements or aggrieved ethnic and regional minorities who have felt themselves socially marginalized and politically excluded and insecure: Sri Lanka's Tamils, Turkey's Kurds, India's Sikhs and Kashmiris. To be sure, democracies must vigorously mobilize their legitimate instruments of law enforcement to counter this growing threat to their security. But a more fundamental and enduring assault on international terrorism requires political change to bring down zealous, paranoiac dictatorships and to allow aggrieved groups in all countries to pursue their interests through open, peaceful, and constitutional means.
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3. It’s impossible to win the war on drugs and the war on terror @ the same time

Longley 10 (Robert, About.com, http://usgovinfo.about.com/cs/waronterror/a/afghanpoppy.htm, date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK

According to the ODCP, the **"challenging security situation" in Afghanistan has complicated the task of fighting a war against drugs and war on terrorism** at the same time. **As the terrorists lose ground, the opium poppy growers win, and much of the money from Afghanistan's opium sales goes right back to the terrorists.**“Poppy cultivation in Afghanistan is a major and growing problem," said John Walters, Director of the ODCP. **"Drug cultivation and trafficking are undermining the rule of law and putting money in the pocket of terrorists.**The drug trade is hindering the ability of the Afghan people to rebuild their country and rejoin the international community. It is in the interest of all nations, including our European partners, to help the Karzai government fight the drug trade."

4. Disad allows for the production of Opium:

A. The Opium Trade causes an endless cycle of Afghanistan instability.

NSN 8 (National Security Network Report. “13 May 2008. http://www.nsnetwork.org/node/858)

In plain view of the United States and the international community, the opium trade is overwhelming Afghanistan’s legitimate government. The facts are stunning: in 2001, after a Taliban ban on poppy cultivation, Afghanistan only produced 11 percent of the world’s opium. Today it produces 93 percent of the global crop; the drug trade accounts for half of its GDP; and nearly one in seven Afghans is involved in the opium trade. In Afghanistan, more land is being used for poppy cultivation than for coca cultivation in all of Latin America. The trade strengthens the government’s enemies and – unless its large place in the Afghan economy is permanently curtailed by crop replacements and anti-poverty efforts – poses a potentially fatal obstacle to keeping the country stable and peaceful. Afghanistan is caught in a vicious cycle. The fall of the Taliban brought the end of their highly coercive crop reduction program. A combination of U.S. inattention and widespread insecurity and poverty allowed poppy cultivation to explode. As the opium economy expanded, it spread corruption and empowered anti-government forces, undermining the Afghan state, leading to more poverty and instability, which in turn only served to further entrench the drug trade. Meanwhile the illicit activity has been a boon to the Taliban insurgency, which has traditionally used poppy cultivation as a lever to improve its own position. Today, the Taliban relies on opium revenues to purchase weapons, train its members, and buy support. Combating the drug trade will require a long-term commitment, not just to counter-narcotics, but to strengthening Afghanistan’s government and improving the lives of its people. The Bush Administration’s efforts, which have focused primarily on eradication, have been ineffective. Only a comprehensive, long-term approach designed to improve the lives of Afghans and empower the Afghan state can be successful. The Opium Problem Facing Afghanistan is Unprecedented in Both Size and Scope Afghanistan now produces 93% of the world’s opium. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) reported in its 2008 winter assessment that an “area of 193,000 ha [hectares] was under opium poppy cultivation in 2007, which represents an increase of 17 percent as compared to 2006.” [UNODC Winter Assessment, 2/08, UNODC Annual Report on Narcotics, 2008] Narcotics generate revenues of more than $4 billion a year – half of Afghanistan’s GDP. Additionally, an alarming number of Afghans, over 3.3 million, participate in the opium trade. [UNODC Annual Report on Narcotics, 2008, UNODC Afghanistan Opium Survey, 2007] Today’s Afghan opium crisis is without modern or historical precedent. The UNODC determined that Afghanistan’s 2007 opium harvest was of “unprecedented size in modern times and unseen since the opium boom in China during the nineteenth century.” UNODC investigations also concluded that “the amount of Afghan land used for growing opium is now larger than the combined total under coca cultivation in Latin America.” [UNODC, Afghan Opium Survey, 2007, UNODC Annual Report on Narcotics, 2008] Opium Creates a Vicious Cycle that Undercuts Coalition Efforts, Weakens the Afghan State and Empowers the Taliban The drug trade is funding the Taliban insurgency. According to UNODC Director Antonio Maria Costa, profits from the poppy harvest help anti-government forces. His Winter Assessment found that “taxes on the crop have become a major source of revenue for the Taliban insurgency,” and Costa himself declared that “this is a windfall for anti-government forces, further evidence of the dangerous link between opium and insurgency.” ISAF Commander, General Dan McNeill lamented that “poppy cultivation undermines everything we are trying to do here,” and estimated that 20% to 40% of opium profits funded insurgents. [UNODC Winter Assessment, 2/08, Der Spiegel, 9/24/07] Lawlessness and insecurity allow both the drug trade and the insurgency to flourish, spawning greater instability and further undermining coalition efforts to strengthen the Afghan state. A recent World Bank report argued that “the opium economy and the insurgency both thrive in an environment where there is insecurity, lack of rule of law, and a weak and corruptible state. Thus even though their interests are by no means always intertwined, there are synergies between the Taliban and drug interests (including notably in Helmand Province) that damage Afghanistan’s state-building agenda.” [World Bank, 03/08] Drug trafficking and corruption are mutually reinforcing, plaguing high levels of the Afghan Government. “Drug traffickers in Afghanistan have close relationships with Afghan government officials or serve in government themselves. According to the U.S. State Department’s 2007 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report on Afghanistan, ‘drug-related corruption remains a problem, being particularly pervasive at provincial and district government levels.’” [Center for American Progress, 11/07, US State Department, 3/01/07] Opium cultivation inhibits the development of the Afghan economy. The World Bank found that dependence on opium prevents Afghanistan’s economy from developing.
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B. Afghan instability collapses Pakistan sparking a global nuclear war

Morgan 6 (Stephen, former member of the British Labour Party Exectutive Committee, Political psychologist, researcher into Chaos/Complexity Theory, http://www.electricarticles.com/display.aspx?id=639)

Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer all of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well.  Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état.  Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations.  The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast.  Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

5. Minerals fill in for Drug Economy- 300 Million Dollars

Science Daily 7 (http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/03/070319180014.htm, 3/07/07)

A British Geological Survey (BGS) project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) addresses the need to alleviate poverty in Afghanistan by encouraging inward investment, commercial and infrastructure development and provides an alternative source of income to poppy cultivation.Afghanistan is well endowed with mineral resources such as copper, gold, iron ore and gemstones. During the late 1970's and 1980's, Russian geologists carried out wide ranging exploration surveys for metals. One of the most advanced of these prospects, the Aynak Copper Deposit, located 35 km south of Kabul, consists of 240 Mt grading 2.3% Copper. This copper was formed within marbles and schists deposited some 500 million years ago. Anthony Benham, project geologist at BGS explained: "BGS geologists have been assisting the Afghanistan Geological Survey (AGS) over the past two years with scanning, digitising and re-interpreting data from the Aynak Copper Deposit. My colleagues and I have created a detailed three-dimensional model of the deposit. We also helped in carefully archiving and cataloguing all geological information and with rebuilding the AGS library, museum and laboratories. Teaching English to AGS geologists, developing computing capacity and updating their geological knowledge have formed a vital part of this project."Assistance from the World Bank and BGS enabled the Ministry of Mines in Afghanistan to prepare a new Mining Law in 2005. This law will enable it to effectively and efficiently manage an emerging mining industry. The development of a minerals industry in Afghanistan has a potential value of at least 300 million dollars a year
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Opium licensing fails -it does not provide enough income, causing farmers to revert back to illicit trade- India proves

Chouvy 6 ( Pierre, Feb 6, PHD- Geography @ Sorbonne U, *Asia Times*) ET

First, it is important to understand that while legal opium-poppy cultivation is undertaken for pharmaceutical use by 12 countries (Australia, China, the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, India, Japan, Slovakia, Spain, Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom), only one of them, India, produces opium, the latex that bleeds, coagulates and is harvested from incised opium-poppy capsules. The 11 other actually grow opium poppies to harvest poppy straw and produce concentrate of poppy straw (CPS) in the context of a modern mechanized agriculture that resorts for the most part to combine harvesters on large tracts of cultivated land. Conversely, because opium harvesting is a long and arduous manual process, it requires a numerous and, more than anything, cheap local workforce if the opium and morphine production process is to be economically viable. For that reason, and also because of international agreements derived from the role the opium economy played in its colonial past, opium is only legally produced in India. Of course, since 12 countries already produce raw opium materials to make morphine, codeine and thebaine, and have significantly increased the concentration of alkaloids in opium-poppy plants, the INCB, pursuant to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, wishes to "to avoid the proliferation of supply sites" to prevent diversion of opium-poppy plants and seeds licitly produced to the illicit market. Diversion from the licit to the illicit market occurs much more easily with opium than concentrate of poppy straw, as the Indian example shows us. In India, legal opium producing occurs in selected tracts in Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan. The Indian central government sets an opium minimum qualifying yield (MQY) according to the yields reported by farmers the previous years. During the 2004-05 crop year (8,770 licensed hectares), MQY of 58 kilograms per hectare in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan and of 49kg in Uttar Pradesh had to be achieved by opium farmers to be eligible for the renewal of their license in 2005-06. Cultivators are issued a license for growing poppies and the entire opium produced by all farmers is purchased by and only by the Central Bureau of Narcotics at a price fixed by the central government. The price paid to the farmers depends on the yields achieved, with farmers producing more opium getting paid a higher price per kilogram: in 2004-05, the minimum price paid per kilogram was Rs750 (US$17) for yields up to 44kg per hectare. The maximum price paid was Rs2,200 for yields above 100kg/ha. The average national yield was 56kg/ha and was paid at a price Rs1,150 per kilogram. However, it is important to bear in mind that, to try to prevent diversion to the illicit market, in 2004-05 the maximum licensed area to be cultivated in opium poppies was 0.10 hectare. Therefore, the maximum income that Indian farmers can derive from legal opium production is limited by fixed prices and by limitation of areas cultivated by each of them. With such low prices paid to Indian opium farmers, diversion to the illegal market, where opium can fetch prices as much as four to five times the minimum government price, clearly takes place; although there is no reliable estimate of such diversion.

Licensing would not be extensive enough, causing instability, ethnic conflict, and even military conflict

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, August 7) ET

The inability to extend the licensing scheme to incorporate all current producers and the entire area of cultivation and selectively licensing only in some areas, because the level of demand for Afghan medical opiates were insufficient or because the security situation in some areas did not permit licensing, would generate serious new political problems. The strengthening of the Taliban insurgency related to licensing production in stable areas without the presence of Taliban insurgency while eradicating in the areas of Taliban activity were described above in Section IV. But licensing selectivity even for reasons other than insurgency, such as economic and demand reasons, would likely generate resentment by those who were not given a license. The possibilities of social and tribal tensions would be high. In considering who would be given a license, great care would need to be given to avoiding fueling perceptions of ethnic and tribal favoritism. Selectivity in implementing counternarcotics policies already exists in the way eradication and interdiction are undertaken, with stable areas, such as in the north of Afghanistan, for example, frequently bearing the brunt of eradication.21 These areas, however, are also areas where economic development projects have been more successful more than in the insurgency-plagued south. It is not clear how long the more stable areas will be willing to put up with eradication. Nonetheless, without mitigating the threat of social and tribal tensions as a result of selective licensing, new instability, strikes, uprisings, and even outright military conflict could well ensue.

2AC A2: Opium Licensing CP (2/3)

Licensing would help the Taliban, delegitimize the government, and increase ethnic tensions

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, August 7) ET

Implementing a licensing scheme on a scale that went beyond very limited pilot projects in the more stable northern part of Afghanistan, while denying license to the Pashtun belt areas plagued by insurgency and eradicating there, would not be desirable. Such selective licensing would thicken the bond between the affected Pashtun population and the Taliban, increasing the insurgency, delegitimizing the central government and NATO, and exacerbating tribal and ethnic tensions.

Licensing of opium would create more problems- illicit drug trade and ethnic conflict

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, pg 1 August 7) ET

The licensing of opium for medical purposes in Afghanistan, most prominently advocated by the Senlis

Council,1 would reduce some of the negative effects of unmitigated illicit drug production. It would also

eliminate several important negative side-effects of standard counternarcotics policies. However, serious

legal, political, economic, efficiency, and security obstacles to launching such a licensing scheme persist

in Afghanistan under current circumstances. These obstacles would have to be overcome for the licensing

policy to become viable. Even if instituted, the licensing scheme would not be a panacea, and some

serious problems posed by large-scale opium cultivation would persist. Because licensing absorbing only

a part of the illicit economy could easily generate new problems, including ethnic and tribal tension,

licensing should only be undertaken once the Taliban insurgency has been defeated, other obstacles to licensing

have been overcome, and licensing could be implemented on a country-wide scale.

And, the International Narcotics Board says that there isn’t demand for medical opium- plan would go bankrupt and revert back to illicit trade

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, August 7) ET

Assuring a large-enough demand for the Afghan licensed opium would be equally difficult. Guaranteeing a sufficient demand would be necessary not only from a legal standpoint where Afghanistan could only be issued a license from the International Narcotics Board (INCB) on the condition that it did not contribute to overproduction of medical opiates, but also from efficiency and related security standpoints. If the entire production could not be absorbed in the licensed scheme, the security and efficiency difficulties discussed above would emerge. It is unclear whether there is currently a sufficient demand for any potential Afghan opium for medical purposes. INCB maintains that the current demand is satiated. INCB estimates this demand based on the level of requests for opium and medical opiates it receives. Many countries do not apply since they cannot afford medical opiates. The official estimated demand may thus not reflect the extant latent need for medical opiates around the world. Assuming that the current official demand is satiated, the only way Afghanistan could sell opium to current customers would be if other suppliers diminished their output. The current large suppliers include Turkey and India for whom the United States guarantees a substantial market under the so-called 80-20 rule (which guarantees that the US buy 80% of opium containing morphine from these two countries), as well as several other countries, including prominently Australia. Turkey and India would of course object to any reduction in demand for their opium. Moreover, if opium licenses were redistributed away from India and Turkey, diversion into the illegal drug trade there may increase. The difficulties of the political renegotiation of current arrangements and deals would be substantial. Furthermore, India and Turkey are already losing the international market to Australia who is the main producer of the highly desirable morphine-free/highthebaine opium. Not only is this form of opium pharmaceutically superior to standard opium with high morphine and low thebaine content, it is arguably also not subject to the 80-20 rule, thus allowing Australia to increasingly penetrate the US market. Without obtaining the altered poppy from Australia (or through independent development processes), it is not clear how competitive Afghan opium would be.

2AC A2: Opium Licensing CP (3/3)

Licensing opium would make the Taliban stronger and risk weakening the government through backlash

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, August 7) ET

If only a small portion of the current area under opium cultivation were licensed, or if the area licensed were not located in the region where the Taliban operated and that region was still subjected to eradication, the link between the population and the Taliban would not be severed. In fact, the local population’s dependence on Taliban’s protection would deepen and its resentment against the state and the international community for being denied a license and facing eradication would be substantial. The Taliban would then be in position to augment its effectiveness in weakening the central government and increasing its support by fomenting tribal and ethnic tensions. The resulting situation -- with eradication selectively targeting areas plagued by the Taliban insurgency and licensing taking place only in secure areas -- could then be even worse from the counterinsurgency perspective than blanket eradication. (Arguably, the population could be enticed to provide intelligence on the Taliban by the government’s temporarily cessation of eradication in that region and by a promise of extending the license once the Taliban were defeated.)

Licensing wouldn’t change the amount in the illicit trade and would cause inefficiency

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, pg 1 August 7) ET

Illicit cultivation of opium for the drug trade may well exist alongside licensed cultivation of opium for medical purposes. The persistence of an illicit opium economy feeding the drug trade alongside a licensed economy for medical opiates would be especially likely to take place if the licensing scheme were not large enough to provide livelihood to a significant portion of the population currently involved in opium cultivation. Moreover, since the current area of cultivation represents only 3% of Afghanistan’s arable land, it would be theoretically possible to license the entire area and still see the persistence of an equally large area of illicit cultivation. Licensing of any area short of the total area of cultivation would only compound the problem of the existence of an illegal economy alongside the legal opium economy, creating a large efficiency problem.

Licensed opium prices will not be high enough- illicit opium will prevail

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, pg 1 August 7) ET

Moreover, if licensing suppressed the amount of opium entering the illegal drug trade, illicit opium prices would be boosted, thus potentially attracting new growers. Given that profits from the illegal economy would be substantially higher than profits from the legal economy, as traffickers could always outbid prices paid by the government for licensed opium, eradication of illicit cultivation would be necessary as a deterrent against participating in the illegal economy instead of the legal one. • Overall drug consumption would be highly unlikely to fall. Given persisting demand, opium production would simply relocate to another area, whether in Afghanistan or elsewhere.

Licensing would not hurt the Taliban- doesn’t solve advantages

Brown 7 (Vanda Felbab, *Brookings Institute on Foreign Policy*, NO 1, August 7) ET

Security Problems • The Taliban (and other militant anti-government actors) would likely replace at least a

portion of their income loss from the suppressed illegal drug trade with income from other activities, such as other illicit economies or donations. The group has already demonstrated its capacity to do so during 2002-2004. Although licensing may somewhat weaken the Taliban and other militant anti-government actors financially, it would be unlikely to bankrupt them. •

2AC AT: Politics - Afghanistan Unpopular

Afghanistan drug war is considered a failure

Dickey 9 (Christopher, writer for Newsweek, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/07/30/losing-afghanistan-s-drug-war.html) PJ

After spending years and hundreds of millions of dollars trying to eradicate the fields of poppies that produce opium in Afghanistan, the United States suddenly announced in June that, in the words of special Af-Pak envoy Richard Holbrooke, "eradication is a waste of money." Instead, NATO and Afghan forces are trying to focus on the nexus between the opium trade and Taliban financing. Nobody has watched these developments more closely than Antonio Maria Costa, executive director of the Vienna-based U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. A frequent visitor to Afghanistan himself, he also has a staff of some 360 locals "crisscrossing the country," tracking the growth and sale of narcotics. In a series of interviews with NEWSWEEK's Christopher Dickey, Costa talked about the surprising drug story behind the war story in Afghanistan. Excerpts:

Presence in Afghanistan is unpopular

Jakes 9 (Lara, Huffington Post writer, 9/10, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/09/10/pelosi-upping-troops-to-a\_n\_282210.html) PJ

WASHINGTON — Democratic leaders in Congress urged the Obama administration Thursday to quickly produce a plan for winning the war in Afghanistan or risk widespread opposition within the president's own party to a new troop buildup. Simmering congressional frustration could lead to tighter scrutiny and more limited resources, even if Capitol Hill ultimately does approve sending more U.S. troops to the war-torn nation, aides said. "I don't think there's a great deal of support for sending more troops to Afghanistan in the country or in the Congress," said House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, the highest-ranking Democrat to signal that a push for more troops will get a skeptical look.

Support for Afghanistan is at an all time low

Steinhauser 9 **(Paul, CNN deputy political director, 9/15, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/09/15/afghan.war.poll/) PJ**

A CNN/Opinion Research Corp. survey released Tuesday morning indicates that 39 percent of Americans favor the war in Afghanistan, with 58 percent opposed to the mission. Support is down from 53 percent in April, marking the lowest level since the start of the U.S. military mission in Afghanistan soon after the September 11, 2001, attacks. The poll suggests that 23 percent of Democrats support the war. That number rises to 39 percent for independents and 62 percent for Republicans. "Most of the recent erosion in support has come from within the GOP," said Keating Holland, CNN's polling director. "Unlike Democrats and independents, Republicans still favor the war, but their support has slipped eight points in just two weeks."

Afghanistan unpopular – kills Obama’s support

Krebs 9 **(writer for Digital Journal news source, 12/2, http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/283059) PJ**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | |  | | |

With the war in Afghanistan increasingly unpopular among U.S. voters, and after long deliberation on a troop surge decision, President Obama's approval on the matter has crashed to a new low. After the long awaited announcement on the troop surge, 30,000 Americans are now heading to the war in Afghanistan - a determination President Obama considers in "our vital national interest." In a prime-time speech delivered at West Point, Obama has taken the Afghanistan conflict fully under his wing.

2AC AT: Politics – Afghanistan Unpopular

War on drugs is unpopular

Zogby 8 (Poll of politics, 10-2-9=8, http://stash.norml.org/zogby-poll-76-of-likely-voters-believe-war-on-drugs-is-failing , *Zogby*) ET

Three in four likely voters (76%) believe the U.S. war on drugs is failing, a sentiment that cuts across the political spectrum – including the vast majority of Democrats (86%), political independents (81%), and most Republicans (61%). There is also a strong belief that the anti-drug effort is failing among those who intend to vote for Barack Obama (89%) for president, as well as most supporters of John McCain (61%). When asked what they believe is the single best way to combat international drug trafficking and illicit use, 27% of likely voters said legalizing some drugs would be the best approach — 34% of Obama supporters and 20% of McCain backers agreed. One in four likely voters (25%) believe stopping the drugs at the border is the best tactic to battle drugs — 39% of McCain supporters, but just 12% of Obama backers agree. Overall, 19% of likely voters said reducing demand through treatment and education should be the top focus of the war on drugs. 13% believe that the best way to fight the war on drugs is to prevent production of narcotics in the country of origin.

The war on drugs is unpopular and brings a view of US instability- aff solves

Hallinan June 22nd (Conn, Foreign Policy in focus Columnist, June 22) ET

The U.S., on the other hand, has drawn widespread anger for its support of the Honduran government, expanding its military bases in Colombia, and its increasingly unpopular war on drugs. If much of the world concludes that regional powers like Turkey and Brazil are centers of stability, while the U.S. seems increasingly ham fisted or ineffectual, one can hardly blame them.

Public support for Afghanistan low

Fabian 10 **(**Jordan, writer for the Hill, 4/5, http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/90569-dem-congressman-public-support-for-afghan-war-is-very-weak**)**

A Democratic member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said Monday that public support for the war in Afghanistan is on shaky ground. Rep. Bill Delahunt (Mass.) said that President Barack Obama might not stand to gain politically from sustaining a high level of combat forces there that are fighting the Taliban and al Qaeda. "Listening to other members as well as people in the district, I would say that the fiasco in Iraq really has colored public sentiment about what is happening in Afghanistan," he said on MSNBC. "Popular support in this country is very weak and very shaky." The retiring lawmaker's comments suggest that there is still some worry in Democratic circles about the president's decision to send 30,000 additional troops to the war-torn country late last year. The troops are supposed to draw down by the middle of 2011.

Afghanistan unpopular – Obama needs to withdraw fast.

Tisdall 10 (Simon, assistant editor of the Guardian, 6/15, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/cifamerica/2010/jun/15/obama-time-afghanistan-mcchrystal) PJ

But time is not on his side, given Obama's preset deadline of July 2011 for the start of troop withdrawals. The setbacks in the south have triggered concern that the overall strategy has lost momentum and is beginning to drift. Despite or perhaps because of the 30,000-strong surge in US forces, which are now almost all deployed, US and Nato casualties have risen alarmingly in recent weeks as the Taliban pushes back in the south. This autumn's mid-term congressional elections may increase political pressure to end an unpopular war.

Afghanistan losing support

Defense and Security News 9 (10/9, http://www.defencetalk.com/us-uk-public-support-for-afghan-war-declines-22487/) PJ

Opinion polls in the United States and Britain indicate that on the eighth anniversary of the start of the war in Afghanistan Wednesday, public support for the conflict is slipping. An Associated Press poll finds only 40 percent of Americans support the war, while in Britain, 56 percent of people surveyed in a BBC poll said they are against it. In Afghanistan, a Taliban statement marking the anniversary said the group never had any agenda to harm other countries, nor has it such an agenda today.

2AC AT: Politics - Afghanistan Popular

Most are confident in the war’s successful outcome

Agiesta and Cohen 09 (Jennifer and Jon, Washington Post writer, 7/20, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/08/19/AR2009081903066.html) PJ

A majority of Americans now see the war in Afghanistan as not worth fighting, and just a quarter say more U.S. troops should be sent to the country, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll. Most have confidence in the ability of the United States to meet its primary goals of defeating the Taliban, facilitating economic development, and molding an honest and effective Afghan government, but few say Thursday's elections there are likely to produce such a government.

Afghanistan war popular

Quinnipiac University Poll Institute 09 (12/8, http://www.quinnipiac.edu/x1295.xml?ReleaseID=1402) PJ

Public support for the war in Afghanistan is up nine percentage points in the last three weeks, as American voters say 57 - 35 percent that fighting the war is the right thing to do. Approval of President Barack Obama's handling of the war is up seven points in the same period, from a 38 - 49 percent negative November 18 to a 45 - 45 percent split, according to a Quinnipiac University poll released today. American voters approve 58 - 37 percent of President Obama's decision to send 30,000 more combat troops to the war-torn nation, the independent Quinnipiac (KWIN-uh-per-ack) University poll finds. And voters approve 60 - 32 percent of the President's plan to begin withdrawing combat troops from Afghanistan in July 2011. But by a 45 - 40 percent margin, Americans do not believe he will be able to keep that promise.

America wants the war on drugs to end.

Healy 9 (Gene, a policy analyst for the Cato Institute, December 1, 2009, “Time to Wind Down the War on Drugs”, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=11019>)KFC

It's hard out here for a libertarian in the Age of Obama. From bailout mania to the drive to nationalize health care, those of who want less federal involvement in American life have plenty to be depressed about. Is there any area in which it's not too audacious to hope for less intrusive government? Yes, thankfully: Today, more and more Americans are open to winding down our destructive war on drugs. In October, Gallup recorded its highest-ever level of public support for marijuana legalization, with 44 percent of Americans in favor. There's "a generational rift" on the issue, Gallup reports: A majority of voters under 50 back legalization. ur prohibitionist policies have filled America's jails to bursting, and made our streets less safe by funneling some $40 billion a year to organized crime

\*\*WOD GOOD\*\*

WoD Good

Counter narcotics is the good- solves security best

Biehl 9 (Jonathan, “Counter-narcotics operations in Afghanistan: a way to success or a meaningless cause”, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA512380>, date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK

The CN effort contributes to four of the stability sectors in the model: security, justice and reconciliation, governance and participation, and economic stabilization and infrastructure. “Efforts in security focus on establishing a stable security environment and developing legitimate institutions and infrastructure to maintain that environment” (Department of the Army 2008, 2-6). The justice and reconciliation sector encompasses far more that policing, civil law and order, and the court systems of a state (Department of the Army 2008, 2-6). This sector is supported by eight key elements, one of which is: effective and scrupulous law enforcement institutions responsive to civil authority and respectful to human rights and dignity (Department of the Army 2008, 2-7). As of now, Afghan LE is unable to do this. “Governance is the states’ ability to serve the citizens 57 58 through the rules, processes and behavior by which interests are articulated, resources are managed and power is exercised in a society, including the representative participatory decision-making processes typically guaranteed under inclusive, constitutional authority” (Department of the Army 2008, 2-8). This is not possible with a narco-based economy with corrupt government officials. In regards to economic stabilization, “much of the broader success achieved in stability operations begins at the local level as intervening actors engage the populace with modest economic and governance programs” (Department of the Army 2008, 2-8). The responsibility for reducing Afghanistan’s economic and social dependence on the cultivation and processing of opium poppies rests with the Afghan government. “Widespread instability--a direct result of that insurgency--makes it almost impossible for Afghan leaders to implement a counter-narcotics strategy” (Wood 2009, 51).

\*\*WOD Bad\*\*

Drug war bad

The drug war undermines the general war effort in Afghanistan & alienates the Afghani public- risks radicalizing more of the population  
Carpenter 4 (Ted Galen, “How the Drug War in Afghanistan Undermines America’s War on Terror”, Nov 10, Foreign Policy Briefing, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb84.pdf> , date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK

There is a growing tension between two U.S. objectives in Afghanistan. The most important objective is—or at least should be—the eradication of the remaining Al Qaeda and Taliban forces in that country. But the United States and its coalition partners are now also emphasizing the eradication of Afghanistan’s drug trade. These antidrug efforts may fatally undermine the far more important anti-terrorism campaign. Like it or not, the growing of opium poppies (the source of heroin) is a huge part of Afghanistan’s economy—roughly half of the country’s annual gross domestic product. As long as the United States and other drug consuming countries pursue a prohibitionist strategy, a massive black market premium exists that will make the cultivation of drug crops far more lucrative than competing crops in Afghanistan or any other drug source country. For many Afghan farmers, growing opium poppies is the difference between prosperity and destitution. There is a serious risk that they will turn against the United States and the U.S.-supported government of President Hamid Karzai if Washington and Kabul pursue vigorous anti-drug programs. In addition, regional warlords who have helped the United States combat Al Qaeda and Taliban forces derive substantial profits from the drug trade. They use those revenues to pay the militias that keep them in power. A drug eradication campaign could easily drive important warlords into alliance with America’s terrorist adversaries. Even those Americans who oppose drug legalization and endorse the drug war as a matter of general policy should recognize that an exception needs to be made in the case of Afghanistan. At the very least, U.S. officials should be willing to look the other way regarding the opium crop and recognize that the fight against radical Islamic terrorists must have a higher priority than anti-drug measures.

Our priority should not be the drug war, which radicalizes Afghani farmers, but the war on terror  
Carpenter 4 (Ted Galen, “How the Drug War in Afghanistan Undermines America’s War on Terror”, Nov 10, Foreign Policy Briefing, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb84.pdf> , date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK

U.S. pressure on the Karzai government is a big mistake. The Taliban and their Al Qaeda allies are resurgent in Afghanistan, especially in the southern part of the country. If zealous American drug warriors alienate hundreds of thousands of Afghan farmers, the Karzai government’s hold on power, which is none too secure now, could become even more precarious. Washington would then face the unpalatable choice of letting radical Islamists regain power or sending more U.S. troops to suppress the insurgency. U.S. officials need to keep their priorities straight. Our mortal enemy is Al Qaeda and the Taliban regime that made Afghanistan into a sanctuary for that terrorist organization. The drug war is a dangerous distraction in the campaign to destroy those forces. Recognizing that security considerations sometimes trump other objectives would hardly be an unprecedented move by Washington. U.S. agencies quietly ignored the drug trafficking activities of anti-communist factions in Central America during the 1980s when the primary goal was to keep those countries out of the Soviet orbit.36 In the early 1990s, the United States also eased its pressure on Peru’s government regarding the drug eradication issue when President Alberto Fujimori concluded that a higher priority had to be given to winning coca farmers away from the Maoist Shining Path guerrilla movement. 37 U.S. officials should adopt a similar pragmatic policy in Afghanistan and look the other way regarding the drug-trafficking activities of friendly warlords. And above all, the U.S. military must not become the enemy of Afghan farmers whose livelihood depends on opium poppy cultivation. True, some of the funds from the drug trade will find their way into the coffers of the Taliban and Al Qaeda. That is an inevitable side effect of a global prohibitionist policy that creates such an enormous profit from illegal drugs. But alienating pro-Western Afghan factions in an effort to disrupt the flow of revenue to the Islamic radicals is too high a price to pay. Washington should stop putting pressure on the Afghan government to pursue crop eradication programs and undermine the economic well-being of its own population. U.S. leaders also should refrain from trying to make U.S. soldiers into anti-drug crusaders; they have a difficult enough job fighting their terrorist adversaries in Afghanistan. Even those policymakers who oppose ending the war on drugs as a general matter ought to recognize that, in this case, the war against radical Islamic terrorism must take priority.

Drug war bad

The war on drugs is causing afghan instability

AP 9 (August 2, “No more opium, no more money for Afghan villagers”, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,536200,00.html>, date accessed: 6/21/2010) AK  
SHAHRAN, Afghanistan —  For as long as anyone can remember, there was no need for paper money in this remote corner of the Hindu Kush. The common currency was what grew in everyone's backyard — opium. When children felt like buying candy, they ran into their father's fields and returned with a few grams of opium folded inside a leaf. Their mothers collected it in plastic bags, trading 18 grams for a meter of fabric or two liters of cooking oil. Even a visit to the barbershop could be settled in opium. But the economy of this village sputtered to a halt last year when the government began aggressively enforcing a ban on opium production. Villagers were not allowed to plant their only cash crop. Now shops are empty and farmers are in debt, as entire communities spiral into poverty. Opium is one of the biggest problems facing this troubled country, because it is deeply woven into the fabric of daily life as well as into the economics of insurgency. Afghanistan supplies 93 percent of the world's opium, and it is one of the main sources of funding for the growing Taliban movement. Yet the government ban on opium is working at best unevenly. In areas of the country under Taliban control, opium production is going strong. In government-held areas like Shahran, it has gone down drastically, but at the cost of the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of people. Their anger is imperiling government support in one of the few areas of the country that has resisted the Taliban's advance. "Now we don't even have 10 Afghanis ($0.25) to give our children to buy bubble gum," says opium farmer Abdul Hay. "Before they would go into the field and collect the money themselves." Two years ago, opium, the raw ingredient used to make heroin, grew on nearly half a million acres in Afghanistan. The harvest was worth about $4 billion, or equal to nearly half the country's GDP in 2007. As much as a tenth — almost half a billion dollars — went to local strongmen, including the Taliban, according to the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. Under intense international pressure, the government redoubled its effort to crack down on opium farmers. By last year, the number of acres planted with poppy had dropped by a fifth, yet the Taliban's finances remained largely untouched. Ninety-eight percent of Afghanistan's opium is now grown in just seven of the country's 34 provinces — all areas under partial or total Taliban control. Opium was so entrenched in Badakshan province, where Shahran is located, that it is said Marco Polo sampled it when he passed through in the 13th century. Until recently, the sloping mountain faces were awash with pink, purple and magenta poppies, nodding in the wind. But in the past year, poppy production has gone down 95 percent. The villagers here held a meeting and decided two years ago not to plant opium, after government radio messages warned that poppy fields would be destroyed and opium growers jailed. Posters distributed throughout the area showed a man with his hands bound by the stem of the opium poppy. The villagers say they did as the government told them, and planted their fields with wheat, barley, mustard and melons. But these crops need more care than the tough opium poppy, which will bloom with little water or fertilizer. Most of the wheat fields yielded little because the farmers couldn't afford to fertilize the land. Even where yields were decent, farmers say they could have earned between two and 10 times more by planting the same land with opium. "See this mustard? It can take care of my family for one month," says 25-year-old farmer Abdul Saboor, pulling up a shoot of the green plant and snapping it open with his teeth. "When we planted opium in this same plot, it took care of all our expenses for an entire year." The hole in the economy is swallowing up the community, from the farmer to the turbaned shopkeepers whose scales used for weighing opium now sit idle. Every month, shopkeeper Abdul Ahmed used to bring $20,000 worth of goods to sell in the bazaar. It's been four months since his last truckload, and he has only sold $1,000. Ahmed is one of 40 traders left; there used to be 400. "We open in the morning and go back at night. No money comes in. No one buys anything," says Ahmed. "There is no money left in this village. Opium is the only income we had." Villagers say desperation is pushing hundreds to immigrate to neighboring Iran, where they work as day laborers. Farmers throughout the region are also sinking deeply into debt. They borrow money to buy staples like rice and oil, which they used to buy with opium. They also take loans to buy seeds and fertilizer and to rent donkeys to take the wheat to market — an expense opium did not bring because all the local shops accepted it as legal tender. On a hill flanking the highway in Argu District, a 4-hour drive southeast of here, a thin farmer is bent over cutting wheat with a hand-held sickle. Abdul Mahin says he is several hundred dollars in debt to the man who sold him fertilizer. "If we plant two bags of wheat, then we'll have just enough money to buy the seeds to plant another two bags of wheat," says the gray-bearded farmer. "We're going backwards. Of course we're angry at the government." A small number of farmers in other towns are planting opium despite the ban. Most are seeing their fields destroyed, as government agents intensify patrols. Farmer Abdulhamid, 55, says he has only rain-fed land, and none of it is irrigated. So he can't grow wheat and barley with much success. Unless the government helps, he says, he will have to plant opium again. "We are getting poorer day by day," says Abdulhamid, in the village of Pengani. "What should I do? Kill my children so that I don't have to feed them?" When farmers were asked to stop planting, they were promised help from the government. Badakshan is set to receive $1,000 for each hectare (roughly 2 1/2 acres) of land freed of poppies — some $10 million this year. It's being used to build three clinics and three schools, pave a major road and rebuild six fallen bridges. Farmers say a distant clinic or bridge is not going to feed their children. But counternarcotics experts and government officials respond that the opium ban is necessary. "These poor farmers are going to get stepped on and get hurt in this effort," says former Drug Enforcement Agency official Doug Wankel, who organized the U.S. counternarcotics effort here in 2003. "But it's a pain that has to be endured for the good of the masses." "In the U.S. and the U.K., when people do an illegal activity, the police stops them, right? This is an illegal act, so we need to stop it in order to enforce the rule of law," says Zalmai Afzali, a spokesman for the Ministry of Counternarcotics. He also notes the link to the insurgency: "I try to explain to the farmer that cultivates poppy that he is buying a coffin for his child." Yet the poverty created by getting rid of opium may be stoking terrorism. Nangahar — which became poppy free last year and is held up as an example of government control — has seen a rapid increase in extremism, according to a field study by David Mansfield, counternarcotics consultant for the U.N. and the World Bank. By April last year, the province rescinded agreements to limit the movement of anti-government groups on its border with Pakistan. By July, these groups were believed to have set up bases in four districts next to Pakistan. By September, they were attacking government buildings. And by October, there were Taliban checkpoints.

Also, the crackdown in the country's far north is unlikely to stop the flow of opium and money to the Taliban in the south. In Zabul — the home province of Taliban spiritual chief Mullah Omar — poppy production grew by 45 percent last year. Helmand province, a Taliban stronghold, grew so much opium last year that if it was a separate country, it would rank as the world's top opium producer, according to Gretchen Peters, author of "Seeds of Terror," on how the Taliban is bankrolling itself through drug smuggling. Peters says the Taliban's video messages now talk about securing smuggling routes and protecting poppy plantations. Poppy fields in Taliban areas are so dangerous that eradication teams comb them for bombs before trying to destroy them. Last year 78 government agents were killed trying to destroy fields in the south. By contrast, the worst they faced in Badakshan was crying farmers. Zainuddin, the head security officer for Darayim district in Badakshan, says he feels awful every time he uproots a poppy field. "Sometimes I cry as I am hitting the poppies," says Zainuddin, who like many Afghans goes by a single name. "Because I know these are poor people and I am taking away the only thing they have." Over the past month, dozens of fields have been destroyed in the mountains of Badakshan. Nasrullah, a 35-year-old farmer, planted three small plots of white-and-violet poppies inside a hill of wheat, hoping the taller crop would hide the illegal blossoms. He stood in silence on a recent morning as nine police officers crossed a small gulch and climbed the hill. They assaulted his crop, hitting the flowers with long sticks until they fell to the ground. He put his face in his hands. "I didn't plant this for my own pleasure," he says. "I planted this so that my family could eat. All the rest of this is worth nothing," he says, waving at the wheat. "The choice I have to make now is either kill myself. Or leave the country."

WOD Fails- Empirics

Teslik 6 (lee – Council on foreign relations journalist, *Council on Foreign Relations*, Apr 6, http://www.cfr.org/publication/10373/forgotten\_drug\_war.html#p7 ) ET

Experts say that control efforts have met with mixed success when considered as specific case scenarios, but represent an overwhelming failure taken as a whole. "You see a growing number of people saying that money spent on the interdiction side is just foolish," says Nadelmann. The trouble lies in what is often referred to as the "push-down, pop-up effect," or squeezing one end of a balloon. Due to basic economic factors, eradications of crops in specific regions have almost never translated into long-term drug war successes. For example, in the 1990s, Peru and Bolivia were considered success stories of the drug war, while Colombia was perceived as a major threat. The United States successfully pressured Colombia's government to launch a program of aerially spraying and uprooting coca crops. Notable reductions were made, but these successes had a perverse effect. Even as the United States launched a multibillion dollar interdiction campaign in Colombia, coca growers in neighboring Peru and Bolivia quickly popped up to fill the supply void. Not only did regional production not decline, but there were unforeseen political consequences in the countries where coca growth was resurgent. Evo Morales, a former coca grower and a populist, rallied the support of Bolivia's coca growers and won Bolivia's recent presidential elections on a pro-coca platform (though not pro-cocaine—coca can be used to produce a mildly intoxicating chew and can be processed into a flour substitute). Ullanta Humala, a Peruvian nationalist who has pledged to legalize the coca crop, is currently leading opinion polls in the run-up to Peru's April 9 elections.

\*\*\* K Aff\*\*\*
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First, opium eradication results in the commodification of women for money to pay off debts – these women suffer huge physical and psychological trauma

Yousafazi 08 (Sami, writer for Newsweek, 3/29, http://www.newsweek.com/2008/03/29/the-opium-brides-of-afghanistan.html)

Afghans disparagingly call them "loan brides"—daughters given in marriage by fathers who have no other way out of debt. The practice began with the dowry a bridegroom's family traditionally pays to the bride's father in tribal Pashtun society. These days the amount ranges from $3,000 or so in poorer places like Laghman and Nangarhar to $8,000 or more in Helmand, Afghanistan's No. 1 opium-growing province. For a desperate farmer, that bride price can be salvation—but at a cruel cost. Among the Pashtun, debt marriage puts a lasting stain on the honor of the bride and her family. It brings shame on the country, too. President Hamid Karzai recently told the nation: "I call on the people [not to] give their daughters for money; they shouldn't give them to old men, and they shouldn't give them in forced marriages." All the same, local farmers say a man can get killed for failing to repay a loan. No one knows how many debt weddings take place in Afghanistan, where 93 percent of the world's heroin and other opiates originate. But Afghans say the number of loan brides keeps rising as poppy-eradication efforts push more farmers into default. "This will be our darkest year since 2000," says Baz Mohammad, 65, a white-bearded former opium farmer in Nangarhar. "Even more daughters will be sold this year." The old man lives with the anguish of selling his own 13-year-old daughter in 2000, after Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed Omar banned poppy growing. "Lenders never show any mercy," the old man says. Local farmers say more than one debtor has been bound hand and foot, then locked into a small windowless room with a smoldering fire, slowly choking to death. While law enforcers predict yet another record opium harvest in Afghanistan this spring, most farmers are struggling to survive. An estimated 500,000 Afghan families support themselves by raising poppies, according to the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. Last year those growers received an estimated $1 billion for their crops—about $2,000 per household. With at least six members in the average family, opium growers' per capita income is roughly $300. The real profits go to the traffickers, their Taliban allies and the crooked officials who help them operate. The country's well-oiled narcotics machine generates in excess of $4 billion a year from exports of processed opium and heroin—more than half of Afghanistan's $7.5 billion GDP, according to the UNODC. Efforts to promote other crops have failed. Wheat or corn brings $250 an acre at best, while poppy growers can expect 10 times that much. Besides, poppies are more dependable: hardier than either wheat or corn and more tolerant of drought and extreme heat and cold. And in a country with practically no government-funded credit for small farmers, opium growers can easily get advances on their crops. The borrower merely agrees to repay the cash with so many kilos of opium, at a price stipulated by the lender—often 40 percent or more below market value. Islam forbids charging interest on a loan, but moneylenders in poppy country elude the ban by packaging the deal as a crop-futures transaction—and never mind that the rate of return is tantamount to usury. Opium is thriving in the south, particularly the provinces of Helmand and Nimruz, where Taliban fighters keep government eradication teams at bay. But times are perilously hard for farmers in other places like Nangarhar, a longtime poppy-growing province on the mountainous Pakistani border. Mohammad Zahir Khan, a Nangarhar sharecropper in his late 40s, borrowed $850 against last spring's harvest, promising 10 kilos of opium to the lender—about $1,250 on the local market. The cash bought food and other necessities for his family and allowed him to get seed, fertilizer and help tending his three sharecropped acres. In the spring he collected 45 kilos of raw opium paste, half of which went immediately to the landowner. But before Khan could repay the loan, his wife fell seriously ill with a kidney ailment. She needed better medical care than Nangarhar could offer, so he rushed her across the Pakistani border to a private hospital in Peshawar. It cost almost every cent they had, and Khan knew his opium debt would only grow. Worse, the provincial governor, a former warlord named Gul Agha Sherzai, chose that moment to declare his own war on drugs, jailing hundreds of local farmers who were caught planting opium. Nangarhar had 45,000 acres in poppies a year ago; today drug experts say the province is totally clean. Late last year Khan reluctantly gave his 16-year-old daughter, Gul Ghoti, in marriage to the lender's 15-year-old son. Besides forgiving Khan's debt, the creditor gave him a $1,500 cash dowry. Khan calls him an honorable man. "Until the end of my life I will feel shame because of what I did to my daughter," Khan says. "I still can't look her in the eye." But at least she was old enough to marry, he adds. He claims one local farmer recently had to promise the hand of his 2-month-old daughter to free his family from an opium debt. Khan is raising wheat this year. He doubts it will support his family, and he worries that eventually one of his two younger daughters will become a loan bride. Neither of them is yet in her teens. Eradication efforts aren't the only thing pushing opium marriages. Poppy acreage is expanding in Helmand province, but loan brides are common there, too, says Bashir Ahmad Nadim, a local journalist. He says moneylenders in Helmand are always looking for "opium flowers"— marriageable daughters ready for plucking if crop failure or family emergency forces a borrower into default. In the south's drug-fueled economy, fathers of opium brides often get hefty cash bonuses on top of having their debts forgiven. But in Nangarhar, even former lenders are feeling the pinch. Enaghul, 40, used to be a relatively prosperous poppy farmer. Today he has little to show for his past wealth aside from his 17-year-old daughter-in-law, Shaukina, and a 2-month-old grandson. "She is pretty and works hard in the fields," Enaghul says, still happy to have won her for his son. Four years ago he gave
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<CONTINUED>Shaukina's father a loan in return for a promise of 30 kilos of opium, never imagining that both their fields would be eradicated before harvest. That's how Enaghul's son married Shaukina. But with the opium ban, Enaghul says his family is barely surviving. They make less than $2 a day growing tomatoes and potatoes. Enaghul casts an appraising eye on his youngest daughter, Sharifa, 5, as she runs after a goat in the courtyard of their mud-and-brick home. "I think she would fetch between $500 and $600," he says. With luck, he says, he might be able to postpone the wedding five or six years. Some Western officials promise the hard times won't last much longer. Loren Stoddard, Afghanistan director for the U.S. Agency for International Development, says crop-substitution programs are already yielding results. As many as 40,000 farming families in Nangarhar are receiving some kind of compensation for the loss of opium revenues, he says, and USAID has financed the planting of 1.3 million fruit, nut and other trees in the province since 2006, with plans for an additional 300,000 this year. There's even a new mill producing 30 tons of chicken feed a day. "Good things are happening here," Stoddard says. "I think Nangarhar will take off in the next two years." Many farmers doubt they can hold out that long. Kachkol Khan looks around his single acre of wheat in Pa Khel village and asks how he will feed his family of seven. "What we earn from this wheat won't feed us for one month," he says. Six months ago he gave the hand of his 13-year-old daughter, Bibi Gula, to settle an opium debt of $700, with roughly $1,500 cash thrown in. That's what they're living on now. At least his creditor agreed to let Gula stay home until she turns 15. "I'm not happy with what I did," Khan says. "Every daughter has ambitions to marry with dignity. I fear she'll be treated as a second-class wife and as a maid." Even worse is his worry that the same future may await his two younger daughters, 11 and 10. Angiza Afridi, 28, has spent much of the past year interviewing more than 100 families about opium weddings in two of Nangarhar's 22 districts. The schoolteacher and local TV reporter already had firsthand knowledge of the tragedy. Five years ago one of her younger aunts, then 16, was forced to marry a 55-year-old man to pay off an older uncle's opium debt, and three years ago an 8-year-old cousin was also given in marriage to make good on a drug loan. "This practice of marrying daughters to cover debts is becoming a bad habit," says Afridi. Even so, the results of her survey shocked her. In the two districts she studied, approximately half the new brides had been given in marriage to repay opium debts. The new brides included children as young as 5 years old; until they're old enough to consummate their marriages, they mostly work as household servants for their in-laws. "These poor girls have no future," she says. The worst of it may be the suicides. Afridi learned of one 15-year-old opium bride who poisoned herself on her wedding day late last year and an 11-year-old who took a fatal dose of opium around the same time. Her new in-laws were refusing to let her visit her parents. Gul Ghoti is on her first visit home since her wedding six months ago. She says it's a relief to be back with her father and mother in their two-room mud-and-brick house, if only temporarily. "My heart is still with my parents, brothers and sisters," she says. "Only my body is with my husband's family." She says she personally knows of two opium brides who killed themselves. "One of the girls had been badly beaten by her husband's brother, the other by her husband," she says. Ghoti says she's considered suicide, too, but Islam stopped her. "I pray that God doesn't give me a daughter if she ends up like me."

Child brides face abuse

**Najibullah 8** (Farangis, Spero News, Jan 6 2008, http://www.speroforum.com/site/article.asp?id=13404)IM

UNICEF says child marriages are a reaction to extreme poverty. They mainly take place in Asian and African regions where poor families see daughters as a burden and as second-class citizens. The girls are given into the "care" of a husband, and many of them end up brutally abused. Moreover, they are often under pressure to bear children, but the risk of death during pregnancy or childbirth for girls under 14 is five times higher than for adult women. According to UNICEF, 57 percent of Afghan marriages involve girls under 16. Women's activists say up to 80 percent of marriages in the country are either forced or arranged. And the problem is particularly acute in poverty-stricken rural areas. In such places, many girls are forced into marriages when they are as young as nine or 10, says Khatema Mosleh of the Afghan Women's Network (AWN), a nonpartisan group of organizations that campaign for women's rights in Afghanistan. Most marry far older men -- some in their 60s -- whom they meet for the first time at their wedding.
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3. The abuse of these girls causes patriarchy and maintains a society of male dominance

**Starita 8** (Laura, Philanthropy Action, Apr. 7, 2008, http://www.philanthropyaction.com/nc/grim\_news\_from\_afghanistan)IM

Discourse is the term of power relations. It is comprehensive and different. For instance, Gender matter is promoting the justice to the unbalance. Hence, Resistance can occur everywhere. Foucault analyzes new society as a term of various and inflexible Society. “Although the subject….is socially constructed in discursive practices, she none the less exists as a thinking, feeling and social subject and agent, capable of resistance and innovations produced out of the clash between contradictory subject positions and practices” (Weedon,1987) Social discourse in Thai society, and in global society, expects a woman to be faithful wife, a good mother and to respect her husband. This expectation allows men to get away with the abuse of women, particularly in poverty-stricken areas. Violence is another realm where we are reminded of the narrowness of the scope of “social norms” and social theory by those whom the norms of civil order, of “civilization” have dramatically failed to protect: abused children, the sexually deviant and women who are kept in their place by physical force (Caroline Ramazanoglu,1993) leading to repeated domestic violence. Intimate violence, as part of a system of coercive controls, is a controlling behavior that serves to create and maintain male dominance and an imbalance of power between husband and wife. (Juanita M. Firestone, 2003)

4. Patriarchy is the root cause of war

**Workman 96** (Thom, Poli Sci @ U of New Brunswick, YCISS Paper no. 31, p. 7, January 1996, http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/OP31-Workman.pdf)IM

On the other side of the war ledger is the flight from the feminine. War is premised upon the understanding that the feminine is the enemy of the warring essence. It is imperative to emphasize that war is not neglectful with respect to woman, or that it is merely non-inclusive, hesitant, or reluctant. Rather, war is axiomatically bound up with the fear of the feminine. The ideology of war involves the presupposition that womanliness is antithetical to war, that it will undermine the warring ethic. Warfare presupposes that woman is the enemy of man's crowning practice. It identifies the feminine as the castrating enemy of the manly/war scheme. Any suggestion of gravitation towards the feminine is equated with the decay of masculine resolve. The flight from the feminine entails the simultaneous denial and appropriation of the things women do. Labels such as heroism, bravery, and sacrifice, for example, are reserved for war; the attendant pain and loss of life in childbirth is socially repressed.15 There is no equivalent effort to commemorate or celebrate the bringing forth of life. In fact, childbirth has been epidemiologized over the last century, while gestation and birth imagery has been appropriated by weapons designers. Birthing does not have the recollective equivalent of war. At best, the womb is enlisted to further the war project, that is, to insure future soldiering generations. Womanliness is domesticated, in a sense, to ensure that it does not undermine war. Men's killing is acclaimed typically in terms of its "protective" function, that is, as protectors of the home and the hearth.16 Men are cast, in the end, as the most important caretakers.
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Contention Two: War is Not an Event

First, assuming war only happens when spectacular conflict breaks out is flawed – it ignores the structural violence in our everyday lives. This mindset furthers women’s oppression and ecological violence.

**Cuomo 96** (Chris, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the Univerity of Georgia, “War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence” Published in Hypatia 11.4, p. 30-46)

Although my position is in agreement with the notion that war and militarism are feminist issues, I argue that approaches to the ethics of war and peace which do not consider “peacetime” military violence are inadequate for feminist and environmentalist concerns. Because much of the military violence done to women and ecosystems happens outside the boundaries of declared wars, feminist and environmental philosophers ought to emphasize the significance of everyday military violence. Philosophical attention to war has typically appeared in the form of justifi­cations for entering into war, and over appropriate activities within war. The spatial metaphors used to refer to war as a separate, bounded sphere indicate assumptions that war is a realm of human activity vastly removed from normal life, or a sort of happening that is appropriately conceived apart from everyday events in peaceful times. Not surprisingly, most discussions of the political and ethical dimensions of war discuss war solely as an event—an occurrence, or collection of occurrences, having clear beginnings and endings that are typi­cally marked by formal, institutional declarations. As happenings, wars and military activities can be seen as motivated by identifiable, if complex, intentions, and directly enacted by individual and collective decision-makers and agents of states. But many of the questions about war that are of interest to feminists including how large-scale, state-sponsored violence affects women and members of other oppressed groups; how military violence shapes gen­dered, raced, and nationalistic political realities and moral imaginations; what such violence consists of and why it persists; how it is related to other oppressive and violent institutions and hegemonies—cannot be adequately pursued by focusing on events. These issues are not merely a matter of good or bad intentions and identifiable decisions. In "Gender and 'Postmodern' War," Robin Schott introduces some of the ways in which war is currently best seen not as an event but as a presence (Schott 1995). Schott argues that postmodern understandings of persons, states, and politics, as well as the high-tech nature of much contemporary warfare and the preponderance of civil and nationalist wars, render an event-based conception of war inadequate, especially insofar as gender is taken into account. In this essay, I will expand upon her argument by showing that accounts of war that only focus on events are impoverished in a number of ways, and therefore feminist consideration of the political, ethical, and onto­logical dimensions of war and the possibilities for resistance demand a much more complicated approach. I take Schott's characterization of war as presence as a point of departure, though I am not committed to the idea that the constancy of militarism, the fact of its omnipresence in human experience, and the paucity of an event-based account of war are exclusive to contemporary postmodern or postcolonial circumstances) Theory that does not investigate or even notice the omnipresence of militarism cannot represent or address the depth and specificity of the every­day effects of militarism on women, on people living in occupied territories, on members of military institutions, and on the environment. These effects are relevant to feminists in a number of ways because military practices and institutions help construct gendered and national identity, and because they justify the destruction of natural nonhuman entities and communities during peacetime. Lack of attention to these aspects of the business of making or preventing military violence in an extremely technologized world results in theory that cannot accommodate the connections among the constant pres­ence of militarismw declared wars, and other closely related social phenomena, such as nationalistic glorifications of motherhood, media violence, and current ideological gravitations to military solutions for social problems.
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Second, crisis-based politics stunts progress by prioritizing security threats. A rethinking of crisis can solve this violent mentality.

**Cuomo 96** (Chris, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the Univerity of Georgia, “War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence” Published in Hypatia 11.4, p. 30-46)

Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states lead to crisis-based politics and analyses. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they distract attention from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the false belief that the absence of declared armed conflicts is peace, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, creates forms of resistance to militarism that are merely exercises in crisis control. Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declara­tions of war might actually keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism. Seeing war as necessarily embed­ded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state. Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies concerning war and military violence also enables consideration of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance. For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests; the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war." Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connec­tions among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns.

Third, the negative’s impact scenarios will likely fall into this flawed methodology – only feminist analysis solves this.

Cuomo 96(Chris, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the U of Georgia, *War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence,* p.34-35)JM

Peach rightly identifies the pessimism, sexism, essentialism, and universal-ism at work in just-war theorists' conceptions of human nature. Nonetheless, she fails to see that just-war theorists employ ossified concepts of both "human nature" and "war." Any interrogation of the relationships between war and "human nature," or more benignly, understandings and enactments of what it means to be diverse human agents in various contexts, will be terribly limited insofar as they consider wars to be isolated events. Questions concerning the relationships between war and "human nature" become far more complex if we reject a conception of war that focuses only on events, and abandon any pretense of arriving at universalist conceptions of human or female "nature." Feminist ethical questions about war are not reducible to wondering how to avoid large-scale military conflict despite human tendencies toward violence. Instead, the central questions concern the omnipresence of militarism, the possibilities of making its presence visible, and the potential for resistance to its physical and hegemonic force. Like "solutions" to the preponderance of violence perpetrated by men against women that fail to analyze and articulate relationships between everyday violence and institutionalized or invisible systems of patriarchal, racist, and economic oppression, analyses that charac¬terize eruptions of military violence as isolated, persistent events, are practi¬cally and theoretically insufficient
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Fourth, the most obvious example is the war on drugs and its systematic war on women. This outweighs “conventional” war.

Mazza 6 (Brittney, PhD candidate at Rutgers U, [http://dialogues.rutgers.edu/vol\_05/essays/documents/mazza.pdf] AD: 6/28/10)JM

In addition to Davis‘s analysis, the concept of and potential for inherent and state-supported violence can also be evidenced through the prison system and through the “war on drugs” as part of a continuing culture of violence and perpetual “war.” Chris Cuomo argues that war can not be viewed as an incident that is separate or independent from society, but rather that it is essential to recognize the militaristic and violent structures and systems that shape everyday life as contributors to and forms of war. Cuomo suggests that a feminist analysis of war is particularly effective and necessary in seeing war as an ingrained and interwoven aspect of twenty-first century life, as ”part of an enmeshed continua or spectra of state-sponsored and other systemic patriarchal and racist violence” (69). The increasing growth of and reliance on the “prison-industrial complex” in the United States, and the use of a strengthened drug policy to disproportionately affect women of color are examples of a system that utilizes violence and punishment as a means of social control. Militarism in everyday life, especially when its practices and enforcement are aimed specifically toward minorities, undoubtedly impacts conceptions of race, gender and gendered relationships. The increasing reliance on and growth of the prison system in the “war on drugs” as a tool of punishment, fear and control over women and minorities most definitely qualifies as the type of “state-sponsored violence” to which Cuomo refers. The vision of war as a continuous cycle impeding upon the lives and minds of the American public will, as Cuomo suggests, make it likely that citizens will become accustomed to dualisms such as “war and peace,” “good and bad” and “right and wrong.” These black-and-white terms and ways of thinking leave little room for the gray areas of race, class and sex that are often undeniable forces in social conflicts such as the “war on drugs,” and the racist and patriarchal violence that is present in every day social institutions. Our country continues to favor legislation that is unsympathetic to the specific needs of women and mothers, and it continues to cut expenditures on social programs such as welfare while the “prison-industrial complex” engulfs the poor. In this way, the prison system is a means of violence that serves to oppress and punish an ever-increasing number of African American women, and the “war on drugs” remains a war on the black community, family and the female body.

Fifth, these anti-drug campaigns justify covert militarism.

Zirnite 97(Peter WOLA (Washington Office on Latin America), Washington DC, “Reluctant Recruits

The US Military and the War on Drugs”)AQB

The "national security" rationale was beefed up in the 1980s when US officials began linking drug traffickers to guerrilla insurgencies in the hemisphere. At a 1984 Senate hearing, federal officials warned that international terrorists were turning to drug trafficking to finance their operations. "Drugs have become the natural ally of those that would choose to destroy democratic societies in our hemisphere through violent means," cautioned then-US Customs Commissioner William Von Rabb, who sought to implicate Cuba and Nicaragua in using the regional drug trade to finance insurgencies throughout Latin America. (7) The next year, the Joint Chiefs of Staff cited the narcoguerrilla threat when it unanimously recommended that the US military take unprecedented action, including the imposition of naval and air blockades, to combat drug trafficking in Central America, a plan they that said could be "a rallying point for this hemisphere." (8) Development of the so-called "narcoguerilla theory" was a critical development in the militarization of international drug control efforts. It has been used not only to justify the Pentagon's involvement in the drug war, but also to legitimize the approach it has taken in carrying out its counter-drug mission. While targets of the Andean operations include "new" enemies - cocaine producers and traffickers - the "old" enemies of Marxist insurgents are explicitly part of antinarcotics programs in Colombia and Peru. Even today, the guerrilla-drug link is routinely cited as an important part of the rationale for increasing military assistance to those military and police forces. Washington is pressing Peruvian officials to accept its proposal for an expanded riverine interdiction program by arguing it would deprive Sendero Luminoso of needed money. (9) The narcoguerrilla theory, however, is widely questioned by experts in the Andean countries and in the United States. While some links undoubtedly exist, traffickers maintain an array of alliances - with state actors as well as guerrilla forces, potentially creating a quagmire for US policy-makers seeking support from the former. In Colombia most often put forward as a bastion of "narco-terrorists" - drug mafias are most closely associated with right-wing paramilitary death squads, which themselves more often than not have close ties to members of the Colombian armed forces.
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Sixth, the plan’s rejection of the militarized “war on drugs” leads to peaceful conflict resolution.

Cuomo 96(Chris, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the Univerity of Georgia, “War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence” 1996 )

**Moving away from crisis driven politics and ontologies concerning** war and **military violence** also **enables consideration of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance**. For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how **militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination**; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; **the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests;** the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. **It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war."** **Given** current **American obsessions with nationalism**, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state**, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connec­tions among phenomena like the "war on drugs**," the "wat on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns.

Lastly, militaristic cost-benefit analysis is the same logic of ecocide, which culminates in extinction.

Cuomo 96(Chris, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the U of Georgia, *War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence,* p.42)JM

There are many conceptual and practical connections between military practices in which humans aim to kill and harm each other for some declared "greater good," and nonmilitary practices in which we displace, destroy, or seriously modify nonhuman communities, species, and ecosystems in the name of human interests. An early illustration of these connections was made by Rachel Carson in the first few pages of The Silent Spring (1962), in which she described insecticides as the inadvertent offspring of World War II chemical weapons research. We can now also trace ways in which insecticides were part of the Western-defined global corporatization of agriculture that helped kill off the small family farm and made the worldwide system of food production dependent on the likes of Dow Chemical and Monsanto. Military practices are no different from other human practices that damage and irreparably modify nature. They are often a result of cost-benefit analyses that pretend to weigh all likely outcomes yet do not consider nonhuman entities except in terms of their use value for humans and they nearly always create unforeseeable effects for humans and nonhumans. In addition, everyday military peacetime practices are actually more destructive than most other human activities, they are directly enacted by state power, and, because they function as unquestioned "givens," they enjoy a unique near-immunity to enactments of moral reproach. It is worth noting the extent to which everyday military activities remain largely unscrutinized by environmentalists, especially American environmentalists, largely because fear allows us to be fooled into thinking that "national security" is an adequate excuse for "ecological military mayhem" (Thomas 1995, 16).

Internal Links

Internal Link – Patriarchy

Domestic abuse intensifies patriarchy, which is the ultimate cause of all abuse against women and human suffering

**Tracy 7** (Steven, Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, Sep 2007, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3817/is\_200709/ai\_n29491710/pg\_2/?tag=content;col1)IM

Feminist theory: Patriarchy is the ultimate cause of all abuse against women. It has only been in the past few decades that domestic violence has been studied in detail. When feminism emerged in the 1960s and 70s, feminist scholars began assessing the history and impact of misogyny and gender inequality in various spheres of life. This led to the first modern works on abuse being published in the mid 1970s.18 During this period of early modern feminism, the perspective developed that patriarchy, in any and all forms, is the ultimate cause of all abuse against women, for patriarchy is seen as the overarching social construct which ultimately engenders abuse. Lenore Walker in her early classic on domestic violence asserts: "My feminist analysis of all violence is that sexism is the real underbelly of human suffering."19 Typically, violence against women is explained in terms of a power struggle, for feminists argue that in a patriarchal society those with all the power-males-must resort to violence when their position of dominance is threatened. This feminist perspective on domestic violence is still fairly common. For instance, in a recent journal article several feminists state: "domestic violence maintains patriarchy, as part of a systematic attempt to maintain male dominance in the home and in society."20

Rape is the base form of patriarchy, which is the root cause of all abuse against women

**Tracy 7** (Steven, Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, Sep 2007, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3817/is\_200709/ai\_n29491710/pg\_2/?tag=content;col1)IM

Much of the early feminist abuse literature is global in its censure of male power and domination, and strident in its condemnation of patriarchy and even of males. For instance, Susan Brownmiller in her classic early feminist work on rape states that early on in human history, "rape became man's basic weapon of force against woman" and became the ultimate "triumph of manhood."21 Furthermore, she argues that from prehistoric times through to the present, "rape has played a critical function. It is nothing more or less than a conscious process by which all men keep all women in a state of fear."22 While she does not actually use the term "patriarchy" to link all female abuse to male power and domination, this is precisely what she is describing. Since the 1970s, many feminists continue to maintain that patriarchy is the ultimate cause of all abuse against women.23 Various religious feminists and egalitarians have also argued that patriarchy is the ultimate and necessary cause of all abuse against women. Like the secular feminists who hold this view, these writers also tend to indict patriarchy in any and all forms as the causal factor in all abuse against women. Carolyn Holderread Heggen states The inherent logic of patriarchy says that if men have the right to power and control over women and children, they also have the right to enforce that control. . . . Domination and glorification of violence are characteristics of patriarchal societies. ... In patriarchy, women and children are defined in relation to men who control the resources and the power. Women and children are the other, the object. Men are the norm, the subject. In a dominance-and-submission social order, there is no true mutual care. Subordinates are to care for the needs of the dominants.24

**Internal Link – Patriarchy**

**The discourse of the War on Drugs celebrates manliness, loathes womanliness and prevents peace – we reject that**

**Workman 96** (Thom, Poli Sci @ U of New Brunswick, YCISS Paper no. 31, p. 7, January 1996, http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/OP31-Workman.pdf)IM

War is masculinist in the sense that it is bound up with the flight from woman to man; it is a repudiation of feminine characteristics and traits in favour of those understood as masculine. War is inscribed with the celebration of manliness and the concomitant loathing of womanliness. We can speak of war in terms of its migration "to the masculine" and its flight "from the feminine". With respect to the former, war is associated explicitly with the achievement and recovery of masculinity. Embedded within the fabric of masculinity are the rituals of violence and destruction. Violence and aggression are not incidental to masculinity; they are integral to its meaning. War arises as the quintessential practice of masculine confirmation; in and through war manliness is achieved. The tapestry of virility embodies the war ethic. The masculinity of the war-maker is not doubted. War becomes the exclusive sanctuary of masculinized males (and occasionally of masculinized females). The extensive role of "women" in the functioning of the militaries is understood logistically but does not resonate within patriarchal consciousness.12 Lyndon Johnson's concern about the measure of a man are telling: President Lyndon B. Johnson had always been haunted by the idea the he would be judged as being insufficiently manly for the job.... He had unconsciously divided people around him between men and boys. Men were the activists, doers, who conquered business empires, who acted instead of talked, who made it in the world and had the respect of other men. Boys were the talkers and the writers and the intellectuals who sat around thinking and criticising and doubting instead of doing.... As Johnson weighed the advice he was getting on Vietnam, it was the boys who were most sceptical, and the men who were most hawkish who had Johnson's respect. Hearing that someone in the administration was becoming a dove on Vietnam, Johnson said "Hell, he has to squat to piss."13 The distancing of oneself from the war-option invites a series of disciplining cultural epithets (such as George Bush's "wimp" image) that signal the fall from the masculine. The debate around the entry of women (and gay men) into the military is driven largely by the fear that the military will be emasculated, this is, that it will lose its integrity as a masculine preserve. Joining the military is understood typically as a part of proving your manliness. Actually fighting in war is a more meaningful confirmation of one's manliness. Males that participate in war in a supportive manner are deemed to be less "manly" that the veteran soldier. Support for peace or peaceful initiatives is viewed easily as a sign of masculine deprivation. Peace is intuited as arousal disfunction.

Internal Links – Patriarchy

Dowries are a form of patriarchal violence

Perveen 6 (Rakhshinda, Executive Vice President SACHET-Pakistan, http://sachet.org.pk/home/publications/FAD\_Project\_End\_Report.pdf)JP

Contradictory to the obvious forms of gender based violence like rape, gang rape, custodial rape, acid throwing, karo Kari (“honor killing”), trafficking ,forced prostitution, child sexual abuse etc. ; Dowry as a form of violence has yet to be accepted and understood by the social activists, researchers and policy makers in Pakistan. The reasons behind this collective forgetfulness include more focused attention by mainstream NGOs and media towards donor funded campaigns and programs for eliminating barefaced forms of violence, conventional and conformist mindset of the public sectors, vested interests of the corporate sectors and inability of the donor agencies to understand the inclusive premise of marriage and dowry in Pakistan. Owing to the amalgamated uphill struggle of many NGOs, women rights activists and other non state actors the awareness level across-the-board on discriminatory laws like Huddod & Zina ordinance, Qanoone Shahadat and Qisas and Dait is quite promising. However, there is no awareness not only among masses but among the classes of those who can make a difference when it comes to the issue of absence of any law on Dowry.

Dowries are pretty bad – Laundry List

Perveen 6 (Rakhshinda, Executive Vice President SACHET-Pakistan, http://sachet.org.pk/home/publications/FAD\_Project\_End\_Report.pdf) JP

Dowry System causes a number of psychological and emotional traumas and ethical challenges by causing delayed marriages, marriage with inept person/elderly person, threats, taunts and torture of greedy in-laws and husband, and financial crises. In some parts of Pakistan, girls are wed with Quraan so that family wealth and property can be safeguarded. It is almost imperative for Pakistani women as sisters to give up their inheritance rights in favor of their brothers. Dowry and expenses on marriage are frequently used explanations for the denial of right of inheritance to women.

Dowries are a subtle form of patriarchy

Rehman 9 (Farehia, writer for The Nation, http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Regional/Regional/12-Feb-2009/Call-to-fight-against-dowry) JP

ISLAMABAD - To mark the National Women Day, civil society activists on Wednesday held a consultative meeting with special focus to stimulate public to think about the institution and practice of dowry and recognising the progress of women in the struggle for peace, equality and development. Women across Pakistan commemorate February 12 as Pakistan Women Day in remembrance of the stateâ€™s brutality against them in Lahore in 1983 to protest against the Law of Evidence, which reduces the status of a woman witness to half that of a male witness. Realising the fact that empowerment, access to equal rights and emancipation are yet only distant dreams for a vast majority of women, the civil society activists organised diverse programmes in order to recognise the achievements of Pakistani women without any discrimination on ethnic, linguistic, cultural, economic or political basis. In this connection, Society for Advancement of Community, Health, Education and Training (SACHET) organised a dialogue, which also was attended by senior development practitioners from public-private sectors and media. On the occasion, two posters and Fight Against Dowry (FAD) Planner 2009 was launched that showed the challenging the elitist consensus on dowry issues. The posters and Planner 2009 also revealed that primarily target the Pakistani intellectuals, majority of whom in their various worldly capacities have repeatedly demonstrated a strong elitism and elitist consensus that in turn is one of the many subtle faces of patriarchy, on the issues of dowry.

Internal Link – Slavery

The marriages of opium brides amount to slavery

**Starita 8** (Laura, Philanthropy Action, Apr. 7, 2008, http://www.philanthropyaction.com/nc/grim\_news\_from\_afghanistan)IM

Thus, when the lender returns for his product at the end of the growing season the farmer has no opium, opening the possibility that the lender will ask for the farmer’s daughter for his son or nephew, or even for himself. The fate of these “opium brides” is horrible. Few women in rural Afghanistan have a choice in who they marry. Some of the matches made in this way are no worse or better than other marriages, but some amount to nothing short of slavery. More than ninety percent of the world’s illegal heroin originates in Afghanistan. The heroin trade contributes to a growing drug abuse problem in Central Asia and around the world, and funds the Taliban-sponsored instability in the country. For those reasons and a host of others, eradicating poppy cultivation is, and should be, a front-line priority of US and Western policy in central Asia. Yet the US government has handled that effort with a remarkable amount of short-sightedness. Initiatives to provide Afghan farmers with alternatives to poppies have gone from non-existent, to illogically targeted to large landowners. US programs do not broadly support alternative livelihoods for farmers, nor do they provide access to markets for the goods those farmers produce—as shown in Sarah Chayes’ December, 2007 article in The Atlantic. Ms. Chayes is the founder of a company that provides such alternative livelihoods and market access, yet has given up on funding from official aid sources because of the insurmountable obstacles put in her path by US aid agencies.

These opium dowries are tantamount to slavery

Morrissey 08 (Ed, writer for Hot Air, 3/31, http://hotair.com/archives/2008/03/31/opium-brides-slavery-for-afghan-women/)IM

The poppy-eradication effort in Afghanistan will upset a very delicate economic situation, and it has to do with the complete lack of infrastructure in the war-torn country. American agriculture excels because of the many systems we have built to support it — storage, transportation, compensation, and so on. We can have produce to market in hours, and we can rotate crops and grow crops that quickly perish because we have storage systems that keep it all fresh for sale. Afghanistan has none of that. They don’t have any significant refrigeration systems, and most farmers are too poor to own their own. Roads and trucks are uncommon. Even if the farmers grew vegetables in place of poppies, they couldn’t reliably get it to market in any condition for sale — and in the winter, they could not store any excess. They would starve before the next planting season. Poppies, on the other hand, allow farmers to almost grow cash. The opium doesn’t spoil, and a good harvest acts just like cash in the bank. Farmers squirrel it away and just bring kilos to market for quick returns when needed. Opium makes the most economic sense while Afghanistan remains infrastructurally backward. Unfortunately, the eradication policies and war have created debt issues for farmers. They have sold their future crops at discounts to lenders who claim not to charge interest, as Islam requires, but who in reality have created vigorish akin to something at which a Mafia shylock might blush. When the crops fail, they get their pound of flesh — or more literally, about 100 pounds of it. This is nothing less than slavery. Families have bartered for dowries in many cultures, including those in the West, but this goes beyond that. If we want the people of Afghanistan to find stability and prosperity without opium, we have to begin by halting the slave trade and addressing the infrastructure issues of that nation.

Internal Link – Slavery

The actions of the US with regard to opium force families to sell their daughters into slavery

**Galien 8** (Michael, The Atlantic, Mar. 30 2008, http://www.theatlanticright.com/2008/03/30/the-opium-brides-of-afghanistan/)IM

Afghans call the young girls who are being sold “loan brides.” Afghanistan’s President, Hamid Karzai, has called on opium farmers not to “give their daughters for money; they shouldn’t give them to old men, and they shouldn’t give them in forced marriages.” However, for the farmers there’s no other option left: if they don’t repay their loans by selling their daughters, they’re killed. This isn’t the first time that such a situation exist, even though the American and Afghani view on opium has made matters worse: in 2000 the leader of the Taliban banned poppy growing. Then too, farmers were forced to sell their young daughters. The main question is, of course, what to do about it. We can’t let them grow poppy, we can’t let them continue to destroy the lives of many thousands of people, just to earn a living. On the other hand, the Afghan government and its US ally can’t destroy the crops either; they’re ruining many lives when they do so. It seems to me that the Afghan government, the US and other allied nations – such as the Netherlands – should repay the Afghan farmers; give them money so they can pay back their loans and they don’t have to sell their daughters. Not only that, we should also teach them how to grow other crops; they’ve got to produce other products. That means that the West has to invest bigtime in Afghan farmers, but we can’t allow the “opium brides” practice to continue. Besides, the worse the situation becomes for Afghanistan’s opium farmers, and there are quite many of them, the more likely it is that they’ll turn to the Taliban, and turn their backs on the country’s central government, let alone its Western allies.

**Internal Link – Abuse**

**Child brides are routinely beaten and abused by their husbands**

**Smith 10** (Mary, June 1 2010, http://www.newsoxy.com/world/child-brides-flogged-13260.html)IM

Child brides were flogged by their husbands in Afghanistan. The Afghan brides were flogged (lashes) after the children escaped from their local village. The brides, Khadija, 13, and Basgol, 14, were sent back to their home village where they received the lashing. The teenage brides were fleeing on a bus when the officers found them. Upon returning to their home village, they were brutally flogged for the runaway attempt. This situation is common in Afghanistan, even though marriage of girls under 16 and public flogging are both illegal. After their weddings, Khadija and Basgol complained that their husbands beat them when they tried to resist consummating the unions. Some girls have reported being routinely beaten, fed rat poison by their husbands, and forced to become suicide bombers, according to sources who have visited a shelter for escaped child brides in Kabul. Others have been killed by their fathers for fleeing their husbands. A study from the United Nations Children's Fund, (Unicef), found from 2000 to 2008, that brides in 43 percent of Afghan marriages were under 18. Even though the Afghan Constitution forbids the marriage of girls under the age of 16. Tribal customs often condone marriage once puberty is reached, or even earlier.

Impacts

Impact – Human Rights

Child brides are a violation of human rights

**NYT 9** (Sheri Stritof, Aug. 6 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/06/magazine/09BRI.html?\_r=1)IM

Poor health, early death, and lack of educational opportunities lead the list of problems attributed to child marriage. \* Child brides have a double pregnancy death rate of women in their 20s. \* In developing countries, the leading cause of death for young girls between the ages of 15 and 19 is early pregnancy. \* Additionally, from having babies too young, child brides are at an extremely high risk for fistulas (vaginal and anal ruptures). \* The babies of child brides are sicker and weaker and many do not survive childhood. \* Child brides have a higher risk of being infected with sexually transmitted diseases. \* These young girls are at an increased risk of chronic anemia and obesity. \* Child brides have poor access to contraception. \* These young girls have a lack of educational opportunities. \* Being forced into an early marriage creates a lifetime of poverty. \* Statistically, child brides have a higher risk of becoming a victim of domestic violence, sexual abuse, and murder. According to "Factsheet: Early Marriage" (page 4), a report issued by the United Nations, these early marriage unions violate the basic human rights of these girls by putting them into a life of isolation, service, lack of education, health problems, and abuse. The UNICEF paper states: UNICEF is opposed to forced marriages at any age, where the notion of consent is non-existent and the views of bride or groom are ignored, particularly when those involved are under age."

Impact – Slavery

Slavery is the ultimate form of dehumanization – both physically and psychologically

**Painter 6** (Nell, Feb. 14 2006, Oxford University Press, http://blog.oup.com/2006/02/slavery\_a\_dehum/)IM

Slaves retained their humanity thanks to the support of families and religion, which helped them resist oppression. Nonetheless, slavery was, and is, a dehumanizing institution. Assaults on the bodies and minds of the enslaved exposed them to trauma that was both physical and psychological. By the end of the eighteenth century, branding, amputation, and other extremely brutal forms of punishment became rare as means of controlling slaves. But beating continued, causing slaves’ most catastrophic physical and psychological trauma. Every ex-slave narrative includes scenes of physical torture inflicted by owners (female as well as male), overseers, and fellow slaves forced to administer their masters’ punishments. The narratives also comment on the emotional pain of parents, children, and spouses, forced to watch their kin being beaten. Artists have depicted the physical torture of slavery in countless images, such as “Slave Lynching” by Claude Clark (1915–2001). The enslaved woman’s nakedness before a crowd of onlookers adds further humiliation to the physical pain of the beating. Painter\_claudeclark\_slavelynching\_1946\_5 In addition to physical injury caused by beating, slaves suffered from the chronic conditions caused by overwork, scanty rations, and insufficient clothing. Frederick Douglass recalled going barefoot and ill clothed all winter and suffering from frostbite as a child. Stealing food to stanch constant hunger earned many a slave a whipping. Years of hard work, often in swampy conditions, left their signs within slaves’ bodies. The skeletons of enslaved children and adults working in eighteenth-century New York City bore the traces of lesions denoting excessive, repetitive stress. The remains found in the African burial ground in lower Manhattan indicate that about 50 percent of New York’s colonial Africans died before the age of twelve, and 30 to 40 percent of those children died in infancy. Many of the 40 percent of the skeletons in the burial ground belonged to preadolescent children and show the thickening of the skull associated with anemia and osteomalacia (weakening of the bones due to poor diet and nutrition). The skeletons’ enlarged muscle attachments are attributable to the heavy loads children were forced to carry. The skeletons also show signs of arthritis in the neck bones and lesions on the thighbones from muscle and ligament tears, caused by carrying heavy loads.

Dehumanization makes all impacts of nuclear war, genocide, and environmental destruction inevitable

**Berube 97** (David, prof of Speech Comm. 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 – Patriarchy

Patriarchy promotes rape, domestic violence, environmental destruction, warism, nuclear proliferation, and will culminate in extinction.

Warren and Cady 94 (Karen and Duane, Hypatia, Vol. 9, No. 2, Spring, p4-20)IM

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty belief that is okay to “rape the earth,” that it is “man’s God-given right” to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for “progress.” And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current “unmanageability” of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender-identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence towards women, which many feminist see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only though observing these dysfunctional behaviors—the symptoms of dysfunctionality—that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this “unmanageability” can be seen for what it is—as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy. The theme that global environmental crisis, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature. Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that “a militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is the first step toward reducing their impact and preserving the earth”. Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claim by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various women-nature-peace connections in regional, national and global contexts.

Impact – Patriarchy => Terrorism

Western hegemony promotes the re-inscription of patriarchal dominance and results in extremism

Lee 7 (Theresa Man Ling, author, “Rethinking the Personal and the Political: Feminist Activism and Civic Engagement” Muse) JP

Gender and social change are also behind the emergence of Islamist movements, and this distinguishes Islamist move­ments from other radical movements (especially left-wing ones). As is well known, the role, status, comportment, and couverture of women constitute a major preoccupation of Islamist movements, who claim to seek greater independence from Western hegemony via a return to a more conservative or "authentic" culture. In fact, fundamentalist movements called for veiling because Muslim women had been taking off their veils. The movements called for a return to traditional family values and female domesticity because women had been entering public space and the public sphere, which for so long had been the province of men.5 Some of the moral and gender preoccupation of fundamentalist movements is theologically rooted. Much of it, I believe, can be explained in terms of the inevitability of gender conflict at a time of ten­sion between the waning patriarchal order and the emergent feminist movement. 6 In some countries, such as in Iran im­mediately after the revolution and in Algeria during the rise of the FIS (1988-91) and the civil conflict of the 1990s, unveiled women were the targets of seriously punitive Islamist action. As mentioned above, Islamic fundamentalist movements reflect the tensions and contradictions of the transition to modernity and the conflict between traditional and modern values, norms, and social relations. Women's rights—and the conflict over the roles, rights, and privileges of men and women as well as the structure and status of the family--are at the center of this transition and this conflict. In the MENA region, governments have dealt with the Islamist threat in various ways, sometimes by accommodating fundamentalist demands and sometimes by confronting the organizations head-on. Early on, the Tunisian government confronted the an-Nanda movement and banned it while the Syrian govern­ment put down its growing Islamist movement rather vio­lently though effectively. Accommodation was initially the response of the governments of Egypt and Algeria, who conceded women's rights to the Islamist movements as a way of placating them. This concession took the form of rein­forcing the patriarchal principles of Muslim family law. Only when the Islamists took up arms against the governments, sought to overthrow them, or used violence and terror in a way that threatened the power and authority of the state, did the Egyptian and Algerian states turn on the Islamist move­ments, their leaders and members. More recently in Morocco, a (nonviolent) conflict has emerged between the socialist gov­ernment and feminists on one side and a fundamentalist movement on the other. The point of contention is a pro­posed national development plan for the advancement of women, which is bitterly opposed by Islamic fundamentalists.

Impact – Patriarchy => Root Cause of War

Patriarchy is the root cause of war

**Workman 96** (Thom, Poli Sci @ U of New Brunswick, YCISS Paper no. 31, p. 9, January 1996, http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/OP31-Workman.pdf)IM

These motifs shade into outright loathing. War may be hell indeed; but it is driven by an ideology of hatred. Misogyny is the theory; war is the practice. Myths surrounding woman as the enemy of man (and the things men do) lay at the heart of war-thought. Modern war is connotatively inseparable from the dehumanizing representations of woman. The drive "to war" is recessed within the myth of woman as man's worst enemy. Modern warfare is a relentlessly Pandoran affair. Its abundant coital imagery is organically inspired by its mysogynistic cradle. Common parlance routinely asserts that an enemy that has been consigned to ignominious defeat is an enemy that has been "thoroughly fucked" (which resonates culturally as being reduced to a woman). It has been observed that the construction of a soldier requires the killing of the woman within.17 The training of the soldier is replete with a litany of disciplining epithets regarding the feminine. The transformation from boy-recruit into man-soldier requires the extirpation of any feminine traits and identities; it demands the vanquishing of any lurking womanliness. War is femicidal. This foreshadows, moreover, the vigilance with respect to the subversive feminine being looming within the warring fabric. Soldier and policymakers guard against the association of their actions or ideas with feminine traits. Regardless of its particular manifestation or definition of a practice, ritual, or goal linked to militaries and to battle, the ideology of war requires a strict, unrelenting overcoming of anything understood as womanly. Its discourse of identity and achievement, in other words, repudiates and disavows the feminine as much as it is embraces the masculine. This mysogynistic reflex undergirds the representation of opponents (on the war front and the "home" front) as women. Those opposing war routinely are dismissed in feminine terms, as being too emotional, too sentimental, as lacking in firmness and determination, as naïve, unthoughtful, weak, confused, and, in the branding coup de grâce, as unmanly (it is commonly suspected that peaceful people or doves, after all, don't "have balls"). There is a common and essential association between women and peace, an association that has permeated a share of social activism and scholarly research. Military enemies, moreover, typically are represented as woman. Military targets, especially the ground or earth itself, also are connotatively feminized in war-think. The practice of war surfaces within gendered understandings and identities. War embodies the rehearsal of patriarchal consciousness. Numerous leaders (mainly male but occasionally female) overtly draw upon gendered understandings for policy guidance. It is this sense of war being constituted and inflected through gender that informs the claim that patriarchy lies at the root of war. Without gender it is unlikely that war would arise as such a frequent alternative in human life, and that entire societies could be so extensively militarized regardless of the costs and trade-offs involved.

Impact – Environment/Opium Nevit

America’s war on drugs is detrimental to the environment and women’s rights - makes opium growing inevitable

Lance 8 (Jennifer, staff writer, 5/7, http://redgreenandblue.org/2008/05/07/us-drug-war-policies-spur-sale-of-afghan-child/) PJ

The US Government’s Drug War has spurred many social and environmental consequences throughout the world. Widespread aerial herbicide spraying aimed at eradication has caused environmental damage from Central America to Central Asia. Recently, I learned you can add the sale of child brides in Afghanistan to the list of social ills caused by the Drug War. A bumper crop of Afghan opium was produced in 2007, which is expected to be repeated in 2008. Despite these record poppy crops, farmers are deeply in debt. The average Afghan poppy grower’s per capita income is about $300, and farmers have to borrow money for seeds, fertilizer, food, and basic necessities from traffickers. The farmers are unable to pay their debts when their crops are eradicated, or they are pressured by local governments and westerners to stop growing. Westerners don’t keep promises to provide free seeds for substitute crops, and creditors demand child wives in payment for debts. The growers’ daughters are called “opium flowers“, and moneylenders seek them out in case of crop failure or family emergency. It is a traditional Afghan custom for a family to pay off a debt by marrying a daughter to a relative of the creditor. Now the practice is being used to pay off debts to drug traffickers. Mr Isamuddin, 68, stopped growing poppies because of a government crack down; further up the valley helicopters sprayed the poppy fields with insecticide. He explained, “”If people here cannot earn enough to feed their families, they will start growing opium again.” Even though production of Afghan opium is high, world demand has not increased largely. Afghanistan is accused of stockpiling opium, and the US supports aerial spraying programs for eradication. Afghan and British officials oppose aerial spraying, as it would increase support for the Taliban for fear the herbicide would poison growers and their families. The Bush administration supports expansion of eradication programs, whereas Afghanistan wants to emphasize long-term crop substitution for opium poppy plants. One goal of the drug war is increase prices in order to deter usage, only the ones profiting from such prohibition are the drug traffickers. The farmers have tried other crops, such as wheat, but poppies bring in 10 times the amount and are hardier than grains. It is the only reliable cash crop they know. Opium growers ask for advances on their crops from the drug traffickers, which they are then unable to pay. Sayed Shah was forced to pay his debt to a trafficker with the marriage of his 9-year-old daughter. According to Newsweek: Shah borrowed $2,000 from a local trafficker, promising to repay the loan with 24 kilos of opium at harvest time. Late last spring, just before harvest, a government crop-eradication team appeared at the family’s little plot of land in Laghman province and destroyed Shah’s entire two and a half acres of poppies… “I never imagined I’d have to pay for growing opium by giving up my daughter,” says Shah…”It’s my fate,” the child says. Poppy eradication causes many Afghan daughters to be turned into child brides. Whether a farmer loses his crop to Drug War eradication or his substitute wheat crop fails, US policies should not be causing such practices to continue in Central Asia. “Until the end of my life I will feel shame because of what I did to my daughter,” said a former poppy grower. “I still can’t look her in the eye.”

Impact – Militarism

Patriarchy is the root cause of militarism and the commodification of women

**PCP 6** (People’s Charter for Peace, June 15 2006, www.networkers.org/userfiles/Peace%20Charter.pdf)IM

The links between patriarchy and war need to be emphasized. The very structure of the military is patriarchal. To galvanize to full potential the struggle against militarism, its gender-based approach has to be challenged. Since the very beginning of war, women have been considered spoils of war and, as victims, are today subsumed under the euphemistic phrase "collateral damage". The War on Terror intertwined with neo-liberal globalization has intensified exploitation and oppression of women, commodifying them, trafficking them, and thus systematically violating their dignity. The main casualties of war are women and children. The economic consequences of war are exacerbated by patriarchy. Militarization reinforces the sexual commodification of women. It also perpetuates sexual violence against women. Military occupation further degrades women.

Impact – War on Drugs

The war on drugs is waging a systematic war on women that outweighs conventional war

Mazza 6 (Brittney, PhD candidate at Rutgers U, [http://dialogues.rutgers.edu/vol\_05/essays/documents/mazza.pdf] AD: 6/28/10)JM

In addition to Davis‘s analysis, the concept of and potential for inherent and state-supported violence can also be evidenced through the prison system and through the “war on drugs” as part of a continuing culture of violence and perpetual “war.” Chris Cuomo argues that war can not be viewed as an incident that is separate or independent from society, but rather that it is essential to recognize the militaristic and violent structures and systems that shape everyday life as contributors to and forms of war. Cuomo suggests that a feminist analysis of war is particularly effective and necessary in seeing war as an ingrained and interwoven aspect of twenty-first century life, as ”part of an enmeshed continua or spectra of state-sponsored and other systemic patriarchal and racist violence” (69). The increasing growth of and reliance on the “prison-industrial complex” in the United States, and the use of a strengthened drug policy to disproportionately affect women of color are examples of a system that utilizes violence and punishment as a means of social control. Militarism in everyday life, especially when its practices and enforcement are aimed specifically toward minorities, undoubtedly impacts conceptions of race, gender and gendered relationships. The increasing reliance on and growth of the prison system in the “war on drugs” as a tool of punishment, fear and control over women and minorities most definitely qualifies as the type of “state-sponsored violence” to which Cuomo refers. The vision of war as a continuous cycle impeding upon the lives and minds of the American public will, as Cuomo suggests, make it likely that citizens will become accustomed to dualisms such as “war and peace,” “good and bad” and “right and wrong.” These black-and-white terms and ways of thinking leave little room for the gray areas of race, class and sex that are often undeniable forces in social conflicts such as the “war on drugs,” and the racist and patriarchal violence that is present in every day social institutions. Our country continues to favor legislation that is unsympathetic to the specific needs of women and mothers, and it continues to cut expenditures on social programs such as welfare while the “prison-industrial complex” engulfs the poor. In this way, the prison system is a means of violence that serves to oppress and punish an ever-increasing number of African American women, and the “war on drugs” remains a war on the black community, family and the female body.

Impact – Imperialism

U.S presence furthers imperialism which oppresses women.

Kasama 9 (Kasama, communist project for the forcible overthrow and transformation of all existing social conditions, [http://kasamaproject.org/2009/03/07/iran-call-to-oppose-womens-oppression/] AD: 6/28/10)

Women’s oppression under U.S. occupation in Afghanistan and Iraq is equally ugly and bestial. In Afghanistan, honor killing, stoning to death and forced marriage are rampant in areas under the rule of the U.S.’s Islamic Republic, as well as in areas under the Taliban. Afghanistan is run by pro-U.S. tribal chieftains, warlords and drug lords. Women cannot even show their face while walking outdoors. Since occupation of Iraq by the U.S., medieval rules of Sharia have come back to hound women, and at the same time thousands of schoolgirls have been thrown into the prostitution market in the Gulf countries, encouraged by globalization and U.S. occupation. This is how the U.S. war has “liberated” women of the Middle East. Many people in the U.S. and around the world harbor false hopes about Obama. They argue that he has promised to be “different” than the Bush regime. But in fact he has promised to pursue U.S. wars in the Middle East. Of course he takes care to call his wars “good wars.” All right! During his campaign he wasted no time encouraging Israeli attacks against Palestinians in Gaza (which came on December 27, 2008) and dubbed it “self defense.” He even used imagery of his two daughters to justify such a crime, which should be called a holocaust. Unfortunately, soon we will find out that the greedy and war-hungry Imperialist system requires and can only produce bloody and ruthless leaders. Let us be clear: We who have been in a kind of civil war with the Islamic Republic of Iran for the last 30 years are not fighting to trade one oppressor for another one. We are not fighting to liberate ourselves from the clutches of one outmoded social, ideological, political system like the IRI in order to let another outmoded system like U.S. imperialism replace it. The very workings of this system perpetuate misogyny and woman-hating religious fundamentalism in the U.S. and around the world. Nothing is a more deadly trap for the oppressed than to prefer one set of oppressors to another set of oppressors. There are no “good oppressors” vs. “bad oppressors.” We did not need GW Bush to “liberate us.” And we do not need the Obama-Hillary kiss of death! But we do need and want the support of the people living in the U.S.!

Solvency

Solvency – Discourse

The discourse we use functions to map out logics of domination and solve oppression.

Cuomo 2 (Chris, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies at the University of Cincinnati, "On Ecofeminist Philosophy", Ethics and the Environment, 7(2) 2002, Indiana University Press) PJ

Talk of a logic of domination is a way of identifiying the values embedded in culture's unjust hierarchies, and mapping the effects of such hierarchies, and such logics, is a crucial project for moral philosophv. Ecofeminists have shown that this is true because different forms of exploitation and domination are connected conceptually, but also because gender, race, class, and "nature" comingle in reality-in identities, economies, social institutions, and practices. Analyses of complex and interwoven systems of domination are therefore key to understanding social truths, and nearly any interface of nature and culture. Warren's Ecofeminist Philosophy shows that the clear and persuasive presentation of such analyses was one of the primary projects of twentieth-century ecofeminist philosophy . This project was political as well as philosophical, for to identify the hidden lines of influence and power that shape patterns of injustice and impairment is to point toward strategies for ethical engagement and improvement.

Solvency

Opium eradication forces farmers to give their daughters in place of loans – pulling out troops would stop this

Rawa News 8 (3/31, http://www.rawa.org/temp/runews/2008/03/31/afghanistan-opium-brides-pay-the-price.html) PJ

As Afghanistan battles to check growing poppy production, there thrives a disturbing trend behind the scene, where daughters of poppy producers pay the price for the unpaid loans. Termed as "opium brides", the daughters of poor poppy farmers are often given to drug traffickers if their fathers are unable to pay the loan taken for growing the illicit crop because of the official action. In a report in its upcoming issue, Newsweek takes the case of an illiterate poor farmer in Laghman Province who borrowed US$ 2000 from a local traffickers promising to pay back with 24 kilos of opium at harvest time. But officials destroyed his two and half acre poppy farm. Unable to pay, he fled but was located by the trafficker and then village elders decided that he should give his 10-year old daughter to 45-year old trafficker to settle the debt. ''It is my fate,'' she told the magazine. She had desired to be become a teacher. Afghan call these girls ''loan brides'' and their number is increasing since the opium eradication programme began. The practice, explains the magazine, began with the dowry a bridegroom's family traditionally pays to the bride's father in tribal Pashtun society. These days the amount ranges from US$3000 or so in poorer places like Laghman and Nangarhar to US$8000 or more in Helmand, Afghanistan's No 1 opium-growing province. All the same, local farmers were quoted as saying that a man can get killed for failing to repay a loan. No one, the magazine says, knows how many debt weddings take place in Afghanistan, where 93 per cent of the world's heroin originates. But Afghans say the number of loan brides keeps rising as poppy-eradication efforts push more farmers into default. "This will be our darkest year since 2000," says Baz Mohammad, 65-year old former opium farmer in Nangarhar was quoted as saying. ''Even more daughters will be sold this year.'' The old man lives with the anguish of selling his own 13-year-old daughter in 2000, after Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed Omar banned poppy growing. "Lenders never show any mercy," he said. The local farmers are quoted by Newsweek as saying more than one debtor has been bound hand and foot, then locked into a small windowless room with a smoldering fire, slowly choking to death. While law enforcers predict yet another record opium harvest in Afghanistan this spring, the magazine says most farmers are struggling to survive. An estimated 500,000 Afghan families support themselves by raising poppies, according to the UN Office on Drugs and Crime. Last year, those growers received an estimated USD one billion for their cropsabout USD 2,000 per household. With at least six members in the average family, opium growers' per capita income is roughly US$ 300. The real profits go to the traffickers, their Taliban allies and the crooked officials who help them operate.

Solvency

U.S presence hurts Afghani women

Friedman 9(Ann, deputy editor of The American Prospect, [http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=listening\_to\_afghanistan] AD: 6/28/10)JM

In the spring of 2008 I wrote a column, "Listening to Iraq," in which I lamented the lack of access that most Americans had to the voices and opinions of the people most affected by the ongoing war. This made it difficult, I wrote, "for even the best-intentioned anti-war American to see Iraqis as partners, rather than as a political project." I was reminded of that column after Obama's speech announcing his Afghanistan strategy, In it, he declared, "For the Afghan people, a return to Taliban rule would condemn their country to brutal governance, international isolation, a paralyzed economy, and the denial of basic human rights to the Afghan people -- especially women and girls." But he made very clear that he does not see our involvement in Afghanistan as a humanitarian mission. As the American left debates, I'm struck by a desire to know what Afghan women, who have been living under the U.S. occupation for roughly eight years now, think would be best for their country. The Afghan politician and activist Malalai Joya has warned that "Obama's military buildup will only bring more suffering and death to innocent civilians." Another woman, who goes by the pseudonym Zoya, has appeared in various U.S. media calling for "withdrawal of the troops immediately." She is a member of the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan, a Kabul-based political group that has fought for human rights and social justice since 1977. And Sakena Yacoobi, who founded a network of underground schools for Afghan women and girls, says "most foreign troops are not primarily focused on protecting women and children. Their focus is on beating the enemy, which is very different, and ordinary citizens become collateral damage in the process." At least Obama and Yacoobi are in agreement: This mission is not about human rights and democracy. It's about defeating an enemy. Admittedly, three women do not make for a comprehensive survey of Afghan civilians' attitudes. Still, I can't help but notice how the opinions of these activists, who are all based in Afghanistan, diverge from those of U.S.?based advocates who are clamoring for continued military involvement on behalf of Afghan women. Rather than focusing on Obama's own words on the subject or examining the lessons learned during the past eight years of occupation (namely that women's rights are not a priority for the U.S. military or the Afghan government it supports), they seem to believe activists can convince the president to make this war about human rights. "When I think of why the U.S. and the world have a moral obligation to the reconstruction of Afghanistan, women are the central issue," Sunita Viswanath, who founded Women for Afghan Women in New York in 2001, recently told my former colleague Dana Goldstein at The Daily Beast. Other non-Afghan leaders, such as Feminist Majority Foundation president Eleanor Smeal, also support continued U.S. involvement. This debate among people committed to women's rights is as old as the war. Two months after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, first lady Laura Bush used the president's weekly radio address to cite the rights of Afghan women as a primary reason for invasion. While this was roundly derided as rank hypocrisy from an administration that only paid lip service to women's rights when there was a war to sell, many feminists were happy to see light shed on the plight of women living under the Taliban. Some remained staunchly anti-war, where others went so far as to cheer the invasion. Eight years later, the consensus is that the current regime has not been markedly better for women than the former Taliban rulers were -- especially outside of Kabul. President Hamid Karzai signed a law this summer that legalized marital rape and required women to get permission from their husbands to work. In November UNICEF declared Afghanistan the worst country in the world in which to be born. Women and girls still face daily oppression and epidemic levels of violence. The difference between the pro-intervention feminists like Viswanath and Smeal and the pro-withdrawal Afghan women like Joya, Zoya, and Yacoobi is not their level of commitment to women's rights. It's their faith in military intervention as a means of securing them. As Prospect senior correspondent Michelle Goldberg put it recently, one's view of whether a continued U.S. presence in Afghanistan will improve the situation for women "depends on whether one believes that the American military can be a force for humanitarianism." To me, the answer is tragically apparent: It doesn't matter whether U.S. military intervention can be a force for humanitarianism because, in Afghanistan, it never has been and won't become one.

Solvency

The US’s failing “war on drugs” in Afghanistan only prolongs structural violence against women in Afghanistan.

Ayotte and Hussain 5(Dr. Kevin California State University, Fresno Department of Communication and Mary  Lecturer in the Department of Communication at the California State University “Securing Afghan Women: Neocolonialism, Epistemic Violence, and the Rhetoric of the Veil” NWSA Journal)AQB

One of the most important advances in the history of feminism was the recognition of structural violence against women as(is) a significant aspect of gender oppression. Structural violence includes the myriad material harms done to women through inadequate education and health care, exploitative employment conditions, endemic poverty, and other conditions that inflict damage on lives without the brute immediacy of physical violence. The analysis of structural violence is vital because it accounts for disadvantages that shorten or degrade women's lives and traces the sometimes convoluted causes to social, political, and economic structures. Rather than allowing these conditions to remain unexamined as a neutral part of the landscape, attention to structural violence imputes agency, and hence responsibility, to social, political, and economic actors for the maintenance of structural conditions that harm women. Women in Afghanistan were subjected to structural violence long before, as well as during, the Taliban regime. Although the U.S. government certainly made use of representations of structural violence against Afghan women, the epistemic violence done to Afghan women by the homogenized, neocolonial, and paternalistic rhetoric of the veil short-circuited any reflexive recognition of U.S. contributions to that self-same structural violence. As Abu-Lughod puts it, framing the oppression of women in Afghanistan as a problem caused solely by the Taliban's ruthless twisting of religion and culture "prevented the serious exploration of the roots and nature of human suffering in this part of the world" while "recreating an imaginative geography of West versus East, us versus Muslims" (2002, 784). Although arguably performed by every decontextualized image of a burqa-shrouded Afghan woman, Laura Bush's radio address exemplifies the erasure of history with the reduction of women's structural oppression in Afghanistan to "the central goal of the terrorists." To the extent that the Taliban, and even bin Laden himself, sprang from the U.S.-supported Mujahadeen, the absence of such history makes it possible to identify structural violence against Afghan women without achieving the reflexive recognition of U.S. complicity in maintaining those very structures. RAWA has noted, for instance, that in 2000 the United States gave $43 million to the Taliban for reducing opium production as part of the "war on drugs" (Rawi 2004).

2ACs AT

A2: Hegemony Solves

Empirically denied – the US led invasions was premised off emancipation and has only caused more harm for women

Rawa News 8 (5/27, http://www.rawa.org/temp/runews/2008/05/27/alarming-rise-of-suicides-among-afghan-women\_9375.html) PJ

Greater freedom for the women of Afghanistan was one of the promises of the 2001 U.S.-led invasion. U.S. and Afghan officials say there have been significant improvements, noting that some two million women and girls are now attending school, something that was forbidden under the extremist Taliban government. But despite Western efforts, many Afghan women say their lives have not improved significantly and an increasing number of women are committing suicide by burning themselves to death as a way to escape physical, sexual and psychological abuse. Mandy Clark reports from Kabul. Badly burnt and barely alive in a shabby Kabul hospital, a 15 year old girl lies in agony. The burn unit surgeon, Dr. Sarwani Sahab says these types of injuries are becoming more common among young Afghan women. "In Afghanistan, young girls, maybe from 18 to 35, is a big problem for self-burning here," said Dr. Sahab. The girl is from Kandahar province and insists she was burnt by a lantern but doctors believe it was a failed suicide attempt. They say her chance of survival is 50-50. This young girl's story is becoming increasingly common. An Afghan women rights group say that last year, almost 500 women chose death or disfigurement to a life of despair by setting themselves on fire to escape forced marriages, slavery or sexual and other types of abuse. For those who live through this form of suicide attempt, the scarring can be a death sentence in itself. The survivors who leave this ward cannot return home because of the shame they brought on their family. Some will live the rest of their lives on the streets or if they're lucky, they may find a safe house. There are other women who brave the wrath of society and try to help these young burn victims. Many risk their own lives to do so. Political activist, Malalai Joya is one of them and agreed to speak with VOA. She was elected as a member of the Afghan parliament in 2005 but was kicked out of government. She says it was because of her views. Security around Joya is tight, it has to be; she has survived four assassination attempts because of her fight for women's rights. "They burn themselves in many cases because they prefer to die than have this hell life," Joya. "It is so sad for me, it is impossible, I cannot find the words to show, to express my suffer, my sadness." But her work is having an impact. Razia is another burn victim. Razia gives only her first name. She says her failed suicide bid bought her freedom. She tells how a warlord from her village threatened to kill her if she did not allow him to marry her 13-year-old daughter. As a war widow, she had no one to protect her. Razia says she hoped if she died, an orphanage would take in her children. But she survived. A women's group found her in the hospital and offered her and her children a safe house. She says she was dead at that time, but God gave her a new life. Afghan officials are quick to point out that women now do have greater freedom and opportunities since the fall of the extremist Taliban regime. They say some two million women and girls are now getting an education - something that was forbidden under the Taliban. But, women's rights advocate Palwasha Hassan says not enough work has been done to help Afghan women. However, she says people should not lose heart. "I think we cannot lose this opportunity and say 'ok, in Afghanistan nothing can be changed because we have a traditional system and this and that.' You have to start from where you can so if this is the opportunity, it should not be missed," said Hassan. Abuse against women and suicide attempts to escape it are all too frequent problems in the strict traditional societies of South Asia and the Middle East. But, in Afghanistan, the ouster of the Taliban regime was supposed to change that. Many Afghan women are still waiting for that to happen.

2AC – AT: DAs – Cuomo

Focus on war as an event marginalizes the ongoing wars on the individual level and perpetuates violence

Cuomo 96 (Chris J, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, “War is not just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence” Jstor)

Philosophical attention to war has typically appeared in the form of justifi­cations for entering into war, and over appropriate activities within war. The spatial metaphors used to refer to war as a separate, bounded sphere indicate assumptions that war is a realm of human activity vastly removed from normal life, or a sort of happening that is appropriately conceived apart from everyday events in peaceful times. Not surprisingly, most discussions of the political and ethical dimensions of war discuss war solely as an event-an occurrence, or collection of occurrences, having clear beginnings and endings that are typi­cally marked by formal, institutional declarations. As happenings, wars and military activities can be seen as motivated by identifiable, if complex, inten­tions, and directly enacted by individual and collective decision-makers and agents of states. But many of the questions about war that are of interest to feminists—including how large-scale, state-sponsored violence affects women and members of other oppressed groups; how military violence shapes gen­dered, raced, and nationalistic political realities and moral imaginations; what such violence consists of and why it persists; how it is related to other oppressive and violent institutions and hegemonies—cannot be adequately pursued by focusing on events. These issues are not merely a matter of good or bad intentions and identifiable decisions.

This marginalization of individual wars makes peace impossible and war inevitable

Cuomo 96 (Chris J, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, “War is not just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence” Jstor)

Peach states that one of the problems with nonfeminist critiques of war is their failure to address the fact that "women remain largely absent from ethical and policy debates regarding when to go to war, how to fight a war, and whether resorting to war is morally justifiable" (Peach 1994, 152). But a just-war approach cannot successfully theorize women's roles in these events because formal, declared wars depend upon underlying militaristic assump­tions and constructions of gender that make women's participation as leaders nearly impossible. The limitations of Peach's analysis make clear some aspects of the relation­ships between peacetime militarism and armed conflicts that cannot be addressed by even feminist just-war principles. Her five criticisms of just-war theory, discussed below, are intended to both echo and revise appraisals made by other feminists. But each fails to successfully address the complexity of feminist concerns. Peach finds just-war theory's reliance on realism, the notion that human nature makes war inevitable and unavoidable, to be problem­atic. She believes just-war theory should not be premised on realist assumptions, and that it should also avoid "unduly unrealistic appraisals" of human and female nature, as found in Ruddick's work. Peach rightly identifies the pessimism, sexism, essentialism, and universal­ism at work in just-war theorists' conceptions of human nature. Nonetheless, she fails to see that just-war theorists employ ossified concepts of both "human nature" and "war." Any interrogation of the relationships between war and "human nature," or more benignly, understandings and enactments of what it means to be diverse human agents in various contexts, will be terribly limited insofar as they consider wars to be isolated events. Questions concerning the relationships between war and "human nature" become far more complex if we reject a conception of war that focuses only on events, and abandon any pretense of arriving at universalist conceptions of human or female "nature." Feminist ethical questions about war are not reducible to wondering how to avoid large-scale military conflict despite human tendencies toward violence. Instead, the central questions concern the omnipresence of militarism, the possibilities of making its presence visible, and the potential for resistance to its physical and hegeinonic force. Like "solutions" to the preponderance of violence perpetrated by men against women that fail to analyze and articulate relationships between everyday violence and institutionalized or invisible systems of patriarchal, racist, and economic oppression, analyses that charac­terize eruptions of military violence as isolated, persistent events, are practi­cally and theoretically insufficient.

2AC – AT: Nuke DAs

Representations of catastrophic nuclear war marginalize the reality of nuclear wars that are waged on Indigenous peoples and the Fourth World

Kato 93 (Masahide, professor of political science at the University of Hawaii, “Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze” p.347-348)

Let us recall our earlier discussion about the critical historical conjuncture where the notion of "strategy" changed its nature and became deregulated/dispersed beyond the boundaries set by the *interimperial rivalry*. Herein, *the perception of the ultimate means of destruction can be historically contextualized.* The only instances of real nuclear catastrophe perceived and thus given due recognition by the First World community are the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which occurred at this conjuncture. Beyond this historical threshold, whose meaning is relevant only to the interimperial rivalry, the nuclear catastrophe is confined to the realm of fantasy, for instance, apocalyptic imagery. And yet how can one deny the crude fact that nuclear war has been taking place on this earth in the name of "nuclear testing" since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in 1945? As of 1991, 1,924 nuclear explosions have occurred on earth.28 The major perpetrators of nuclear warfare are the United States (936 times), the former Soviet Union (715 times), France (192 times), the United Kingdom (44 times), and China (36 times)." The primary targets of warfare ("test site" to use Nuke Speak terminology) have been invariably the sovereign nations of Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. Thus history has already witnessed the nuclear wars against the Marshall Islands (66 times), French Polynesia (175 times), Australian Aborigines (9 times), Newe Sogobia (the Western Shoshone Nation) (814 times), the Christmas Islands (24 times), Hawaii (Kalama Island, also known as Johnston Island) (12 times), the Republic of Kazakhstan (467 times), and Uighur (Xinjian Province, China) (36 times)." Moreover, although I focus primarily on "nuclear tests" in this article, if we are to expand the notion of nuclear warfare to include any kind of violence accrued from the nuclear fuel cycle (particularly uranium mining and disposition of nuclear wastes), we must enlist Japan and the European nations as perpetrators and add the Navaho, Havasupai and other Indigenous Nations to the list of targets. Viewed as a whole, nuclear war, albeit undeclared, has been waged against the Fourth World, and Indigenous Nations.

2AC – AT: Heg DAs

Promotion of hegemony is the promotion of waging total war against the Other

Badiou 2 (Alain, Professor of Philosophy at the International College of Philosophy in Paris, “Considerations of some recent facts”)

My thesis is that, in the formal representation it makes of itself, the American imperial power privileges the form of war as an attestation - the only one - of its existence. Moreover, one observes today that the powerful subjective unity that cames (away) the Americans in their desire for vengeance and war is constructed immediately around the flag and the army. The United States has become a hegemonic power in and through war: from the civil war, called the war of Secession (the first modem war by its industrial means and the number of deaths); then the two World Wars; and finally the uninterrupted continuation of local wars and military interventions of all kinds since the Korean War up until the present ransacking of Afghanistan, passing via Lebanon, the Bay of Pigs, Vietnam, Libya, Panama, Barbados, the Gulf War, and Serbia, not to mention their persistent support for Israel in its war without end against the Palestinians. Of course, one will hasten to add that the US won the day in the Cold War against the USSR on the terrain of military rivalry (Reagan’s Star Wars project pushed the Russians to throw in the towel) and are understood to be doing the same tbing against China by the imposition of an exhausting armament race (that is the only sense of the pharaoh-like anti-missile shield project) by means of which one hopes to discourage any project of great magnitude. This should remind us, in these times of economic obsession that in the last instance power continues to be military. Even the USSR, albeit it ruined insofar as it was considered as an important military power (and above all by the Americans), continued to co-direct the world. Today the US has the monopoly on the aggressive financial backing of enormous forces of destruction, and does not hesitate to serve itself with them And the consequences of that can be seen, including (notably) in the idea that the American people has of itself and of what must be done. Let’s hope that the Europeans ~ and the Chinese - draw the imperative lesson from the situation: servitude is promised to those who do not watch carefully over their m e d forces. Being forged in this way out of the continual barbarity of war - leaving aside the genocide of the Indians and the importation of tens of millions of black slaves - the US quite naturally considers that the only riposte worthy of them is a spectacular staging of power. Truly speaking, the adversary matters little and may be entirely removed from the initial crime. The pure capacity to destroy this or that will do the job, even if at the end what is left is a few thousand miserable devils or a phantomatic “government.” Provided, in sum, that the appearance of victory is overwhelming, any war is convenient. What we have here (and will also have if the US continues in Somalia and in Iraq etc.) is war as pure form, as the theatrical capture of an adversary (“Terrorism”) in its essence vague and elusive. The war against nothing; itself removed from the very idea of war.

2AC – AT: Environment DAs

Their impacts obsession with ecological “horror story” is flawed – it normalizes the idea that we only need to save nature when catastrophe looms.

Doremus 00 (Holly, professor of Law at UC Davis, "The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature

Protection: Toward a new Discourse,” pg. 51)

Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. n212 Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, n213 the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. n214 Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. n215 One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. n216 But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse. n217

2AC – AT: Disease DAs

Depictions of threatening diseases devalue life and create a form of stigmatization and surveillance

Vaz and Bruno 05 (Paulo, scholar at the department of communications at Chicago, and works at the institute of psychology at the University of Rio de Janiero, “Types of Self-Surveillence: from Abnormality to Individuals at Risk”)

Risk factor epidemiology and the progress in medical testing are in fact generalizing the concept of the risky self – the ‘patients before their time’. We are all virtual carriers of some illness because of our predispositions and our life habits. Hence, because we believe in a possibility, we should all behave as if we were ill, while we are not yet so, nor may we ever be from the specific diseases/illness we fight against. The generalization of the risky self provokes the emergence of a new relation between past and future. Human genetic mapping and life habits make it possible to anticipate, among the countless illnesses/diseases that may affect an individual and among the multiple ways of dying, those that are more probable, as well as the means we may dispose of to avoid their emergence. In presenting itself as anticipation of accidents and turbulences that may abbreviate our journey in this world, this scientifically defined possible determines limitations to be observed in the present. Life now depends on knowing how to behave in the distance between everything that may happen and what is more probable of happening; it depends on the restriction of possibilities – and not upon their invention and posterior realization. The aims of human action have indeed changed since the time in which terms such as progress, revolution, liberation, or even cure organized the sense of the future. Care and history It is difficult to sustain a critical stance when associating care and surveillance. How can one question the care of the self if carelessness is not an alternative to constitute oneself as a subject? An answer to this difficulty is that there are historically diverse ways of defining the care of the self. Although every one of them implies an opening up of the future, each one is limited. “Our possibilities, although inexhaustible, are also bounded” (Hacking, 2002: 107). As one way of care emerges, it relegates others to historical forgetting. Certain ways of being a subject become historical impossibilities. Besides, each form of the care of the self has its own limits. We have argued that the limits in our way of caring are related to the status of the future. The future as risk functions, in reality, as a restriction to what can be done in the present and it may signify the disappearance of the future as an alterity to the present. The longing for a different life and even the belief in its possibility might be lost in the vicious circle produced by hedonism and security. One last remark. Our form of caring may also be a way of not comprehending others. The historical make up of the prudent individual may sustain the acceptance that others must be surveilled or even excluded from society. After all, we may think of them as putting others at risk because they are careless with themselves. One lesson that Foucault left in diverse books is that the mixture of the care of others and the belief in ‘truth’, be it religious or scientific, is really a dangerous thing.

2AC – AT: Terrorism DAs

Threats of terrorism are fabricated by elites to pursue war, further the use of body count impact calculus is rooted in the same mentality that promotes prolonging war

Misencik 9(James, Master of Arts in International Relations at Bond University, http://www.uslaboragainstwar.org/article.php?id=20250)

**D**espite the mainstream media's portrayal, there is increasing congressional dissent over the "war" which was unheard of in recent years. While the latest war funding bill ultimately passed the House, it was threatened by Republican opposition along with a record 32 Democrats. The executive branch, vigilant in pursuit of its foreign wars, recognizes this as a major threat to its regional plans. Further, some squarely within the mainstream have begun to take issue with the war in Afghanistan. Regarding the often repeated idea that Afghanistan will once again provide a base for al Qaeda terrorists, Ohio State Professor John Mueller states, "This argument is constantly repeated but rarely examined; given the costs and risks associated with the Obama administration's plans for the region, it is time such statements be given the scrutiny they deserve.... The very notion that al Qaeda needs a secure geographic base to carry out its terrorist operations, moreover, is questionable. After all, the operational base for 9/11 was in Hamburg, Germany. Conspiracies involving small numbers of people require communication, money, and planning—but not a major protected base camp." Al Qaeda consists of a few hundred individuals occasionally helping the Taliban. Mueller concludes that this activity "scarcely suggests that 'the safety of people around the world is at stake,' as Obama dramatically puts it." Furthermore, despite well-publicized 2002 reports to the contrary, the FBI has failed to uncover a single true al Qaeda sleeper cell or operative in the U.S. T he war in Afghanistan was designed by elites, for elites, and packaged under the benvolent-sounding puruist of the U.S. national interest. However, Americans are becoming weary of the Global War on Terror and its manifestation in Afghanistan. As Defense Secretary Robert Gates recently conceded, "American public support for the Afghan war will dissipate in less than a year unless the Obama administration achieves 'a perceptible shift in momentum'" (Dreazen and Cole, "Gates Says Taliban Have Momentum in Afghanistan," WSJ, 5/26/09). He has further elaborated that the initiative is with the Taliban who control major portions of the country and will continue to inflict increasing numbers of U.S. casualties throughout 2010. But plans to achieve this perceptible shift include deploying an additional 21,000 U.S. military personnel, known popularly as the "Afghan surge." Other ploys have included the firing of commanding General David McKiernan without specific cause, a move that drew the consternation of top generals, and publicizing Vietnam-era style body counts, in which the public is dosed with quantifiable measures of "success." The aptly titled article "Army Deploys Old Tactic in PR War" reports that, "U.S. officers say they've embraced body counts to undermine insurgent propaganda, and stiffen the resolve of the American public." A spokesperson for the 101st Airborne Division further clarifies the intent, "It's a concern that at home, the common perception is this war is being lost" (Phillips, WSJ, 6/1/09). In the Vietnam War, body counts became the one and only measure of "success." Now, body counts are being used in Afghanistan to an extent not seen since the practice fell into disrepute. But a cursory understanding of counterinsurgency warfare reveals that body counts have nothing to do with defeating an insurgency. Since the enemy already knows how many of their soldiers have died, body counts are instead a technique for controlling domestic thought. In fact, military officers worry that their use ostracizes the population which they are trying to control, thereby strengthening the insurgency.

2AC – AT: T

1. Silencing is the worst form of propaganda, their attempts to shift the discussion from women to topicality is no better than masculine propaganda.

Huckin 2 (Thomas prof at the University of Utah “Textual silence and the discourse of homelessness” http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/13/3/347)AQB

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but greater still, from a practical standpoint, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals.’ These comments by Aldous Huxley in his 1946 foreword to Brave New World underscore the power of silence to affect communication. Traditionally, discourse analysts have tended to ignore such silences, preferring instead to focus on the words, phrases, clauses and other linguistic elements that constitute the surface of text and talk. Brown and Yule’s (1983) definition of discourse analysis is illustrative: ‘We examine how humans use language to communicate and, in particular, how addressers construct linguistic messages for addressees and how addressees work on linguistic messages in order to interpret them’ (1983: ix, emphasis added). Yet any practicing discourse analyst will readily acknowledge that communication involves more than just the linguistic markers used to encode it – that often what is not said or written can be as important, if not more so, than what is. As Stuart Hall (1985) has noted, ‘Positively marked terms “signify” because of their position in relation to what is absent, unmarked, the unspoken, the unsayable. Meaning is relational within an ideological system of presences and absences’.

2. The neg’s attempt to omit women from the world of international relations plays into and justifies ongoing masculine dominance.

Sjoberg 7 (Laura, PhD and visting professor at Duke University, 2/13, http://www.genderandsecurity.umb.edu/Laura%20Sjoberg%20-%202\_13\_07.pdf)

The search for feminist knowledge can be seen as a journey to understand and change the world through “gendered lenses.” In feminist research, I am looking to understand international politics, to find its injustices, and to challenge those injustices, while recognizing a pluralism concerning the definition and appraisal of injustice. As Ann Tickner points out, this makes feminist method not an event, but a journey – a journey that I take through observation, critique, revealing, reformulation, reflexivity, and action, guided by gendered lenses. We will start with individual gender. Feminists in IR frequently go out of their way to *look for* *women* in global politics. Women are necessarily a part of global politics: they make up more than half the world’s population and are located everywhere that men are. Yet, the stories of global politics often do not mention the women whose lives affect and are affected by international relations. The histories or Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, and Israel are contentious. Political convictions influence the stories that people tell of Middle East relations since the end of the First World War. Some speak of Israel’s fight to survive in a region that threatens to replicate the Holocaust. Others recount the oppression of the Arab Middle East by rich and powerful outsiders, in Israel and abroad. These stories from diverse political perspectives perhaps share nothing but their tendency to omit women. Women are largely omitted from the histories of the First Gulf War. Where women are mentioned, it is normally in the context of either their need for protection or a human interest story on the oddity of women in participatory roles. The stories of women that were told in the First Gulf War (when they were told at all) were of innocent women in need of protection or feminine emulation of masculine military values. Telling the stories that remain untold in traditional histories is one of feminisms’ strongest tools. Feminisms look to politics at the margins to find women - to see realities about their lives, their actions, and their suffering. Speaking about women’s lives makes it more difficult to ignore them.

**2AC – AT: T**

3. Weigh Discourse before claims of education or fairness - Discourse is intrinsic with policy making - the way a policy is represented determines the way it functions.

Bleiker 2k (Roland, Ph.D. visiting research and teaching affiliations at Harvard, Cambridge Popular “Dissent, Human Agency and Global Politics”) PJ

Language is one of the most fundamental aspects of human life. It is omnipresent. It penetrates every aspect of transversal politics, from the local to the global. We speak, Heidegger stresses, when we are awake and when we are asleep, even when we do not utter a single word. We speak when we listen, read or silently pursue an occupation. We are always speaking because we cannot think without language, because 'language is the house of Being', the home within which we dwell. [2](http://www.questia.com/reader/action/next/105471279#2) But languages are never neutral. They embody particular values and ideas. They are an integral part of transversal power relations and of global politics in general. Languages impose sets of assumptions on us, frame our thoughts so subtly that we are mostly unaware of the systems of exclusion that are being entrenched through this process. And yet, a language is not just a form of domination that engulfs the speaker in a web of discursive constraints, it is also a terrain of dissent, one that is not bound by the political logic of national boundaries. Language is itself a form of action — the place where possibilities for social change emerge, where values are slowly transformed, where individuals carve out thinking space and engage in everyday forms of resistance. In short, language epitomises the potential and limits of discursive forms of transversal dissent.

4. Cross apply all the impacts from the 1AC, their subjugation of women is another example of masculine identity the aff resists.

5. The neg’s impacts to T are inevitable when they omit women from international politics. Their so called loss of knowledge is meaningless because it is riddled with Masculine discourse that integrates oppression into society.

1AR – EXT - Education

Notions of knowledge are rooted in masculine ideals of what is wrong and right excluding women.

Stopler 8 (Gola, Assistant Professor, Academic Center of Law & Business "A Rank Usurpation of Power" The Role of Patriarchal Religion and Culture in the Subordination of Women”, August, 15 Duke J. Gender L. & Pol'y 365, Lexis)

B. The Control of Knowledge and Paternalistic Dominance as Key Elements of the Hegemony of Patriarchy and Patriarchal Religion 1. Control of Knowledge One of Foucault's most important insights is that power operates by forming knowledge and producing discourses that define and legitimate its operation. Men's monopoly over defining, determining, and interpreting truth [\*378] and knowledge perpetuates the hegemony of patriarchy and maintains men's control over women. Nowhere is the structure of patriarchy more evident than in patriarchal religions, which are built on two pillars of control - men's control over truth and knowledge, which ensures their control over women, and men's control over women's sexuality and reproductive capacity. The considerable influence of patriarchal religions in liberal democratic societies also manifests itself along these same two pillars of control. In the United States this is demonstrated very well in the abortion controversy. The "knowledge" that life begins at conception not only serves to prevent women within some patriarchal religions from having abortions, but when allegedly severed from its religious origins and presented as socio-cultural "knowledge," this "knowledge" also serves to justify legal restrictions on abortions imposed by the secular state. n95 The control of women's reproductive ability and the division of labor attached to it has been crucial in maintaining men's control of knowledge. Throughout history men have left themselves free to control culture by relegating most tasks of domestic production and reproduction to women. n96 Based on their procreative abilities, women have been assigned to perform all of the domestic work, leaving men free to engage in cultural and religious definitions that justify and normalize this division of labor. Accordingly, women's procreativity and sexuality have served as the basis for creating the hegemony of patriarchy by excluding women from the creation of religion and culture and by turning them from persons into property. These exclusions enable the proprietor (father/husband) to exploit their labor, fail to remunerate it, and declare it non existent and insignificant while still relying on it as the indispensable basis for his own achievements. n97 Patriarchal religions are not alone in using male domination of knowledge and truth to control women's sexuality and reproductive rights. As Betty Friedan shows in her classic book The Feminine Mystique, scientific, psychological, and cultural male-generated "truths" have served, as late as the second half of the twentieth century, to reduce women to the role of complacent, procreative machines. n98 The hegemony of patriarchy is subsequently maintained through mutually reaffirming religious, cultural, and scientific knowledge and discourses. Although the control over knowledge and truth formation in most disciplines and institutions in many liberal states is still largely in the hands of men, most liberal states are at least formally committed to rectifying the situation and achieving equality within these institutions. But, the opposite is true with regard to religion, whereby liberal states are committed to protecting the right of religious patriarchs to preserve their own hegemony by invoking concepts such as freedom of religion and freedom of association, autonomy, and toleration

.

\*\*Case Neg\*\*

A2: Solvency

Opium addiction affects many women in Afghanistan, abandoning the war on drugs leaves them in a cycle of drug abuse.

Vogt 6/22/10(Heidi writer for the Herald Sun, “Afghan opiate use doubled in five years”)AQB

KABUL, Afghanistan -- Drug addicts as young as a month old. Mothers who calm their children by blowing opium smoke in their faces. Whole communities hooked on heroin with few opportunities for treatment. Use of opiates such as heroin and opium has doubled in Afghanistan in the last five years, the U.N. said Monday, as hundreds of thousands of Afghans turn to drugs to escape the misery of poverty and war. Nearly 3 percent of Afghans aged 15 to 64 are addicted to opiates, according to a study by the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. The U.N. defines addicts as regular users. That puts Afghanistan, along with Russia and Iran, as the top three countries for opiate drug use worldwide, according to Sarah Waller, an official of the U.N.'s drug office in Kabul. She said a 2005 survey found about 1.4 percent of Afghan adults were opiate addicts. The data suggest that even as the U.S. and its allies pour billions of dollars into programs to try to wean the Afghan economy off of drug money, opium and heroin have become more entrenched in the lives of ordinary Afghans. That creates yet another barrier to international efforts to combat the drug trade, which helps pay for the Taliban insurgency. "The human face of Afghanistan's drug problem is not only seen on the streets of Moscow, London or Paris. It is in the eyes of its own citizens, dependent on a daily dose of opium and heroin above all -- but also cannabis, painkillers and tranquilizers," said Antonio Maria Costa, executive director of the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. Afghanistan supplies 90 percent of the world's opium, the main ingredient in heroin, and is the global leader in hashish production. Drug crops have helped finance insurgents and encourage corruption, particularly in the south where the Taliban control cultivation of opium poppies and smuggling routes. The Afghan government and its international backers have made a massive effort in recent years to discourage farmers from growing opium poppy, and its cultivation dropped 22 percent last year. Some of the drop is likely due to lower market prices, but the government has said it also shows that the Afghan war on drugs is having some success. Twenty of the country's 34 provinces were declared poppy-free in 2009. Yet almost 1 million Afghans -- 8 percent of the 15 to 64 age group -- are regular drug users -- addicted to opiates, as well as cannabis and tranquilizers, according to the report, which was based on surveys of about 2,500 drug users, community leaders, teachers and doctors.

Abandoning the war on drugs leaves women at the mercy of warlords.

UNODC 3(United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime “THE OPIUM ECONOMY IN AFGHANISTAN”)AQB

There are no simple answers to these questions. The opium economy of Afghanistan is an intensely complex phenomenon. In the past, it reached deeply into the political structure, civil society and economy of the country. Spawned after decades of civil and military strife, it has chained a poor rural population – farmers, landless labour, small traders, women and children - to the mercy of domestic warlords and international crime syndicates that continue to dominate several areas in the south, north and east of the country. Dismantling the opium economy will be a long and complex process. It cannot simply be done by military or authoritarian means. That has been tried in the past, and was unsustainable. It must be done with the instruments of democracy, the rule of law, and development.

A2: Solvency

Women cannot be re-integrated into Afghan society until women aren’t used as a cheap source of labor in opium fields.

UNODC 3(United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime “THE OPIUM ECONOMY IN AFGHANISTAN”)AQB

Finally, there is also a need to change the image of opium traders. They cannot be perceived any longer as local heroes who supply their villages with income, but as criminals who cause misery to many people across the world and prevent the village from securing rehabilitation and development assistance. The analysis presented in this book has also shown that the timing of interventions is crucial. There is, for instance, a need to syphon-off itinerant labour at the opium harvest time. Thus, public works should be timed in a way that the most labour intensive operations take part at harvest time. Quite apart from the issue of itinerant labor, there is a need for women being re-integrated into Afghan society, including into the labour market. The work of women in opium harvesting was not costed as an input because women were not allowed to work outside the household. Once this is changed some of the structural advantages of labour intensive opium production will disappear.

Farmers resort to using women as cheap sources of labor.

UNODC 3(United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime “THE OPIUM ECONOMY IN AFGHANISTAN”)AQB

Over the last two decades, in many Afghan provinces opium cultivation became part of the livelihood of rural households. The principal reason for farmers’ deciding to grow opium poppy was that it was more profitable and up to 2000 it was *de-facto* legal to do so. Even after the Taliban ban on cultivation, opium trading remained *de-facto* legal until January 2002, when the Karzai Government banned it. Legality combined well with opium’s high profitability relative to other crops. Poppy cultivation’s comparative cost disadvantage (its labor intensity is high, about 10 times more than that of cereals) was remedied by cheap labor provided by women, children and returning refugees. Farmers’ decisions in favor of opium crops have been facilitated by easy access to other inputs for opium cultivation, including planting, weeding and harvesting techniques. The know-how was disseminated countrywide by a large pool of itinerant labourers.

A2: Solvency

The solution is to make the industry legal – not withdraw troops and risk instability

**Applebaum 7** (Anne, Slate, Jan. 16 2007, http://www.slate.com/id/2157644)IM

Yet by far the most depressing aspect of the Afghan poppy crisis is the fact that it exists at all—because it doesn't have to. To see what I mean, look at the history of Turkey, where once upon a time the drug trade also threatened the country's political and economic stability. Just like Afghanistan, Turkey had a long tradition of poppy cultivation. Just like Afghanistan, Turkey worried that poppy eradication could bring down the government. Just like Afghanistan, Turkey—this was the era of Midnight Express—was identified as the main source of the heroin sold in the West. Just like in Afghanistan, a ban was tried, and it failed. As a result, in 1974, the Turks, with U.S. and U.N. support, tried a different tactic. They began licensing poppy cultivation for the purpose of producing morphine, codeine, and other legal opiates. Legal factories were built to replace the illegal ones. Farmers registered to grow poppies, and they paid taxes. You wouldn't necessarily know this from the latest White House drug strategy report—which devotes several pages to Afghanistan but doesn't mention Turkey—but the U.S. government still supports the Turkish program, even requiring U.S. drug companies to purchase 80 percent of what the legal documents euphemistically refer to as "narcotic raw materials" from the two traditional producers, Turkey and India. Why not add Afghanistan to this list? The only good arguments against doing so—as opposed to the silly, politically correct, "just say no" arguments—are technical: that the weak or nonexistent bureaucracy will be no better at licensing poppy fields than at destroying them, or that some of the raw material will still fall into the hands of the drug cartels. Yet some of these problems can be solved by building processing factories at the local level and working within local power structures. And even if the program only succeeds in stopping half the drug trade, then a huge chunk of Afghanistan's economy will still emerge from the gray market, the power of the drug barons will be reduced, and, most of all, Western money will have been visibly spent helping Afghan farmers survive instead of destroying their livelihoods. The director of the Senlis Council, a group that studies the drug problem in Afghanistan, told me he reckons that the best way to "ensure more Western soldiers get killed" is to expand poppy eradication further. Besides, things really could get worse. It isn't so hard to imagine, two or three years down the line, yet another emergency presidential speech calling for yet another "surge" of troops—but this time to southern Afghanistan, where impoverished villagers, having turned against the West, are joining the Taliban in droves. Before we get there, maybe it's worth letting some legal poppies bloom.