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**TIME TO GO HOME!!**

**OBSERVATION ONE: WELCOME TO THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN**

Rising DEATH TOLLS, CRIMINAL PRACTICES of IMPERIAL foreign occupation that has SHATTERED the lives of TENS of THOUSANDS with REPEATED TOURS all to support the interests of a TINY few financial elites are IGNORED by the administration that rode the wave of anti-war sentiment and promised CHANGE

A GENIUNE struggle to end WAR DEMANDS immediate WITHDRAWL of U.S. Troops

**VAN AUKEN writer for the World Socialist Web.org 2k10**

Bill-; *U.S. death toll in Afghanistan Tops 1,000*; AXIS OF LOGIC; May 19

<http://axisoflogic.com/artman/publish/Article_59920.shtml>

**The massive suicide bombing that ripped through a NATO convoy in Kabul** Tuesday claimed the lives of five more US soldiers, a Canadian officer and a dozen Afghan civilians.

The attack demonstrated **the failure of more than eight years of US-led occupation, not to mention that of the puppet government of President** Hamid **Karzai, to secure even the center of the Afghan capital**. It also **marked a grim milestone for American forces, bringing the total number killed in action in “Operation Enduring Freedom” to the 1,000 mark.**

**There is little doubt that the Obama administration**, like the Bush White House before it, **will seek to gloss over the significance of this casualty figure.** A White House spokesman issued a brief statement Tuesday praising American military forces for their “extraordinary sacrifice”, but made no mention of the number of American dead in this war having risen to 1,000.

**Such numbers, however, do have an immense significance and demand serious reflection.** Behind them lie devastated family members and love ones, not to mention the **tens of thousands** more **US troops** who **have seen their lives shattered by horrendous physical wounds as well as the immense psychological toll of repeated tours of duty fighting a hostile population as part of an army of occupation.**

In 2009, 17,538 military personnel were hospitalized for mental problems, compared to 11,156 for injuries and battle wounds. “War is difficult. It takes a toll,” commented the Army’s surgeon general, Lt. Gen. Eric Schoomaker.

No doubt, the same can be said for any war. But **when soldiers are sent to kill and die in a war based upon lies, a war whose human costs are covered up by the government and a servile media and a war that is waged to suppress popular resistance to foreign occupation**, this **psychological toll is sharply intensified.**

For what have 1,000 US American soldiers died? What has justified the shattered bodies and minds of many thousands more? And what can excuse the slaying and maiming of tens of thousands of Afghans over the course of the last 103 months in this, the second longest war in US history?
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**The Obama administration’s claims—echoing the lies of Bush and Cheney—that US imperialism is fighting in Afghanistan to prevent another terrorist attack on US soil have been discredited by the military commanders themselves**, who estimate that no more than 100 Al Qaeda members are operating inside the country, and acknowledge that their counterinsurgency efforts are directed against indigenous resistance.

**It is, in short, a filthy colonial-style war consisting of the kind of pacification operations that US forces waged against Native Americans** in the 19th century or against Filipinos and Haitians in the early 20th. **It involves criminal practices** familiar to the armies of France, Portugal and Britain, in their attempts to crush anti-colonial movements in Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

**US soldiers are dying to prop up the venal puppet regime** of Hamid Karzai, **which represents a group of brutal warlords and heroin traffickers on the CIA payroll, but**, according to the US military’s own surveys, **enjoys no significant base of popular support in any part of the country.**

**And, in the final analysis, they are dying in pursuit of a strategy of aggression—elaborated well before 9/11—that is aimed at establishing US military hegemony** **over** energy supplies and oil pipeline routes that are of immense importance to the **countries neighboring Afghanistan—in particular, China, Russia, Iran, Pakistan and India.**

**This strategy is designed to benefit a tiny ruling financial elite at the expense of working people not only in Afghanistan, but in the US as well.** Under conditions in which working people are being told that there is “no money” to deal with unemployment, poverty and deteriorating social conditions, the Democratic controlled **Congress is preparing** this week **to pass another $59 billion “emergency” supplemental bill to finance the Afghan war and its escalation.**

By this summer, **as a result of the Obama administration’s “surge,” the number of US troops occupying Afghanistan will be triple** what it was when George W. Bush left office. **Far from securing the country, the increased US military presence has only led to a steady escalation of violence and death.**

According to a report released by the US Government Accountability Office, US-led occupation forces were subjected to an average of more than 40 attacks each day in March, double the rate for the same month in 2009.

Meanwhile, even according to the Pentagon’s absurdly low estimates, the number of **unarmed civilians, the majority of them women and children, killed by US-led occupation forces in night raids, bombings, checkpoint shootings and drive-by killings by US convoys** also **doubled** during the first quarter of this year, compared to the number recorded for the same period last year.

**The level of bloodletting is set to escalate sharply**, with the resistance launching its own summer offensive and US forces preparing for a siege of Kandahar, a city roughly the size of Detroit, which has been a stronghold of the Taliban. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s statement last week that the US military did not intend to “destroy Kandahar in the effort to save Kandahar” was hardly reassuring.

The **broad popular hostility in the US to this war**, as well as to the continued occupation of Iraq, both launched under the Bush administration and **continued under Obama, has not disappeared.** **But it can find no expression whatsoever within the two big business parties or in the mass media, which largely echoes the official line that the US is fighting a “good war” in Afghanistan.**
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**There is no doubt a broad sense that nothing can be done within the existing political setup, particularly after repeated elections in which masses of people have gone to the polls to express their opposition to these wars and**, in 2008, **elected as president, Barack Obama, who had appealed to these sentiments, only to take office and dramatically escalate US military aggression in** both **Afghanistan** and Pakistan.

**The experience of 15 months of the Obama administration has** also **exposed the bankrupt perspective of the middle class antiwar protest organizations** that had maintained war could be opposed by supporting the Democrats against Bush. **The Bush administration is gone, the Democrats control both houses of Congress and the war crimes continue. For their part, the protest organizations have become largely inactive, having adapted themselves to Obama’s “progressive” agenda.**

**A genuine struggle against war** can be waged only through the development of an independent socialist movement of the working class against the capitalist profit system, which is the source of militarism.

This movement **must demand the immediate withdrawal of all US** and other foreign **troops** from the Middle East and Central Asia. It must also fight for the dismantlement of the US war machine and the redirection of the trillions of dollars in military spending to pay for reparations to the populations ravaged by American wars of aggression and to deal with the deepening social crisis confronting working people in the US itself.
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**PLAN:**

**THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCE ITS MILITARY PRESENCE IN AFGHANISTAN BY WITHDRAWING ALL DEPLOYED COMBAT TROOPS IN THE REGION.**
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**OBSERVATION TWO: THE HARMS**

U.S. Military Presence in Afghanistan has caused severe damage. We will isolate a few independent scenarios.

**SCENARIO ONE: THE ECONOMY**

**U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE WILL COLLAPSE THE U.S. ECONOMY**

**HIGGS Senior Fellow in Political Economy for the Independent Institute 2k10**

Robert-Editor of The Independent Review; *The Financial Crisis And Leviathan*; EURASIA REVIEW; May 23

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/2010/05/financial-crisis-and-leviathan.html>

**Even if policy makers decline to adopt World War II-type policies as remedies for the current recession, the immense magnitude of the present-day military-industrial complex certainly complicates all efforts to effect a recovery, by draining** [**more than $1 trillion**](http://www.independent.org/blog/?feed=rss2&p=5827) **a year from the economy’s potential to produce private consumer and producer goods. The current long-running wars and military occupations in Afghanistan** and Iraq, **which will probably never end**, although eventually they may be scaled back somewhat, **only add to the economic drain on U.S. resources.** So far, [more than $1 trillion](http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article24298.htm) has been expended for these ill-fated adventures, and their total cost may eventually cumulate to several times this amount, not simply because they, like the U.S. military presence in Japan, Korea, and various European countries, will continue indefinitely, but also because of the need to care for a multitude of physically and psychologically [disabled veterans](http://www.amazon.com/Three-Trillion-Dollar-War-Conflict/dp/0393067017) over a span of several decades.  
Even if the wars in the Middle East were concluded overnight, however, a huge distortion would continue to affect the U.S. economy, owing to the normal operation of the military-industrial complex and the maintenance of the current armed forces and their far-flung empire of more than 800 large overseas bases. **This** [**military hypertrophy**](http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig10/rozoff4.1.1.html) **reflects not an attempt to pump up the macroeconomy**, as military Keynesians would have it, **but rather the devotion of U.S. ruling elites to the maintenance of global military hegemony**, ultimately capped by the attainment of [“full-spectrum dominance”](http://dissidentvoice.org/2010/02/pentagon%d5s-full-spectrum-dominance-facing-headwinds/)—“control of land, sea, air and space and all attendant resources” over the entire world.  
Why do U.S. policy makers seek such god-like control of the planet? To the extent that the military leadership itself contributes to shaping national-security policies, **this overleaping ambition merely expresses the latest phase of the military’s longstanding maniacal quest for total power—the undoubted ability to win any and all conceivable wars.** Among the civilian leadership, the motives range more widely. An important impulse, though it is never mentioned frankly in polite company, is to maintain a foreign military presence configured so as to make the state of Israel as secure as possible. Another abiding interest is to control the worldwide distribution of petroleum, if necessary by bribing, intimidating, or taking military action against the governments of important oil-producing countries, especially in the Persian Gulf region.  
Related to this wholly unnecessary quest to control the world’s oil-distribution channels—after all, it does not serve the interests of the oil producers to withhold their product from the world market—is the ambition to [play the Great Game](http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2275) by throwing up barriers to the expanding influence of China and India and the residual potential of Russia in southwest Asia, especially in the [Caspian Sea region](http://english.pravda.ru/world/asia/05-06-2009/107728-caspian_sea-0), where vast stores of oil and gas remain to be tapped and brought to market. For more than half a century, U.S. leaders have been obsessed with projecting their country’s power into petro-military adventures of all sorts. However senseless this fixation might seem in a purely economic perspective, we can scarcely deny that the coziest crony capitalists in the oil and related industries have reaped a great deal of income along the way, and owing to their extraordinary political clout, they have every expectation of continuing to reap such income in the future, with the vital assistance of U.S. diplomats and armed forces to grease the skids.  
**Although the** [**military-industrial-congressional complex**](http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir_12_02_08_etc.pdf) **is one of the most powerful interest groups in U.S. politics,** and we may certainly expect it to struggle forcefully to retain or even to increase the flow of wealth placed at its disposal, the U.S. government’s increasingly precarious financial condition may compel even this powerful coalition to settle for a smaller space at the trough, especially if stagflation sets in as the U.S. economy’s normal condition during the next decade (as I suspect it will). **If America’s economic future turns out to be even worse** than I now foresee—for example, with rapid inflation, price and capital controls, and a flight from the dollar—**then even greater retrenchment of the U.S. military presence abroad will be unavoidable. Such economic ruin would be a heavy price to pay for reining in America’s global hegemony,** but, nevertheless, the military retrenchment itself would be a consequence that most of the world’s people would celebrate.
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**THE MONEY SPENT ON THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN IS WASTEFUL**

More troops means HIGHER COSTS. The lowball estimate of $33 billion would be BETTER invested in things such as healthcare, education, mass transit and renewable energy, things that would have a larger DIRECT and INDIRECT impact on the economy.

**SWANSON former coordinator for ACORN 2k10**

David, author of Daybreak: Undoing the Imperial Presidency and Forming a More Perfect Union, former

coordinator for ACORN, member of Progressive Democrats of America, *“Afghan Escalation Funding: More War, Fewer Jobs, Poor Excuses”,* <http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/05/11-8>; May.

And remember what this $33 billion actually involves: adding **more troops**, support troops, and private contractors, whose work, in turn, **will mean ongoing higher costs to maintain the Afghan occupation, [construct new bases](http://www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175204/tomgram:_nick_turse,_america%27s_shadowy_base_world/" \t "_blank) there, fuel the machines of war, and provide the weaponry.  Keep in mind as well that various other costs associated with the president's most recent "surge" are hidden in the budgets of the CIA, the Department of State, and other parts of the government.  Looking just at the military**, however, **this is $33 billion to be added to an unfathomable pile of waste.  According to the Congressional Budget Office, Congress has already approved [$345 billion](http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN0517261220100506?type=marketsNews" \t "_blank) for war in Afghanistan**, not to mention $708 billion in Iraq.

According to the National Priorities Project, for **that same money** we **could have [renewable energy](http://www.nationalpriorities.org/tradeoffs?location_type=1&state=888&program=585&tradeoff_item_item=371&submit_tradeoffs=Get+Trade+Off" \t "_blank) in** 1,083,271,391 **homes** for a year (or every home in the country for more than 10 years), **or pay** 17,188,969 **elementary school teachers** for a year.  There may be 2.6 million elementary and middle school teachers in our country now.  Assuming we could use 3 million teachers, we could hire them all for five years and employ that extra $13 billion or so to give them bonuses.  "Honor our brave teachers" anyone?

Even these **calculations**, however, **are misleading**.  **As economists** Linda Bilmes and Joseph Stiglitz demonstrated in *[The Three Trillion Dollar War](http://www.amazon.com/dp/0393334171/ref=nosim/?tag=tomdispatch-20" \t "_blank)*, their book on the cost of the Iraq war alone, **adding in debt payments on moneys borrowed to fight that war, long-term care for veterans wounded in it, the war's impact on energy prices, and other macroeconomic impacts, the current tax bill** for the Iraq War **must be at least tripled and probably quadrupled or more to arrive at its real long-term cost.** (Similarly, the cost in lives must be multiplied by all those lives that could have been saved through other, better uses of the same funding.)  The same obviously applies to the Afghan War.

**The fact is that military spending is destroying the U.S. economy.**  An excellent report from the National Priorities Project, "[Security Spending Primer](http://nationalpriorities.org/" \t "_blank)," provides a summary of research that supports these basic and well-documented facts:

\***Investing public dollars in the military produces fewer jobs** than cutting taxes.

\*Cutting taxes produces fewer jobs than investing public dollars in any of these areas: healthcare, education, mass transit, or construction for home weatherization and infrastructural repair.

\*Investing public dollars in mass transit or education produces more than twice as many jobs as investing in the military.

\*Investing public dollars in education produces better paying jobs than investing in the military or cutting taxes.

\***Investing public dollars in any of these areas: healthcare, education, mass transit, construction for home weatherization and infrastructural repair has a larger direct and indirect economic impact than investing in the military** or cutting taxes.
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**NEW TROOP DEPLOYMENT TRADES OFF WITH DOMESTIC PRIORITIES DEVOURING OUR ABILITY TO REBUILD THE ECONOMY**

**KANE member of the International Security Program 2k9**

Paul-member of the U.S. Marine Corps;  *“No Clear Plan for Paying for Obama’s Afghanistan troop increase”*, WASHINGTON POST; December 9;

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/12/01/AR2009120103864.html>)

Liberal Democrats, who largely oppose the wars, argued that **the new troop deployment would crowd out funding for domestic priorities.** Led by House Appropriations Committee Chairman David R. Obey (D-Wis.), they have vowed to force a new tax to finance Obama's strategy, setting up a confrontation with other Democrats.

Minutes after Obama finished speaking, Obey issued a statement opposing **the troop buildup and** warning that the **cost of the military efforts "could devour our ability to pay for the actions necessary to rebuild our own economy. We simply cannot afford to shortchange the crucial investments we need in education, job training, healthcare, and energy independence. The biggest threat to our long-term national security is a stunted economy."** Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) and House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.) pledged earlier in the day to find ways to fund **the war effort** but did not offer specifics. "I generally am in favor of paying for what we do, but **because of the economic crisis that confronts us,** that [war tax] effort **is complicated,"** Hoyer told reporters.

**ECONOMIC COLLAPSE CAUSES EXTINCTION**

**BEARDEN LT U.S. Army (Retired) 2k**

T.E.-;*“The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How to Solve It Quickly,”* <http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3aaf97f22e23.htm>, June 24]

**History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD)** now possessed by some 25 nations, **are** almost **certain to be released.** As an example, suppose a starving **North Korea launches nuclear weapons** upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate **China**-whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States-**attacks Taiwan.** In addition to immediate responses, **the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict,** escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, **once a few nukes are launched, adversaries** and potential adversaries are then compelled to **launch on perception** of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, **rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs.** Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. **The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere,** at least for many decades.
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**SCENARIO TWO: AFGHANISTAN INSTABILITY**

**U.S. PRESENCES HAS FUELED THE ETHNIC DIVIDE WITHIN THE REGION**

The Pashtuns, Afghanistan’s LARGEST and HISTORICALLY dominant ethnic group DESPISE foreign occupation and have INTENSIFIED opposition to U.S. Troop Presence. The Tajik ethnic minority has taken advantage of that presence to fight back their historic Pashtun rivals.

THE U.S. HAS BACKED ITSELF INTO A CORNER FOR WHICH THERE IS NO GRACEFUL ESCAPE.

**HARRISON Director of the Asia Program @ the Center for Intl Policy 2k9**

Selig -; THE NATION,10/21; <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20091109/harrison/print>

Alexander the Great, the British Raj and the Red Army all learned the hard way that **the Pashtuns, Afghanistan's largest and historically dominant ethnic group, will unite to fight a foreign occupation force simply because it is foreign.** As Howard Hart, a former CIA station chief in Pakistan, recently told the New York Times, **"The very presence of our forces in the Pashtun areas is the problem. The more troops we put in, the greater the opposition." The tenacity of the Taliban insurgency is rooted in opposition to an occupation that is, in this case, a particularly distasteful one to the Pashtuns. The US infidel is hated for Persian Gulf and Middle East policies--especially unconditional US support for Israel--that are perceived as anti-Muslim.** But there are other factors that explain the strength of the Taliban. Some are widely written about, like drug money, popular anger at corrupt warlords and support from Pakistani intelligence agencies. **One factor of special sensitivity and importance that receives almost no attention either in the public debate about Afghanistan or in the internal policy battles of the Obama administration may well be the most important of all: the domination of the Afghan armed forces, police, secret police and intelligence agencies by leaders of the Tajik ethnic minority, who use their US-backed power in Kabul to lord it over their historic Pashtun rivals.** Pashtun kings ruled Afghanistan from its inception in 1747 until the overthrow of the monarchy in 1973. Initially limited to the Pashtun heartland in the south and east, the Afghan state gradually conquered the neighboring Tajik, Hazara and Uzbek areas to the north and west. **Today the Pashtuns make up an estimated 42 percent of a population of 28 million; the Tajiks make up 27 percent. Yet Tajik generals hold the key levers of power in Kabul because they happened to be in the right place at the right time during the confused months when US forces overthrew the Taliban in 2001.** During the struggle against the Soviet occupation, the Tajiks built up a militia in the Panjshir Valley, north of Kabul, that had close CIA ties. Later it acquired allies in neighboring areas and became the Northern Alliance, which fought the Pashtun-based Taliban government that ruled from 1996 until 2001. **When the victorious US forces marched into Kabul**, the Northern Alliance was there, too, and with US help **a clique of Tajik generals seized the key security posts in the new government.** The Bush administration, wanting to give a Pashtun face to the initial interim government, installed Hamid **Karzai** as president. He, too, had longstanding CIA ties and **was the only Pashtun leader acceptable to the Tajik in-group headed by Gen. Muhammad Fahim.** Fahim vetoed other more popular Pashtun figures identified with the last Pashtun king, Zahir Shah, notably Abdul Sattar Sirat. The United States later blocked Pashtun efforts to make Zahir Shah president of the second transitional government, which ruled from 2002 until a constitution was adopted and Karzai was elected president in 2004. **Now the Tajiks are riding high.** In Karzai's recent bid for a second term (in elections widely regarded as rigged), Fahim was his running mate as first vice president. Army chief of staff Bismillah Khan has made fellow Tajiks his key corps commanders, and some 70 percent of his battalion commanders are Tajiks, making it difficult to enlist Pashtuns. **The Tajik-dominated National Security Directorate, a sprawling network of intelligence and secret police agencies, systematically harasses Pashtun leaders who seek to challenge Tajik control.** And if Karzai's challenger, Abdullah Abdullah, a half-Tajik and longtime Northern Alliance insider, shares power in a coalition government or wins a runoff, Tajik dominance would be strengthened. **The United States has painted itself into a corner in Afghanistan from which there can be no graceful escape. If it seeks to end Tajik dominance and shifts to a pro-Pashtun policy, there could well be a Tajik backlash and an uncontrollable, ethnically defined civil war. Yet a continuation of the status quo will only deepen Pashtun discontent.**
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**U.S. TROOPS HAVE ONLY SERVED TO STRENGTHEN THE PASHTUN RESOLVE**

American Troops into ethnic Pashtun areas may only GALVNIZE local people. The greater the troops, the greater the opposition RADICALIZING Pashtuns in Pakistan furthering instability and possibly the COLLAPSE of Pakistan.

**KRISTOFF Pulitzer Prize Winning Journalist for the New York Times 2k9**

Nicholas-; *The Afghanistan Abyss*; NEW YORK TIMES, September 5, op.ed.;

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/06/opinion/06kristof.html?_r=1>

**President Obama has already dispatched** an **additional** 21,000 **American troops to Afghanistan** and [soon will decide](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/01/world/asia/01military.html) whether to send thousands more. That would be **a fateful decision for his presidency, and a group of former intelligence officials and other experts is now reluctantly going public to warn that more troops would be a historic mistake.**

**The group’s concern** — dead right, in my view — **is that sending more American troops into** [**ethnic Pashtun areas**](http://www.heritage.org/research/middleeast/images/bg2076_map1-lg.jpg) **in the Afghan south may only galvanize local people** to back the Taliban **in repelling the infidels.**

“Our policy makers do not understand that **the very presence of our forces in the Pashtun areas is the problem,”** the group said in a statement to me. “**The more troops we put in, the greater the opposition. We do not mitigate the opposition by increasing troop levels, but rather we increase the opposition and prove to the Pashtuns that the Taliban are correct.**

“The basic ignorance by our leadership is going to cause the deaths of many fine American troops with no positive outcome,” the statement said.

The group includes [Howard Hart](http://ciahart.blogspot.com/), a former Central Intelligence Agency station chief in Pakistan; David Miller, a former ambassador and National Security Council official; William J. Olson, a counterinsurgency scholar at the National Defense University; and another C.I.A. veteran who does not want his name published but who spent 12 years in the region, was station chief in Kabul at the time the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in 1979, and later headed the C.I.A.’s Counterterrorism Center.

“We share a concern that **the country is driving over a cliff**,” Mr. Miller said.

Mr. Hart, who helped organize the anti-Soviet insurgency in the 1980s, cautions that **Americans just don’t understand the toughness, determination and fighting skills of the Pashtun tribes.** He adds that **if the U.S. escalates the war, the result will be radicalization of Pashtuns in Pakistan and further instability there — possibly even the collapse of Pakistan.**

These experts are not people who crave publicity; I had to persuade them to go public with their concerns. And their views are widely shared among others who also know Afghanistan well.

“We’ve bitten off more than we can chew; we’re setting ourselves up for failure,” said [Rory Stewart](http://www.hks.harvard.edu/about/faculty-staff-directory/rory-stewart/%28page%29/faculty), a former British diplomat who teaches at Harvard when he is not running a [large aid program](http://www.turquoisemountain.org/) in Afghanistan. Mr. Stewart describes the American military strategy in Afghanistan as “nonsense.”

I’m writing about these concerns because I share them. I’m also troubled because officials in Washington seem to make decisions based on a simplistic caricature of the Taliban that doesn’t match what I’ve found in [my reporting trips to](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/opinion/editorialsandoped/oped/columnists/nicholasdkristof/index.html?match=any&query=afghanistan+pakistan&submit.x=14&submit.y=11&submit=Search) Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Among the Pashtuns, the population is not neatly divisible into “Taliban” or “non-Taliban.” Rather, **the Pashtuns are torn by complex aspirations and fears.**

Many Pashtuns I’ve interviewed are appalled by the Taliban’s periodic brutality and think they are too extreme; they think they’re a little nuts. But these Pashtuns also admire the Taliban’s personal honesty and religious piety, a contrast to the corruption of so many officials around President Hamid Karzai.

Some Taliban are hard-core ideologues, but **many join the fight because friends or elders suggest it, because they are avenging the deaths of relatives in previous fighting, because it’s a way to earn money, or because they want to expel the infidels from their land — particularly because the foreigners haven’t brought the roads, bridges and irrigation projects that had been anticipated.**

Frankly, if a bunch of foreign Muslim troops in turbans showed up in my hometown in rural Oregon, searching our homes without bringing any obvious benefit, then we might all take to the hills with our deer rifles as well.

In fairness, the American military has hugely improved its sensitivity, and some commanders in the field have been superb in building trust with Afghans. That works. But all commanders can’t be superb, and **overall, our increased presence makes Pashtuns more likely to see us as alien occupiers.**
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**THE ESCALATION OF MILITARY OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN DESTABILIZES PAKISTAN**

Sympathetic groups crossing borders into Pakistan have already STRETCHED the government to its limit. A massive surge would only WORSEN the situation.

**DITZ Research Editor for Antiwar.com 2k9**

Jason-; 6/24,http://news.antiwar.com/2009/06/24/nato-chief-afghan-surge-coulddrive-taliban-into-central-asia/]

Commenting on a recent spate of Taliban attacks in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, NATO Secretary General Jaap de

Hoop Scheffer admitted that it was possible that **as the international forces escalate military operations in Afghanistan, the insurgency might move north into Central Asia’s former Soviet states. “If people want to cross borders, NATO cannot prevent that. If extremists want to cross borders into Central Asia to continue their horrific work there, NATO cannot possibly stop that,”** Scheffer conceded. He added that NATO’s current mandate doesn’t allow it to conduct operations in those nations. **Since the 2001 US-led invasion of Afghanistan, the former Taliban government has grown in influence in neighboring nations, particularly Pakistan where the group’s presence has led to the founding of several sympathetic groups among the tribesmen along the border. US officials**, including Joint Chiefs chairman Admiral Michael Mullen **have expressed concern that the massive surge meant to cope with the growing violence in Afghanistan would worsen the situation in Pakistan, where insurgents are already stretching the government to its limit.** This is the first time officials have conceded the danger of the surge extends beyond Pakistan, into Afghanistan’s northern neighbors.

**A COMPLETE COLLAPSE OF PAKISTAN WOULD BE BEYOND REPAIR**

With NATIONALISTS bent on SEIZING the disputed province of Kashmir from India there are grounds for REAL WORRIES as military initiatives to AVOID catastrophic possibilities are DAUNTING. We MUST act BEFORE a COMPLETE government collapse.

**KAGAN resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute 2k7**

Robert-; (http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/18/opinion/18kagan.html)

Moreover, **Pakistan’s intelligence services contain enough sympathizers and supporters of the Afghan Taliban, and enough nationalists bent on seizing the disputed province of Kashmir from India, that there are grounds for real worries. The most likely possible dangers are** these: **a complete collapse of Pakistani government rule that allows an extreme Islamist movement to fill the vacuum; a total loss of federal control over outlying provinces, which splinter along ethnic and tribal lines; or a struggle within the Pakistani military in which the minority sympathetic to the Taliban and Al Qaeda try to establish Pakistan as a state sponsor of terrorism. All possible military initiatives to avoid those possibilities are daunting.** With 160 million people, Pakistan is more than five times the size of Iraq. It would take a long time to move large numbers of American forces halfway across the world. And unless we had precise information about the location of all of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons and materials, we could not rely on bombing or using Special Forces to destroy them. **The task of stabilizing a collapsed Pakistan is beyond the means of the United States and its allies.** Rule-of-thumb estimates suggest that a force of more than a million troops would be required for a country of this size. **Thus, if we have any hope of success, we would have to act before a complete government collapse**, and we would need the cooperation of moderate Pakistani forces.
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**INSTABILITY IN THIS REGION OF THE WORLD RISK NUCLEAR EXCHANGE**

**AHARI Professor of National Security and Strat @ Warfighting School 2k1**

M. Ehsan Ahrari – Professor of National Security and Strategy of the Joint and Combined Warfighting School at the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Virginia *“JIHADI GROUPS, NUCLEAR PAKISTAN, AND THE NEW GREAT GAME”* [www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/jihadi.pdf](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/jihadi.pdf)

**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.

**PARTICULARLY PAKISTANI COLLAPSE COULD USE TO THE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

**BROOKES Senior Fellow @ Heritage 2k7**

Peter-; “Barack’s Blunder,” 8/2/2007,

<http://www.nypost.com/seven/08022007/postopinion/opedcolumnists/baracks_blunder_opedcolumnists_peter_brookes.htm?page=2>

**The last thing we need is for Islamabad to fall to the extremists. That would exacerbate the problem of** those **terrorist safe havens** that Obama apparently thinks he could invade. **And** it would also **put Pakistan's nuclear arsenal into the wrong hands. That could lead to a number of nightmarish scenarios - a nuclear war with India over Kashmir, say, or the use of nuclear weapons by a terrorist group against any number of targets, including the United States.**

**PAKISTANI NUKES SEND OFF A CHAIN REACTION ENDING MOST LIFE ON EARTH**

**CALDICOTT Founder of Physicians for Social Responsibility 2k2**

Helen-; “The New Nuclear Danger: George W. Bush’s Military-Industrial Complex”

**The use of Pakistani nuclear weapons could trigger a chain reaction. Nuclear-armed India**, an ancient enemy, **could respond in kind. China**, India's hated foe, **could react if India used her nuclear weapons, triggering a nuclear holocaust on the subcontinent. If any of either Russia or America's** 2,250 **strategic weapons on hair-trigger alert were launched either accidentally or purposefully in response, nuclear winter would ensue, meaning the end of most life on earth.**
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**OBSERVATION THREE: SOLVENCY**

**U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE IN AFGHANISTAN IS MORE OF THE PROBLEM**

There is a need for DRASTIC revision of U.S. strategic thinking, Military force WILL NOT win the day in Afghanistan as the crises has only grown WORSE under the U.S. military footprint, creating HATRED and DESTABALIZING PAKISTAN. Only a WITHDRAW of American Boots on the Ground will SOLVE.

Must allow NON-MILITARY and NEUTRAL international organizations free of geopolitical taint take over in Afghanistan.

**FULLER Former CIA Station Chief in Kabul and noted author on Islam 2k9**

Graham E.- a former vice-chair of the CIA's National Intelligence Council; [*Obama's Policies Making Situation Worse in Afghanistan and Pakistan*](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/graham-e-fuller/global-viewpoint-obamas-p_b_201355.html); THE HUFFINGTON POST, May 10;

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/graham-e-fuller/global-viewpoint-obamas-p_b_201355.html>

**For all the talk of "smart power," President Obama is pressing down the same path of failure** in Pakistan marked out by George Bush. **The realities suggest need for drastic revision of U.S. strategic thinking.**

-- **Military force will not win the day in** either **Afghanistan** or Pakistan; **crises have only grown worse under the U.S. military footprint.**

-- The Taliban represent zealous and largely ignorant mountain Islamists. They are also all ethnic Pashtuns. Most Pashtuns see the Taliban -- like them or not -- as the primary vehicle for restoration of Pashtun power in Afghanistan, lost in 2001. Pashtuns are also among the most fiercely nationalist, tribalized and xenophobic peoples of the world, united only against the foreign invader. In the end, the Taliban are probably more Pashtun than they are Islamist.

-- **It is a fantasy to think of ever sealing the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.** The "Durand Line" is an arbitrary imperial line drawn through Pashtun tribes on both sides of the border. And there are twice as many Pashtuns in Pakistan as there are in Afghanistan. The struggle of 13 million Afghan Pashtuns has already inflamed Pakistan's 28 million Pashtuns.

-- India is the primary geopolitical threat to Pakistan, not Afghanistan. Pakistan must therefore always maintain Afghanistan as a friendly state. India furthermore is intent upon gaining a serious foothold in Afghanistan -- in the intelligence, economic and political arenas -- that chills Islamabad.

-- Pakistan will therefore never rupture ties or abandon the Pashtuns, in either country, whether radical Islamist or not. Pakistan can never afford to have Pashtuns hostile to Islamabad in control of Kabul, or at home.

-- **Occupation everywhere creates hatred, as the U.S. is learning.** Yet Pashtuns remarkably have not been part of the jihadi movement at the international level, although many are indeed quick to ally themselves at home with al-Qaida against the U.S. military.

-- The U.S. had every reason to strike back at the al-Qaida presence in Afghanistan after the outrage of 9/11. The Taliban were furthermore poster children for an incompetent and harsh regime. But the Taliban retreated from, rather than lost, the war in 2001, in order to fight another day. Indeed, one can debate whether it might have been possible -- with sustained pressure from Pakistan, Iran, Saudi Arabia and almost all other Muslim countries that viewed the Taliban as primitives -- to force the Taliban to yield up al-Qaida over time without war. That debate is in any case now moot. But **the consequences of** that **war are baleful, debilitating and *still* spreading.**

-- **The situation in Pakistan has gone from bad to worse as a direct consequence of the U.S. war raging on the Afghan border. U.S. policy has now carried the Afghan war over the border into Pakistan with its incursions, drone bombings and**
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**assassinations** -- the classic response to a failure to deal with insurgency in one country. Remember the invasion of Cambodia to save Vietnam?

-- The deeply entrenched Islamic and tribal character of Pashtun rule in the Northwest Frontier Province in Pakistan will not be transformed by invasion or war. The task requires probably several generations to start to change the deeply embedded social and psychological character of the area. **War induces visceral and atavistic response.**

-- **Pakistan is indeed now beginning to crack under the relentless pressure directly exerted by the U.S. Anti-American impulses in Pakistan are at high pitch, strengthening Islamic radicalism and forcing reluctant acquiescence to it even by non-Islamists.**

**Only the withdrawal of American** and NATO **boots on the ground will begin to allow the process of near-frantic emotions to subside within Pakistan, and for the region to start to cool down.** Pakistan is experienced in governance and is well able to deal with its own Islamists and tribalists under normal circumstances; until recently, Pakistani Islamists had one of the lowest rates of electoral success in the Muslim world.

But **U.S. policies have** now **driven local nationalism, xenophobia and Islamism to combined fever pitch. As Washington demands that Pakistan redeem failed American policies in Afghanistan, Islamabad can no longer manage its domestic crisis.**

**The Pakistani army is more than capable of maintaining state power against tribal militias and to defend its own nukes. Only a convulsive nationalist revolutionary spirit could change that -- something most Pakistanis do not want. But Washington can still succeed in destabilizing Pakistan if it perpetuates its present hard-line strategies. A new chapter of military rule -- not what Pakistan needs -- will be the likely result**, and even then Islamabad's basic policies will not change, except at the cosmetic level.

**In the end, only moderate Islamists themselves can prevail over the radicals whose main source of legitimacy comes from inciting popular resistance against the external invader. Sadly, U.S. forces and Islamist radicals are now approaching a state of co-dependency.**

**It would be heartening to see a solid working democracy established in Afghanistan.** Or widespread female rights and education -- areas where Soviet occupation ironically did rather well. **But these changes are not going to happen even within one generation, given the history of social and economic devastation of the country over 30 years.**

Al-Qaida's threat no longer emanates from the caves of the borderlands, but from its symbolism that has long since metastasized to other activists of the Muslim world. Meanwhile, the Pashtuns will fight on for a major national voice in Afghanistan. But few Pashtuns on either side of the border will long maintain a radical and international jihadi perspective once the incitement of the U.S. presence is gone. Nobody on either side of the border really wants it.

What can be done must be consonant with the political culture. **Let non-military and neutral international organizations, free of geopolitical taint, take over the binding of Afghan wounds and the building of state structures.**

If the past eight years had shown ongoing success, perhaps **an alternative case for U.S. policies could be made. But the evidence on the ground demonstrates only continued deterioration and darkening of the prognosis.** Will we have more of the same? Or will there be a U.S. recognition that **the American presence has now become more the problem than the solution**? We do not hear that debate.
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**WAR IN AFGHANISTAN IS UNWINNABLE WITH U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE**

Only EXPEDITIOUS WITHDRAWL will prevent EXACERBATION of the problem

**FULLER Former CIA Station Chief in Kabul and noted author on Islam 2K9**

Graham E.- former vice-chair of the CIA's National Intelligence Council. He is author of numerous books on the Middle East, including "The Future of Political Islam;" CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, December 2, 2009; *Obama speech: kicking the can down the road in Afghanistan,”* p. 9

Many decades ago, as a fledgling CIA officer in the field, I was naively convinced that if the facts were reported back to Washington correctly, everything else would take care of itself in policymaking. The first loss of innocence comes with the harsh recognition that "all politics are local" and that overseas realities bear only a partial relationship to foreign-policy formulation back home. So **in President Obama's new policy directions for Afghanistan, what goes down in Washington politics far outweighs analyses of local conditions.** I had hoped that Obama would level with the American people that **the war in Afghanistan is not being won, indeed is not winnable within any practicable framework.** Obama possesses the intelligence and insight to grasp these realities. But such an admission - however accurate - would sign the political death warrant of a president to be portrayed as having snatched defeat out of the jaws of "victory." **The "objective" situation in Afghanistan remains a mess.** The details are well known. **Senior commanders acknowledge that we are not now winning hearts and minds in Afghanistan; indeed, we never can, and certainly not at gunpoint.** **Most Pashtuns will never accept a US plan for Afghanistan's future.** The non-Pashtuns - Tajiks, Uzbeks, Hazaras, etc. - naturally welcome any outside support in what is a virtual civil war. America has inadvertently ended up choosing sides. **US forces are perceived by large numbers of Afghans as an occupying army inflicting large civilian casualties.** The struggle has now leaked into Pakistan - with even higher stakes. **Obama's policies** would **seem an unsatisfying compromise among contending arguments. Thirty thousand more troops will not turn the tide; arguably they present more American targets for attack. They will heighten traditional xenophobia against foreigners** traipsing through Pashtun villages and homes. **It is a fool's errand to persuade the locals** in Pashtun territory **that** the Taliban are the enemy and **the US is their friend.** Whatever mixed feelings Pashtuns have toward the Taliban, they know the Taliban remain the single most important element of Pashtun political life; the Taliban will be among them long after Washington tires of this mission. **The strategy of the Bush era envisioned Afghanistan as a vital imperial outpost in a post-Soviet dream world where hundreds of overseas US bases would cement US global hegemony**, keeping Russia and China in check and the US on top. **That world vision is gone** - except to a few Washington diehards who haven't grasped the new emerging global architectures of power, economics, prestige, and influence. The Taliban will inevitably figure significantly in the governance of almost any future Afghanistan, like it or not. Future Taliban leaders, once rid of foreign occupation, will have little incentive to support global jihadi schemes - they never really have by choice. The Taliban inherited bin Laden as a poison pill from the past when they came to power in 1996 and have learned a bitter lesson about what it means to lend state support to a prominent terrorist group. The Taliban with a voice in power will have every incentive to welcome foreign money and expertise into the country, including the Pashtun regions - as long as it is not part of a Western strategic package. An austere Islamic regime is not the ideal outcome for Afghanistan, but it is by far the most realistic. **To reverse ground realities and achieve a markedly different outcome is not in the cards and will pose the same dilemma to Obama** next year. **Meanwhile, Pakistan will never be willing or able to solve Washington's Afghanistan dilemma. Pakistan's own stability has been brought to the very brink by US demands that it solve America's self-created problem in Afghanistan. Pakistan will eventually be forced to resolve Afghanistan itself - but only after the US has gone**, and only by making a pact with Taliban forces both inside Afghanistan and in Pakistan itself. Washington will not accept that for now, but it will ultimately be forced to fairly soon.

Maybe the Pakistanis can root out bin Laden, but meanwhile, Al Qaeda has extended its autonomous franchises around the world, and terrorists can train and plan almost anywhere in the world; they do not need Afghanistan. By now, as in so many other elements of the Global War on Terror, **the US has become more part of the problem than part of the solution. We are sending troops to defend troops that themselves constitute an affront to Afghan nationalism. Only expeditious American withdrawal from Afghanistan will prevent exacerbation of the problem.** Afghans must face the complex mechanics of internal struggle and reconciliation. They have done so over long periods of their history. The ultimate outcome is of greater strategic consequence to Pakistan, Russia, China, Iran, India, and others in the region than to the US. Europe and Canada have lost all stomach for this mission that is now promoted primarily in terms of "saving NATO" for future (and obsolescent) "out of area" struggles in a world in which Western strategic preferences can no longer predominate.
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**ECONOMIC COSTS AND THREATENED INSTABILITY IN PAKISTAN MAKE THE TIME FOR A RESPONSIBLE WITHDRAW NOW.**

**THE BRADENTON HERALD 2K9**

The Bradenton Herald (Florida), December 9, 2009, p. 1

**The latest military casualty count in Afghanistan** count is 932 Americans of 1,536 total coalition fatalities; at least 4,434 Americans have been gravely wounded. Stark numbers **understate the sacrifices.** **Government estimates placed the cost of the 40,000 additional forces** sought by Gen. McChrystal **at $40 billion to $54 billion per year.**

**Even the reduced number of troops will cost at least $30 billion annually.** A continued or expanded commitment might still be justified to serve U.S. national security interests. But to rely on counterinsurgency efforts to combat terrorist threats today, the United States must also be prepared to invade Pakistan, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen and other countries.More broadly from "AFPAK" perspective, **many more troops in Afghanistan may well be counterproductive in pushing more Taliban insurgents across the border and complicating Pakistani government antiterrorist offensives** in Waziristan. The Obama decision followed a prolonged process, for which we commend the president. We remain, however, convinced that **our brave U.S. troops and civilian support personnel have accomplished what could reasonably be done in Afghanistan. The time has come to initiate a responsible withdrawal**. Public expression of this position by no means undervalues our concern for U.S. national security or support for our commander-in-chief. Quite the contrary, expressing informed and well-reasoned dissenting opinions is essential to our democratic processes.

## OBAMA INCREASING TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

**Obama sending an additional 30,000 troops to Afghanistan to aid the 38,000 soldiers already stationed there**

**Starr- ’09** (Barbra, CNN Pentagon correspondent, graduate of California State, reported from Afghanistan concerning Nation Defense, “Obama Approves Afghanistan Troop Increase,” <http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/02/17/obama.troops/index.html#cnnSTCText>)

President Barack **Obama has approved a significant troop increase for Afghanistan**, Pentagon officials said Tuesday. **The new troop deployment is expected to include 8,000 Marines from Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, as well as 4,000 additional Army troops from Fort Lewis, Washington**.

"This increase is necessary to stabilize a deteriorating situation in Afghanistan, which has not received the strategic attention, direction and resources it urgently requires," Obama said in a written statement."The Taliban is resurgent in Afghanistan, and al Qaeda supports the insurgency and threatens America from its safe haven along the Pakistani border." **Another 5,000 troops will be deployed at a later date to support combat troops, bringing the total to 17,000 the Defense Department said. A senior administration official confirmed the total**.

The Obama administration has been conducting several reviews of U.S. policy in Afghanistan, including a review by Gen. David Petraeus, the commander in the region. **The president and the Pentagon have been considering a request from the top commander in Afghanistan, Gen. David McKiernan, to send as many as 30,000 additional troops. Obama said the troop increase in Afghanistan would be made possible in part by the impending troop drawdown in Iraq**.

**All 17,000 troops announced Tuesday will go to the southern region of the country where Afghanistan borders Pakistan, with the goal mainly being to stop the flow of foreign fighters, according to a U.S. military official with direct knowledge of the deployment and military plans for Afghanistan.**

The troops will also train Afghan army units. The military operations will set up a string of bases and smaller combat outposts, allowing the troops to move around and engage in counterterrorism against foreign fighters and counterinsurgency operations against the Taliban and other local enemies, the official said. **The goal is to have enough troops to "seize and hold" territory and maintain basic security, which hasn't been possible** under current troop levels, the official said. The Taliban continues to maintain at least half a dozen safe areas inside Afghanistan, which are prime targets for the U.S. military.

**About 38,000 U.S. troops are currently serving in Afghanistan. The increased troop levels are expected to last three to four years**, the military official said. **However,** the administration official said **there was no clear timeline**. "That would prejudge the outcome of the strategic review," the senior administration official said.

## OBAMA INCREASING TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

**Obama increasing US troops in Afghanistan to over 100,000 US soldiers by 2010**

**BBC Word News, Dec. ’09** (“Barack Obama orders 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan”, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8389778.stm)

**US President Barack Obama has ordered 30,000 more US troops to Afghanistan** but warned America would begin to withdraw its military forces by 2011. **Soldiers will be deployed as quickly as possible, bringing US troop strength in the country to more than 100,000**. World security was at stake, Mr. Obama said, calling for more allied troops. The mission in Afghanistan, he added, was to defeat al-Qaeda, reverse the Taliban's momentum and deny them the ability to overthrow the government. Mr. Obama reached his deployment decision after more than three months of deliberations and 10 top-level meetings with advisers. Gen Stanley McChrystal, the US commander in Afghanistan, welcomed the speech, saying he had been given "a clear military mission" and the necessary resources. **Some 32,000 other foreign troops are serving in Afghanistan but Nato allies have been cautious about further contributions.**

**Nato Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen urged members to do more. He told reporters on Wednesday that 5,000 extra troops would be sent in 2010, and "probably" a few thousand in addition.**

**U.S. HAS BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR TROOP PRESENCE IN AFGHANISTAN**

**NEW YORK TIMES 2k10**

New York Times, March 10, 2010, p. nyt.com – Accessed March 10, 2010

**In a strong bipartisan endorsement of the Obama administration’s policy in Afghanistan, the House of Representatives** on Wednesday **soundly rejected a call to withdraw American troops** by the end of the year. After a three-hour debate held to allow antiwar Democrats to air their dissent, the House voted 356 to 65 to reject the withdrawal proposal. Five Republicans joined 60 Democrats in support of pulling out; 189 Democrats and 167 Republicans were opposed. Although the outcome was never in doubt, debate on the resolution written by Representative Dennis J. Kucinich, Democrat of Ohio, offered a preview of Congressional consideration later this year of the administration’s request for money to pay for operations in Afghanistan.

## ECONOMIC COLLAPSE INTERNALS

**Funding US troops in Afghanistan trades off with the money that could be spent on US housing, healthcare, education, food scarcity, and saving the US economy**

**Smith, Sep. ’09** (David Miller, Director of the Human Rights Campaign and Public Education Programs of the HRC Foundation, “Afghanistan, Ten Reasons to Resist”, <http://www.hrc.org/about_us/6031.htm>)

Students protest cuts to education. **President Obama has inherited a major global financial crisis the worst since World War II.** The unemployment rate is the highest since the government started keeping track in 1976. Tens of millions of workers live in daily dread of being the next to be laid off. Two and half million homes are projected to be foreclosed on in 2009 alone.

**The US government is wasting billions of dollars on open-ended wars overseas instead of tending to problems in our own backyard. To date, the Congress has allocated $915 billion toward the wars in Iraq ($687 billion) and Afghanistan ($228 billion).**

**That amount does not include**, among other things, **the cost of borrowing the money to pay for the war, lost productivity, higher oil prices and the cost of health care for veterans. Include those related expenses, and the total cost through 2009 for Afghanistan alone is $864 billion. For both occupation wars, its $2.17 trillion!**

On our current course, **we will end up spending $3.4 trillion within a few years at a cost of over $11,000 for each person living in the US! It is past time that we put those resources towards solving our growing problems here at home, including housing, healthcare, education, and food scarcity. War spending will not lift the U.S. out of the current economic stagnation**.

Our 1AC author is qualified

**Robert Higgs** is Senior Fellow in Political Economy for [**The Independent Institute**](http://www.independent.org/) and Editor of the Institute’s quarterly journal [***The Independent Review***](http://www.independent.org/publications/tir/). He received his Ph.D. in economics from Johns Hopkins University, and he has taught at the University of Washington, Lafayette College, Seattle University, and the University of Economics, Prague. He has been a visiting scholar at Oxford University and Stanford University, and a fellow for the Hoover Institution and the National Science Foundation. He is the author of many books, including [***Depression, War, and Cold War***](http://www.independent.org/store/book_detail.asp?bookID=65). This article was published by [**The Independent Institute**](http://www.independent.org/)  and reprinted with permission.

## ECONOMIC COLLAPSE IMPAX

**Economic decline would spark fast and wildfire prolif globally**

**BURROWS & WINDHAM Economic Professors** **94**

[William & Robert, Critical Mass, pgs. 491-492]

Economics is in many respects proliferation's catalyst. As we have noted, economic desperation drives Russia and some of the former Warsaw pact nations to peddle weapons and technology. The possibility of considerable profits or at least balanced international payments also prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, drive proliferation just as surely as do purely political motives. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, well-off, relatively secure societies like today's Japan are less likely to buy or sell superweapon technology than those that are insecure, needy, or desperate. Ultimately, solving economic problems, especially as they are driven by population pressure, is the surest way to defuse proliferation and enhance true national security.

**Economic decline causes Chinese nationalism and nuclear lashout**

Philip **Bowring 04,** Hong Kong-based journalist and commentator, August 17, 2004, International Herald Tribune, “China's new power can be contained,” p. Lexis

The biggest source of danger is not simply the emergence of a China with strategic nuclear weapons, a plethora of missiles facing Taiwan and a growing blue-water fleet. Those are inevitable consequences of China's self-styled "peaceful rise." They should only be a threat if power struggles within China, or economic disruptions stemming from global problems, cause China to shift its focus from satisfying its new materialism to satisfying nationalist urges. Even now, when China's economic success is so apparent, rivalry between the new leadership of President Hu Jintao and Prime Minister Wen Jiabao, and the old boss, former President Jiang Zemin, using his position as head of the Central Military Commission, expresses itself in terms of military posturing and rhetoric toward Japan and Taiwan. Taiwan and Japan are inextricably linked not only in the minds of Chinese nationalists but also in those of Japanese defense planners. Japan may not care much about Taiwan's identity, but it does care about Taiwan's geography. Taiwan is as close to Japan's Ryukyu islands as it is to the Chinese mainland, and it controls the Luzon Straits, which give access to the South China Sea and Japan's trade partners in Southeast Asia and the Middle East. China claims that Asia fears renewed Japanese militarism. But Southeast Asia is more worried about China's territorial sea claims and its search for raw materials than about Japan, which is preoccupied with protecting its trade and investments. Japan's conventional arms build-up has been quieter but as significant as that of China. Its naval capability is particularly impressive. But its continued partnership with the United States on nuclear issues and the missile defense shield remains critical to its own defense and, arguably, that of Taiwan. That alliance remains crucial if Japan is not to go its own way on nuclear and strategic weapons, raise tensions and perhaps send China into a dangerous spasm of xenophobia. The U.S. decision to reduce troop strength in Asia is not important in itself, but any domestic U.S. reaction against failures in Iraq which severely reduced America's strategic role in East Asia would be destabilizing. Chinese nationalism could burst out anyway if China's economic hopes were dashed by global recession, a world energy crisis or a trade war with a United States that took unilateral measures to correct its huge imbalance with China.

## ECONOMIC COLLAPSE IMPAX

**WMD Conflict with China is inevitable absent a strong US economy that allows economic interdependence**

Mead 04 (Walter Russell, Senior Fellow @ Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Policy, lexis)

Similarly, in the last 60 years, as foreigners have acquired a greater value in the United States--government and private bonds, direct and portfolio private investments--more and more of them have acquired an interest in maintaining the strength of the U.S.-led system. A collapse of the U.S. economy and the ruin of the dollar would do more than dent the prosperity of the United States. Without their best customer, countries including China and Japan would fall into depressions. The financial strength of every country would be severely shaken should the United States collapse. Under those circumstances, debt becomes a strength, not a weakness, and other countries fear to break with the United States because they need its market and own its securities. Of course, pressed too far, a large national debt can turn from a source of strength to a crippling liability, and the United States must continue to justify other countries' faith by maintaining its long-term record of meeting its financial obligations. But, like Samson in the temple of the Philistines, a collapsing U.S. economy would inflict enormous, unacceptable damage on the rest of the world. That is sticky power with a vengeance. THE SUM OF ALL POWERS? The United States' global economic might is therefore not simply, to use Nye's formulations, hard power that compels others or soft power that attracts the rest of the world. Certainly, the U.S. economic system provides the United States with the prosperity needed to underwrite its security strategy, but it also encourages other countries to accept U.S. leadership. U.S. economic might is sticky power. How will sticky power help the United States address today's challenges? One pressing need is to ensure that Iraq's economic reconstruction integrates the nation more firmly in the global economy. Countries with open economies develop powerful trade-oriented businesses; the leaders of these businesses can promote economic policies that respect property rights, democracy, and the rule of law. Such leaders also lobby governments to avoid the isolation that characterized Iraq and Libya under economic sanctions. And looking beyond Iraq, the allure of access to Western capital and global markets is one of the few forces protecting the rule of law from even further erosion in Russia. China's rise to global prominence will offer a key test case for sticky power. As China develops economically, it should gain wealth that could support a military rivaling that of the United States; China is also gaining political influence in the world. Some analysts in both China and the United States believe that the laws of history mean that Chinese power will someday clash with the reigning U.S. power. Sticky power offers a way out. China benefits from participating in the U.S. economic system and integrating itself into the global economy. Between 1970 and 2003, China's gross domestic product grew from an estimated $ 106 billion to more than $ 1.3 trillion. By 2003, an estimated $ 450 billion of foreign money had flowed into the Chinese economy. Moreover, China is becoming increasingly dependent on both imports and exports to keep its economy (and its military machine) going. Hostilities between the United States and China would cripple China's industry, and cut off supplies of oil and other key commodities. Sticky power works both ways, though. If China cannot afford war with the United States, the United States will have an increasingly hard time breaking off commercial relations with China. In an era of weapons of mass destruction, this mutual dependence is probably good for both sides. Sticky power did not prevent World War I, but economic interdependence runs deeper now; as a result, the "inevitable" U.S.-Chinese conflict is less likely to occur.

**Economic decline causes Asian war**

Bernardo V. **Lopez**, September 10, 19**98**, BusinessWorld, “Global recession phase two: Catastrophic,” p. Lexis

Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan. In the Philippines, as in some Latin American countries, splintered insurgency forces may take advantage of the economic drought to regroup and reemerge in the countryside. Unemployment worldwide will be in the billions. Famine can be triggered in key Third World nations with India, North Korea, Ethiopia and other African countries as first candidates. Food riots and the breakdown of law and order are possibilities. Global recession will see the deferment of globalization, the shrinking of international trade - especially of high-technology commodities such as in the computer, telecommunications, electronic and automotive industries.

## ECONOMIC COLLAPSE IMPAX

**Economic decline leads to multiple scenarios for war and mass death.**

Bernardo V. **Lopez**, September 10, 19**98,** BusinessWorld, “Global recession phase two: Catastrophic,” p. Lexis

Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan. In the Philippines, as in some Latin American countries, splintered insurgency forces may take advantage of the economic drought to regroup and reemerge in the countryside. Unemployment worldwide will be in the billions. Famine can be triggered in key Third World nations with India, North Korea, Ethiopia and other African countries as first candidates. Food riots and the breakdown of law and order are possibilities. Global recession will see the deferment of globalization, the shrinking of international trade - especially of high-technology commodities such as in the computer, telecommunications, electronic and automotive industries. There will be a return to basics with food security being a prime concern of all governments, over industrialization and trade expansions. Protectionism will reemerge and trade liberalization will suffer a big setback. The WTO-GATT may have to redefine its provisions to adjust to the changing times. Even the World Bank-IMF consortium will experience continued crisis in dealing with financial hemorrhages. There will not be enough funds to rescue ailing economies. A few will get a windfall from the disaster with the erratic movement in world prices of basic goods. But the majority, especially the small and medium enterprises (SMEs), will suffer serious shrinkage. Mega-mergers and acquisitions will rock the corporate landscape. Capital markets will shrink and credit crisis and spiraling interest rates will spread internationally. And environmental advocacy will be shelved in the name of survival. Domestic markets will flourish but only on basic commodities. The focus of enterprise will shift into basic goods in the medium term. Agrarian economies are at an advantage since they are the food producers. Highly industrialized nations will be more affected by the recession. Technologies will concentrate on servicing domestic markets and the agrarian economy will be the first to regrow. The setback on research and development and high-end technologies will be compensated in its eventual focus on agrarian activity. A return to the rural areas will decongest the big cities and the ensuing real estate glut will send prices tumbling down. Tourism and travel will regress by a decade and airlines worldwide will need rescue. Among the indigenous communities and agrarian peasantry, many will shift back to prehistoric subsistence economy. But there will be a more crowded upland situation as lowlanders seek more lands for production. The current crisis for land of indigenous communities will worsen. Land conflicts will increase with the indigenous communities who have nowhere else to go either being massacred in armed conflicts or dying of starvation. Backyard gardens will be precious and home-based food production will flourish. As unemployment expands, labor will shift to self-reliant microenterprises if the little capital available can be sourced. In the past, the US could afford amnesty for millions of illegal migrants because of its resilient economy. But with unemployment increasing, the US will be forced to clamp down on a reemerging illegal migration which will increase rapidly. Unemployment in the US will be the hardest to cope with since it may have very little capability for subsistence economy and its agrarian base is automated and controlled by a few. The riots and looting of stores in New York City in the late '70s because of a state-wide brownout hint of the type of anarchy in the cities. Such looting in this most affluent nation is not impossible. The weapons industry may also grow rapidly because of the ensuing wars. Arms escalation will have primacy over food production if wars escalate. The US will depend increasingly on weapons exports to nurse its economy back to health. This will further induce wars and conflicts which will aggravate US recession rather than solve it. The US may depend more and more on the use of force and its superiority to get its ways internationally. The public will rebel against local monopolies. Anarchy and boycotts will be their primary weapons against cartels especially on agricultural products such as rice and vegetables, which are presently in the hands of a few in most Third World nations. Global recession will test the limits of human cooperation and sharing in the name of survival. Grants and aids will decrease. Rescues and international funding for advocacy NGOs will disappear rapidly. Coupled with disasters such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, climatic aberrations like the El Nino, global recession will degrade a step further.

## AFGHANISTAN INSTABILITY INTERNALS

**COLLAPSE OF AFGHANISTAN SPILLS OVER TO PAKISTAN AND CAUSES REGIONAL WAR**

**Guardian Unlimited 2007**

(July 14, "Failure in Afghanistan Risks Rise in Terror, Say Generals", The Guardian Online)

Britain's most senior generals have issued a blunt warning to Downing Street that **the military campaign in Afghanistan is facing a catastrophic failure, a development that could lead to an Islamist government seizing power in neighboring Pakistan.** Amid fears that London and Washington are taking their eye off Afghanistan as they grapple with Iraq, the generals have told Number 10 that the collapse of the government in Afghanistan, headed by Hamid Karzai, would present a grave threat to the security of Britain. Lord Inge, the former chief of the defence staff, highlighted their fears in public last week when he warned of a 'strategic failure' in Afghanistan. The Observer understands that Inge was speaking with the direct authority of the general staff when he made an intervention in a House of Lords debate. **'The situation in Afghanistan is much worse than many people recognise,'** Inge told peers. 'We need to face up to that issue, the consequence of strategic failure in Afghanistan and what that would mean for Nato... We need to recognise that the situation - in my view, and I have recently been in Afghanistan - is much, much more serious than people want to recognise.' Inge's remarks reflect the fears of serving generals that the government is so overwhelmed by Iraq that it is in danger of losing sight of the threat of failure in Afghanistan. One source, who is familiar with the fears of the senior officers, told The Observer: 'If you talk privately to the generals they are very very worried. You heard it in Inge's speech. Inge said we are failing and remember Inge speaks for the generals.' Inge made a point in the Lords of endorsing a speech by Lord Ashdown, the former Liberal Democrat leader, who painted a bleak picture during the debate. Ashdown told The Observer that Afghanistan presented a graver threat than Iraq. 'The consequences of failure in Afghanistan are far greater than in Iraq,' he said. '**If we fail in Afghanistan then Pakistan goes down.**

The security problems for Britain would be massively multiplied. I think you could not then stop a widening regional war that would start off in warlordism but it would become essentially a war in the end between Sunni and Shia right across the Middle East.'

## AFGHANISTAN INSTABILITY INTERNALS

**Collapse of Pakistan causes nuclear war with India that kills at least 17 million**

Keay **Davidson**, 6/7/**2002**, “Nuclear Threat Has World on Edge,” http://www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0607-03.htm

**Pakistan already is** "what people mean by **a failing state,"** Cirincione says. **"If there is no Pakistani government, then there's nobody to crack down on and there'll be an increase in terrorist attacks" against India.** Thereafter, for India, "it starts to look a lot like Vietnam." **And that raises the specter of nuclear war**: If Pakistan thinks its survival is threatened, its surviving leaders, whether civilian or military, might deploy nuclear weapons as desperate last-minute defenses. In recent years, Western analysts have conducted many computer-assisted scenarios about hypothetical India-Pakistan nuclear wars. These "war games" simulate conventional and nuclear conflicts. One such scenario was described in a report co-written in the late 1990s by David Shlapak, an international policy analyst at the Rand think tank whose experience with war gaming goes back to the Cold War. The report depicts a hypothetical India-Pakistan war that breaks out in 2005. Participants in the scenario "gamed" what happened next.

They based their actions on their knowledge of the region and its leadership. Here's what they anticipated: "In the spring of 2006, India dramatically increases its counterinsurgency operations in both Kashmir and Punjab, and the rebels are pushed into precipitate retreat," the Rand report says. "Pakistan responds by infiltrating a number of special forces teams, which attack military installations supporting the Indian operations. "India mobilizes for war," the report continues, "and launches major attacks all along the international border, accompanied by an intense air campaign. . . . As Indian forces continue to press forward, Pakistan detonates a small fission (nuclear) bomb on an Indian armored formation in an unpopulated area of the desert border region; it is unclear whether the weapon was intended to go off over Pakistani or Indian territory. "India responds by destroying a Pakistani air base with a two-weapon nuclear attack. Condemning the 'escalation' to homeland attacks, Pakistan attacks the Indian city of Jodhpur with a 20-kiloton weapon and demands cessation of hostilities." Then "India strikes Hyderabad with a weapon estimated to be 200 kilotons and threatens 10 times more destruction if any more nuclear weapons are used. Pakistan offers a cease-fire in place." The war game ends shortly after the cease-fire. The report doesn't estimate the likely number of deaths in such a war. Some other **scenarios have estimated the number of dead in an India-Pakistan war at up to 17 million.**

**A coup would give radicals nuclear weapons to launch at the United States**

**Albright, 02** (David, President and Founder of the Institute for Science and

International Security, www.922investigations.net./IMG/pdf/doc-320.pdf)

**Several observers have suggested that if Pakistan suffers a coup by forces hostile to the United States, the U.S. military should be ready to provide security over the nuclear weapons** (or even to take the weapons out of Pakistan entirely) without the permission of Pakistani authorities.12 Others have raised the possibility of asking President Musharraf to allow the United States or China to take possession of Pakistan's nuclear weapons during a coup. Although such responses appear possible in theory, their implementation could be extremely difficult and dangerous. A U.S. military action to seize or cripple Pakistan's strategic nuclear assets may encourage India to take similar action, in essence to finish the job. Even if India does nothing, **a new Pakistani government may launch any remaining nuclear weapons at U.S. forces or against India.**

## HARMS (INDIA-PAKISTAN NUCLEAR EXCHANGE)

**Nuclear War Between India and Pakistan Would Destroy All Value To Life, Spread To Effect The Whole World And Cause More Nuclear Wars By Breaking the Nuclear Taboo.**

**Kheli, Krepon, and Ganguly,** December 13, **1999**, Scholar @ Foreign Policy Research Institute, President of the Stimson Center, and Prof @ Hunter College, Shirin Tahir-, Michael, and Sumit, *Nuclear War Between India and Pakistan?*

NARRATOR: Regardless of how **a nuclear war** might start **in South Asia**, there is little doubt that it **would be the worst disaster of modern times.**

KHELI: ... this is a weapon of horror, and the consequences of its use would be disastrous for both sides.

KREPON: There have been some studies of the consequences of **a nuclear exchange by South Asians**. And they've all arrived at the same conclusion. That the use of a nuclear weapon **is very likely to cause casualties far in excess of those that were incurred in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.**

GANGULY: The costs would make Hiroshima look like a minor skirmish.... **There is no point of surviving a nuclear war.** In fact the survivors might actually envy the people who died.

NARRATOR: Some of the world's most densely populated cities could be destroyed, and **water and land resources, upon which countless millions of people depend, could be rendered toxic forever.** **A region already underdeveloped, and at times unstable, might never recover from such devastation. Apart from the inconceivable costs in lives lost and environmental damage, a nuclear war in South Asia would threaten stability all over the world.**

GANGULY: I think politically **it would have a devastating effect on international relations. Because there has been a nuclear taboo since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. People have come to the brink, have stared into the abyss and then pulled back**.... And I worry that once that nuclear taboo is broken, what consequences that has for the future of the taboo. And most international relations scholars agree on this.

**India Pakistan Nuclear War Causes Massive Amounts Of Death And Radiation Dooms Humanity**

Lal **Khan**, June 3, **2002**, *India and Pakistan Millions threatened with a Nuclear Holocaust*

http://www.marxist.com/Asia/india\_pakistan\_war\_threat.html

In the madness which now rules on both sides, they do not even try to imagine **the implications of a nuclear exchange**. Nor those blind followers from primitive sections of society who danced with joy and distributed sweets **in India and Pakistan** when these tests were detonated in May 1998. Current estimates **are that 12 million people would be killed outright** in a nuclear exchange between the two warring countries and **countless more millions would linger on, dying slowly, painfully and horribly.**

Taking Hoffman's 1 megaton blast as an example, those within a radius of say 6 square miles will be killed by the gamma rays emitted by the blast. They will be the lucky ones. They will have no warning, no idea as to what it was that cooked them.

Outside the circle for another ten miles or so **every living thing, human or animal, will be instantly blinded by the bright light from the explosion whether their eyes be open or closed.** The initial gamma burst will be followed a tenth of a second later, by a multi-spectral heat blast, followed over the next few seconds by **a pressure wave** which **will cause all living beings in its way to bleed from every orifice of their bodies.** The wave will be accompanied by high velocity winds about 70 miles per hour as far as 6 miles from the epicentre. These will be carrying dangerous debris causing multiple wounds and injuries. The wave and winds will cause the death of many and those that survive over perhaps an area of 150 square miles will later suffer from vomiting, skin rashes and unquenchable thirst. Their hair will fall out in clumps, and their skin will peel off. The mushroom-shaped cloud will dissipate within an hour and **then comes the invisible and intractable radiation, spreading death and disease over a large area. The clouds that drift with the wind will carry a deadly cargo for thousands of miles, over international borders into countries which have no involvement in the India-Pakistan dispute.**

Cancer, leukaemia and other genetic damage by radioactive material will strike generations to come. The final phenomenon is the electromagnetic pulse caused by the nuclear blast, which can be as large as the subcontinent and as deadly. It can electrify metallic structures in such a way that an entire country can seem to have been struck by lightning in one fell swoop. To cite just a few examples of what would happen, pacemakers will cease to work, aircraft will fall from the skies, train tracks and telephone wiring will carry the charge and **whatever does not explode will cease to function.**

## SYSTEMIC HARMS (TROOPS CAUSE CIVILIAN CASUALTIES)

**There have been too many innocent civilian causalities in Afghanistan due to unreliable US troops and airstrikes**

**Smith, Sep. ’09** (David Miller, Director of the Human Rights Campaign and Public Education Programs of the HRC Foundation, “Afghanistan, Ten Reasons to Resist”, <http://www.hrc.org/about_us/6031.htm>)

**The promise is that these weapons will minimize civilian casualties in war zones. However, the reality is that civilian casualties rose 40% in 2008 according to a UN report. Civilian deaths in Afghanistan from US and NATO airstrikes nearly tripled from 2006 to 2007**, according to a September 2008 report by Human Rights Watch. **On May 4, 2009, over one hundred civilians were killed by a U.S. airstrike** in Farah province. Recently **the US military has admitted errors, but drone attacks continue. Thousands of non-combatant Afghanis have been killed**, but reliable statistics are non-existent.

**“As the conflict has intensified, it is taking an increasingly heavy toll on civilians.”** U.N. Report by The Campaign for Innocent Victims in Conflict (CIVIC), February 2009

## SYSTEMIC HARMS (VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMYN)

**An increase of US troops in Afghanistan has contributed to the unstable conditions of violence against women, in addition to an increase in sex trafficking, prostitution, and rape**

**Smith, Sep. ’09** (David Miller, Director of the Human Rights Campaign and Public Education Programs of the HRC Foundation, “Afghanistan, Ten Reasons to Resist”, <http://www.hrc.org/about_us/6031.htm>)

**We have been told that the initial invasion, continued presence, and escalation of foreign troops in Afghanistan are needed to “protect” Afghani women and girls.** However, **women in Afghanistan have endured oppression and mistreatment at the hands of the Taliban, the current government, and by foreign occupiers.**

**Women have had their families torn apart by war and are themselves killed by military violence. The U.S. has been guilty of arming warlords and armed militias in its fight against the Taliban, contributing to unstable conditions which breed violence against women and children. The increased presence of foreign troops has caused sex trafficking of young girls, prostitution, and rape to skyrocket.**

Meanwhile, **the US hypocritically supports regimes such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Qatar that have similar repressive policies towards women as exist in Afghanistan**.

“Self-immolation, rape and abduction of women and children has no parallel in the history of Afghanistan”¦the **US government has no and will not have any genuine concern for the condition of freedom, democracy and women’s rights in Afghanistan**.”“Revolutionary Women of Afghanistan. October 7, 2008 statement

“**It’s doubtful whether America’s foreign policy has ever had the welfare of Afghan women at heart**”¦ In most parts of the world, **highly militarized societies in almost every instance lead to bad results for women. The security of women is not improved and in many instances it actually becomes worse.”**“Kavita Ramdas, President and CEO of the Global Fund for Women

## SYSTEMIC HARMS (MENTAL DETERIORATION)

**The US Army has reported the highest level of suicides and mental health issues of US troops as a result of the countless troops fighting an endless war in Afghanistan**

**Smith, Sep. ’09** (David Miller, Director of the Human Rights Campaign and Public Education Programs of the HRC Foundation, “Afghanistan, Ten Reasons to Resist”, <http://www.hrc.org/about_us/6031.htm>)

**In February 2009, the US Army reported the highest level of suicides among soldiers** (in 2008) since it began tracking suicides 28 years ago. In May 2009, **Fort Campbell took the unprecedented step of shutting down operations for three days to address the issue of mental health. When soldiers are finally released from the military, care is often woefully inadequate to address both physical and mental health needs. The troops who refuse to fight the war in Afghanistan are at the forefront of ranks swelled with discontented men and women who see no real justification for endless war and occupations**.

“**There is no way I will deploy to Afghanistan. The occupation is immoral and unjust. It does not make the American people any safer. It has the opposite effect**.” “US Army Spc Victor Agosto who refused to deploy to Afghanistan in May 2009

“Iraq **Veterans against the War calls for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all occupying forces in Afghanistan and reparations for the Afghan people, and supports all troops and veterans working towards those ends**.” “Iraq Veterans Against the War. March 6, 2009 resolution

## SYSTEMIC HARMS (TORTURE)

**Having troops in Afghanistan reinforces the war, approving torturing methods US soldiers implement on innocent civilians of Afghanistan**

**Smith, Sep. ’09** (David Miller, Director of the Human Rights Campaign and Public Education Programs of the HRC Foundation, “Afghanistan, Ten Reasons to Resist”, <http://www.hrc.org/about_us/6031.htm>)

**The use of torture and “enhanced interrogation” methods by US forces in Afghanistan “all clearly outlawed by the Geneva Convention**” has been well documented. **The most infamous torture site in Afghanistan is the US Bagram Air Base.**

“**The investigative file on Bagram” showed that the mistreatment of prisoners was routine: shackling them to the ceilings of their cells, depriving them of sleep, kicking and hitting them, sexually humiliating them and threatening them with guard dogs “the very same behavior later repeated in Iraq.”**“Editorial of the New York Times. May 23, 2005. In detailing one of the documented cases of an Afghan detainee, **Mr. Dilawar, being tortured to death by US soldiers**, the New York Times **reported:**

“**A guard tried to force the young man to his knees. But his legs, which had been pummeled by guards for several days, could no longer bend. An interrogator told Mr. Dilawar that he could see a doctor after they finished with him.**

**When he was finally sent back to his cell, though, the guards were instructed only to chain the prisoner back to the ceiling”**¦**It would be many months before Army investigators learned a final horrific detail: Most of the interrogators had believed Mr. Dilawar was an innocent man** who simply drove his taxi past the American base at the wrong time.”In 2005, eight men being held at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba separately gave their lawyers “consistent accounts” of being tortured at a secret prison in Afghanistan at various periods from 2002 to 2004.

Prisoners reported being arrested in various countries, and being flown to Afghanistan where they were held in a secret facility. A report released by Human Rights Watch said that the detainees called the place the “prison of darkness,” and that they said they were chained to walls, deprived of food and drinking water, and kept in total darkness with loud rap or heavy metal music blaring for weeks at a time.  
Obama’s proclaimed intent to close down the Guantanamo Bay prisons for its role in torture and human rights abuses has garnered much attention. However**, Bagram Air Force base has received little attention and the US government does not intend to close it any time soon.**

## U.S. TROOP PRESENCE FUELS OPPOSITION (ECONOMICS)

**The US is financing its own enemy through Taliban insurgents**

**MacKenzie, ’09 (**Jean, 5 year director for the Institute for War & Peace Reporting, covered Taliban insurgency and poppy industry, “Funding the Afghan Taliban,” <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/taliban/funding-the-taliban>)

It is the open secret no one wants to talk about, the unwelcome truth that most prefer to hide. **In Afghanistan, one of the richest sources of Taliban funding is the foreign assistance coming into the country.**

**Virtually every major project includes a healthy cut for the insurgents.** Call it protection money, call it extortion, or, as the Taliban themselves prefer to term it, **“spoils of war,”** the fact remains that **international donors, primarily the United States, are to a large extent financing their own enemy.**

“Everyone knows this is going on,” said one U.S. Embassy official, speaking privately.

It is almost impossible to determine how much the insurgents are spending, making it difficult to pinpoint the sources of the funds.

Mullah Abdul Salaam Zaeef, former Taliban minister to Pakistan, was perhaps more than a bit disingenuous when he told GlobalPost that the militants were operating mostly on air.

“The Taliban does not have many expenses,” he said, smiling slightly. “They are barefoot and hungry, with no roof over their heads and a stone for their pillow.” As for weapons, he just shrugged. “Afghanistan is full of guns,” he said. “We have enough guns for years.”

The reality is quite different, of course. The militants recruit local fighters by paying for their services. They move about in their traditional 4x4s, they have to feed their troops, pay for transportation and medical treatment for the wounded, and, of course, they have to buy rockets, grenades and their beloved Kalashnikovs.

**Up until quite recently, most experts thought that drug money accounted for the bulk of Taliban funding.** But even here opinion was divided on actual amounts. Some reports gauged the total annual income at about $100 million, while others placed the figure as high as $300 million — still a small fraction of the $4 billion poppy industry.

Now administration officials have launched a search for Taliban sponsors. Richard Holbrooke, U.S. special envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, told a press conference in Islamabad last month that drugs accounted for less of a share of Taliban coffers than was previously thought.

“In the past there was a kind of feeling that the money all came from drugs in Afghanistan,” said Holbrooke, according to media reports. “That is simply not true.”

**The new feeling is that less than half of the Taliban’s war chest comes from poppy, with a variety of sources, including private contributions from Persian Gulf states, accounting for much of the rest.** Holbrooke told reporters that he would add a member of the Treasury Department to his staff to pursue the question of Taliban funding.

But **perhaps U.S. officials need look no further than their own backyard.**

**Anecdotal evidence is mounting that the Taliban are taking a hefty portion of assistance money coming into Afghanistan from the outside.**

This goes beyond mere protection money or extortion of “taxes” at the local level — very high-level negotiations take place between the Taliban and major contractors, according to sources close to the process. A shadowy office in Kabul houses the Taliban contracts officer, who examines proposals and negotiates with organizational hierarchies for a percentage. He will not speak to, or even meet with, a journalist, but sources who have spoken with him and who have seen documents say that the process is quite professional.

The manager of an Afghan firm with lucrative construction contracts with the U.S. government builds in a minimum of 20 percent for the Taliban in his cost estimates. The manager, who will not speak openly, has told friends privately that he makes in the neighborhood of $1 million per month. Out of this, $200,000 is siphoned off for the insurgents.

If negotiations fall through, the project will come to harm — road workers may be attacked or killed, bridges may be blown up, engineers may be assassinated.

The degree of cooperation and coordination between the Taliban and aid workers is surprising, and would most likely make funders extremely uncomfortable.

One Afghan contractor, speaking privately, told friends of one project he was overseeing in the volatile south. The province cannot be mentioned, nor the particular project.

“I was building a bridge,” he said, one evening over drinks. “The local Taliban commander called and said ‘don’t build a bridge there, we’ll have to blow it up.’ I asked him to let me finish the bridge, collect the money — then they could blow it up whenever they wanted. We agreed, and I completed my project.”

In the south, no contract can be implemented without the Taliban taking a cut, sometimes at various steps along the way.

One contractor in the southern province of Helmand was negotiating with a local supplier for a large shipment of pipes. The pipes had to be brought in from Pakistan, so the supplier tacked on about 30 percent extra for the Taliban, to ensure that the pipes reached Lashkar Gah safely.

Once the pipes were given over to the contractor, he had to negotiate with the Taliban again to get the pipes out to the project site. This was added to the transportation costs.

“We assume that our people are paying off the Taliban,” said the foreign contractor in charge of the project.

## U.S. TROOP PRESENCE FUELS OPPOSITION (ECONOMICS)

In Farah province, local officials report that the Taliban are taking up to 40 percent of the money coming in for the National Solidarity Program, one of the country’s most successful community reconstruction projects, which has dispensed hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the country over the past six years.

**Many Afghans see little wrong in the militants getting their fair share of foreign assistance.**

“This is international money," said one young Kabul resident. **“They are not taking it from the people, they are taking it from their enemy.”**But in areas under Taliban control, the insurgents are extorting funds from the people as well.

In war-ravaged Helmand, where much of the province has been under Taliban control for the past two years, residents grumble about the tariffs.

“It’s a disaster,” said a 50-year-old resident of Marja district. “We have to give them two kilos of poppy paste per jerib during the harvest; then we have to give them ushr (an Islamic tax, amounting to one-tenth of the harvest) from our wheat. Then they insisted on zakat (an Islamic tithe). Now they have come up with something else: 12,000 Pakistani rupee (approximately $150) per household. And they won’t take even one rupee less.”

It all adds up, of course. But all things are relative: **if the Taliban are able to raise and spend say $1 billion per year — the outside limit of what anyone has been able to predict — that accounts for what the United States is now spending on 10 days of the war to defeat them.**

## ISRAEL ADD-ON

**U.S. – ISRAELI RELATION ARE IN A CRISIS STATE**

The worst in 35 YEARS, the utmost MUST be done to CALM matters.

**RAVID writer for the HAARETZ online 2k10**

Barak-; HAARETZ.com-online Israeli newspaper; *Israel envoy: U.S. ties at their lowest ebb in 35 years*

*Oren was speaking to the Israeli consuls general in a conference call on Saturday night;* March 15;

<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-envoy-u-s-ties-at-their-lowest-ebb-in-35-years-1.264758>

**Israel's ambassador to the United States, Michael Oren, has told the country's diplomats there that U.S.-Israeli relations face their worst crisis in 35 years, despite attempts by Prime Minister** Benjamin **Netanyahu's office to project a sense of "business as usual."**

Oren was speaking to the Israeli consuls general in a conference call on Saturday night.

Netanyahu consulted Sunday with the forum of seven senior cabinet ministers over a list of demands that U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made in a telephone conversation Friday.

Clinton harshly criticized the announcement last week of plans to expand the Ramat Shlomo neighborhood in East Jerusalem while U.S. Vice President Joe Biden was visiting Israel.

Haaretz has learned that Clinton's list includes at least four steps the United States expects Netanyahu to carry out to restore confidence in bilateral relations and permit the resumption of peace talks with the Palestinians.

1. Investigate the process that led to the announcement of the Ramat Shlomo construction plans in the middle of Biden's visit. The Americans seek an official response from Israel on whether this was a bureaucratic mistake or a deliberate act carried out for political reasons. Already on Saturday night, Netanyahu announced the convening of a committee to look into the issue.

2. Reverse the decision by the Jerusalem District Planning and Building Committee to approve construction of 1,600 new housing units in Ramat Shlomo.

3. Make a substantial gesture toward the Palestinians enabling the renewal of peace talks. The Americans suggested that hundreds of Palestinian prisoners be released, that the Israel Defense Forces withdraw from additional areas of the West Bank and transfer them to Palestinian control, that the siege of the Gaza Strip be eased and further roadblocks in the West Bank be removed.

4. Issue an official declaration that the talks with the Palestinians, even indirect talks, will deal with all the conflict's core issues - borders, refugees, Jerusalem, security arrangements, water and settlements.

Two advisers of the prime minister, Yitzhak Molcho and Ron Dermer, held marathon talks Sunday with senior White House officials in Washington and U.S. Mideast envoy George Mitchell and his staff to try to calm the situation. Mitchell will return to Israel Tuesday and expects to hear if Netanyahu intends to take the proposed steps.

At the beginning of Sunday's cabinet meeting, **Netanyahu tried to convey a message that there was no crisis in relations with the United States. But he sent precisely the opposite message to Oren in Washington.**

In Oren's Saturday conference call with the Israeli consuls general, **he said that the current crisis was** the **most serious** with the Americans since a confrontation between Henry Kissinger and Yitzhak Rabin in 1975 over an American demand for a partial withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula.

At Sunday's cabinet meeting, Netanyahu said the matter had been blown out of proportion by the media. He added: "There was an unfortunate incident here that was innocently committed and was hurtful, and certainly should not have occurred."

He said steps would be taken to prevent such cases in the future. "It is extremely important to understand that the State of Israel and the United States have common interests," he said, adding that those interests "also require us to take decisions to change the situation in the country."

Four consuls discussed the conference call with Haaretz. Some noted that in previous conference calls with Oren, the ambassador took pains to make clear that relations with the United States were excellent. This time, however, **Oren sounded extremely tense and pessimistic.** Oren was **quoted as saying that "the crisis was very serious and we are facing a very difficult period in relations** [between the two countries]."

Oren told the consuls to lobby congressmen, Jewish community leaders and the media to convey Israel's position. He said the message to be relayed was that Israel had no intention to cause offense to Vice President Biden and that the matter had stemmed from actions by junior bureaucrats in the Interior Ministry and was caused by a lack of coordination between government offices. "It should be stressed that [our] relations with the United States are very important to us," Oren reportedly said.

Several of the consuls suggested waiting, but Oren hinted that his approach reflected Netanyahu's wishes. "These instructions come from the highest level in Jerusalem," he was quoted as saying, **adding that the utmost must be done to calm matters.**

Oren told participants in the conference call of a meeting he was summoned to on Friday with Deputy Secretary of State James Steinberg for a reprimand. Oren spoke of his surprise at being summoned after believing that the crisis had ended on Thursday.

"Steinberg read to me from the [American] letter of protest, whose content was extremely harsh," Oren reportedly said. Despite several requests for a reaction from the embassy, no response was forthcoming at press time.

## ISRAEL ADD-ON

**OBAMA’S RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL ARE ABYSMAL**

Israel’s expectations are that US foreign policy MIRROR Israeli Doctrine. Israel fears that Obama’s policies in the Middle East will leave Israel DEFENSELESS.

**RODGERS former senior international correspondent for CNN, writes a biweekly column 2k10**

Walter-; *Rift between Israel and the United States: Flotilla incident didn't help;* CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR; June 9; <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Walter-Rodgers/2010/0609/Rift-between-Israel-and-the-United-States-Flotilla-incident-didn-t-help>

**It is difficult to recall a time when relations between a sitting US president and the Jewish state of Israel have been uglier. The embarrassing and deadly raid by not-so-crack Israeli commandos on Gaza-bound relief ships** May 31 **only further demonstrates how badly the American president is constrained because of his earlier jagged ties with the government of Israel and with angry, right-wing American Jews.**

**The Obama administration was painfully aware of just how abysmal relations with Israel had become** even before the confrontation at sea.

**Amid Washington’s fears of an even deeper breach with Jewish voters** as well as earlier disagreements over Jewish settlement building in Jerusalem, **the Obama administration’s response to the flotilla raid was muted. Much of the rest of the world viewed the incident as another public relations torpedo below the waterline of Israel’s international reputation.**

**But Washington’s reluctance to condemn the Israeli fiasco is not likely to help President Obama’s reputation with Jews.**

One Israeli friend – who can’t be named because he works for a major US media organization – told me he was livid about a previous perceived Obama slap at the Jewish state. “We will never forgive the Obama White House for saying America pays with blood and treasure for the continuing conflicts in the Middle East,” he said. “Obama was implicitly blaming Israel for Arab hatred of the United States and terrorism. This is classic anti-Semitism, blaming Jews for all wars.”

Earlier, **more than a few Jews were infuriated with the Obama administration’s flirtation with the idea of a “nuclear-free Middle East.”** Marcia Wagner, an American Zionist and Boston attorney went meshugeneh (crazy), **alleging, “Obama’s trying to take away Israel’s nuclear arsenal! He’s trying to leave Israel defenseless!”**

Other Jewish attacks on this American president have been less subtle. Hagai Ben **Artzi, Prime Minister** Benjamin **Netanyahu’s brother-in-law, recently called Mr. Obama an anti-Semite** on an Israeli talk show.

**Implicit in this criticism is the assumption that US foreign policy is supposed to mirror Israeli doctrine by following the Israeli prime minister’s lead in the Middle East. From Israel’s viewpoint, this is not an unreasonable expectation.** The Bush-Cheney administration gave the government of Ariel Sharon carte blanche in the Middle East.

Yet Obama’s vision differs radically from that of both right-wing Israelis and George W. Bush. He is at least to be credited with tackling the Middle East from Day 1. His message to all parties, including Israel, is that the status quo is unsustainable.

“There are three trends working very much against Israel: demography [i.e., high Arab birthrates], ideology [militant Islam], and technology,” a close aide to Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton told me recently. “With the distances rockets can travel, the old kind of thought is proving untenable.”

## ISRAEL ADD-ON

**TURN: U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENT IN AFGHANISTAN STRAIN ISRAELI SECURITY**

**HASELKORN noted author & contributor to HAARETZ 2k10**

Avigdor-; *Relations of Mutual Liability*; HAARETZ.com;

<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/relations-of-mutual-liability-1.733>

The deployment of military forces abroad by a foreign power is often intended to defend its local allies and deter its enemies. But **in the Middle East**, especially since the second Gulf War, **a curious strategic paradox is unfolding.** Accordingly, **the more extensive the U.S. military involvement is in the region, the more Israel's maneuvering space and freedom of action are constrained.** At the same time, the impact of the robust American presence vis-a-vis Israel's regional enemies has been negligible.

Not only is Washington more determined than ever to prevent an Israeli preemptive attack on Iran's nuclear facilities, but lately even the approval of plans by the Jerusalem municipality for new housing in East Jerusalem has reportedly brought grumbles from the U.S. Central Command. The latter supposedly sees any tension between Israel and the Palestinians as inimical to the well-being of its troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

At the same time, the deterrent effect on radicals like Syria, Iran and their allies of the introduction of over 200,000 U.S. soldiers, backed by the most advanced air and naval assets, into Iraq and Afghanistan, is yet to be felt.

By all indications, the American troop buildup failed to deter Iran's (and before that, Syria's) nuclear program. Additionally, the re-arming by Tehran and Damascus of another implacable Israeli and U.S. foe - Hezbollah - with ever more lethal, accurate and long-range weapons, has proceeded unhindered since 2006. Iran has also taken action against U.S. forces themselves. For example, Gen. David Petraeus, then the top U.S. military commander in Iraq, said in October 2007: "They [the Iranians] are responsible for providing the weapons, the training, the funding and in some cases the direction for operations that have indeed killed U.S. soldiers."

The same month, the U.S. Treasury Department announced economic sanctions against the Al-Quds Force, the elite unit of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), for being the "Iranian regime's primary instrument for providing lethal support to the Taliban ... to support anti-U.S. and anti-coalition activity in Afghanistan." In freezing the assets of nine IRGC-affiliated entities and five IRGC-affiliated individuals, among them the commander of the Al-Quds Force, the treasury accused Iran of providing the Taliban with a wide range and substantial quantity of weaponry and ammunition.

**Rather than deterring radicals, the continued deployment of U.S. troops in** Iraq and **Afghanistan has been used as leverage against America.** By threatening to target their regional bases, Iran is in effect keeping these contingents hostage and acting to dissuade any military undertaking against its nuclear facilities. For instance, Mohammad Ali Jafari, the IRGC commander, said in a June 2008 interview: "We believe that the **Americans are more vulnerable than the Israelis, and the presence of their forces in the region, not far from Iran, is part of this vulnerability."**

**The bottom line is that Middle Eastern radicals have been able to turn the tables on America, and indirectly, Israel as well.** **Instead of Iran and Syria feeling hemmed in by the expanded presence of U.S. forces on their borders, it is Jerusalem that is increasingly fearful of a multi-pronged attack. Rather than keeping regional radicals in check, the U.S. deployment has become a handicap for Israel.**

**The setback for Israel is due to U.S. efforts to pacify** Iraq and **Afghanistan** by co-opting local adversaries, coupled by the Obama administration's principal shift toward an "extended hand" policy vis-a-vis its regional enemies. **In turn, any Israeli military initiative is viewed in Washington as "unhelpful," if not downright dangerous, as it may cause an Arab/Muslim backlash against America and endanger U.S. regional assets.** Last September, Zbigniew Brzezinski, president Jimmy Carter's national security adviser in the 1970s, even went so far as recommending that U.S. pilots shoot down Israeli aircraft if they crossed into Iraq's airspace to attack Iran's nuclear facilities and refused to turn back.

## ISRAEL ADD-ON

**As a result of this approach, the U.S.-Israeli relationship today is one of mutual liability. Israel is increasingly perceived as a strategic liability in Washington, because its actions threaten to derail the courting of Arab/Muslim radicals deemed central to America's global "war" on terror. At the same time, the United States is a growing burden on Israel, given the Obama administration's efforts to deny it the strategic initiative that is vital for preserving its national security.**

**In hindsight, the first Gulf War model, which saw the withdrawal of U.S. troops** from Iraq as soon as the guns fell silent - even though Saddam Hussein remained in power, a move that was roundly criticized in Israel - **was more in tandem with long-range Israeli security interests** than the model of the second conflict.

**Ironically, Jerusalem and the Obama administration now share a desire to see the U.S. troops return home: The sooner America's soldiers leave Iraq, the quicker the two countries' security interests will become more compatible and bilateral relations will be more harmonious.**

Those in Israel who advocate formal ties with NATO should remember that **even a geographically remote ground presence of an allied military in the region inhibited Israel's freedom of action, eroded its deterrent posture and strained its ties with its foremost friend.**

## ISRAEL ADD-ON

**STRONG US-ISRAELI RELATIONS ARE KEY TO AVERTING NUCLEAR WAR**

**O’SULLIVAN, 1998**

(Arieh, staff, Jerusalem Post, “israel needs us shield against nuke

threat,” june 14, l/n)

Israel must maintain strong security ties with the United States as the best answer to the growing threat of nuclear weapons, said Prof. Shai Feldman, head of the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies.   
Feldman said that Israel's passive and active defense doctrines against weapons of mass destruction are also contingent on strong security ties with Washington. "The Israeli answer to a nuclear threat needs cooperation between the Israeli and American security establishments," Feldman said. "Israel must beware of straining these relations with the United States." He made these comments prior to a conference on "Challenges to Global and Middle East Security," which begins tomorrow at Tel Aviv University.   
The conference, organized by both the JCSS and the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, has assembled top security experts from around the world, including former deputy US secretaries of defense.   
According to Feldman, the conference is to focus on the dangers of the proliferation of non-conventional weapons in the Middle East, including chemical and biological weapons and ballistic missiles, but particularly nuclear weapons.   
Feldman said that Israel's current doctrine to protect itself from the non-conventional threat - which includes the need for real-time warning of any launch of ballistic missiles - demands close cooperation with the United States. These ties are the key to whether Israel will be able to successfully deal with the strategic threats facing it, he maintained.

**ISREAL WON’T HESITATE TO RETALIATE AGGRESSION WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

**BERES, 1997**

(Rene -- prof of political science at purdue, “after the peace process,”

Dickinson Journal of International Law, winter, l/n)

Israel's enemies and friends must understand that there are conditions wherein Jerusalem actually might decide to use its nuclear weapons. [31](http://www.lexis.com/research/" \l "n31" \t "_self) Faced with what would be perceived as imminent destruction of the Third Temple, Israel's leaders would likely do whatever is needed to endure, including a resort to nuclear retaliation, nuclear counterretaliation, nuclear preemption, and nuclear warfighting.   
A. Nuclear Retaliation   
Should an enemy launch a nuclear first-strike against Israel, Jerusalem would certainly respond, to the extent possible, with a nuclear retaliatory strike. [32](http://www.lexis.com/research/" \l "n32" \t "_self) If enemy first-strikes were to involve other forms of unconventional weapons such as chemical and/or biological weapons, it is conceivable that Israel might launch a nuclear reprisal (depending, in large measure, upon Jerusalem's expectations of follow-on aggression and on its associated calculations of comparative damage-limitation). If Israel absorbed a massive conventional attack, a nuclear retaliation could not be ruled out, especially if: (a) the aggressor were perceived to hold nuclear and/or other unconventional weapons in reserve; and/or (b) Israel's leaders were to believe that non-nuclear retaliations could not prevent destruction of the Third Temple. [33](http://www.lexis.com/research/" \l "n33" \t "_self) A nuclear retaliation by Israel could be ruled out only in circumstances where enemy aggression were clearly conventional, "typical," (i.e., consistent with previous instances of Arab attacks in degree and intent) and hard-target directed.

## TERRORIST ADD-ON

**U.S. TROOP PRESENCE IN AFGHANISTAN IGNORES TERRORIST THREATS ELSEWHERE**

**CURTIS editor of ONLINECOLUMNIST.com 2k10**

John M.-; *Yemeni Terrorist Al-Awlaki's New Threats* ; LA CITY BUZZ EXAMINER; May 23;

<http://www.examiner.com/x-45268-LA-City-Buzz-Examiner~y2010m5d23-Yemeni-Terrirust-AlAwalkis-New-Threats>

**Escalating U.S. troop strength in Afghanistan** by 30,000 or 40% Dec. 2, 2009, **President Barack Obama committed U.S. assets to Afghanistan, ignoring terrorist threats in Yemen, Somalia and other parts of East Africa.** Former President Bill Clinton had no coherent response following the downing, with al-Qaida’s help, of two Blackhawk helicopters in Mogadishu Oct. 3, 1993, killing 19 U.S. soldiers. Five years later, al-Qaida bombed U.S. embassiesin East Africa Aug. 7, 1998, prompting Clinton’s throwaway missile attack against Bin Laden. Al-Qaida’s East African attacks prompted former CIA Director George J. Tenet to declare war on Bin Laden, yet neither the CIA nor U.S. military were committed to the cause. Two years later, al-Qaida struck the U.S.S. Cole Aug. 12, 2000 in Yemen’s Gulf of Aden, killing 17 U.S. sailors. **Despite al-Qaida’s terrorist activity in East Africa, the U.S. war continues in Afghanistan.**

**FOCUSING ON AFGHANISTAN DOES NOT MAKE SENSE**

**U.S. MUST REDIRECT U.S. ASSESTS TO FIGHT TERRORISM ABROAD**

**CURTIS editor of ONLINECOLUMNIST.com 2k10**

John M.-; *Yemeni Terrorist Al-Awlaki's New Threats* ; LA CITY BUZZ EXAMINER; May 23;

<http://www.examiner.com/x-45268-LA-City-Buzz-Examiner~y2010m5d23-Yemeni-Terrirust-AlAwalkis-New-Threats>

**While U.S. troops prepare for an all-out offensive in Taliban-stronghold Kandahar, Obama must urgently reassess the mission and redirect U.S. assets to East Africa, especially Yemen and Somalia.** Al-Awlaki reportedly had direct contacts with Nigerian-born underwear bomber Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab and Fort Hood shooter Army psychiatrist Abdel Malik Hasan. “The president will continue to take action directly at terrorists like Awlaki and keep our country safe from their murderous thugs,” said White House spokesman Robert Gibbs. **While House officials can’t explain a terrorism policy that focuses primarily of Afghanistan, when recent terrorism has originated from East Afrcia. Like the U.S. is finding in Kandahar, terrorists quickly shift locations, staying several steps ahead of their pursuers. U.S. terrorism policy must be more capable of switching gears.**

Despite promises from Yemen’s security services to track down and arrest al-Awlaki, the U.S. must pursue the U.S.-born traitor and terrorist with more vigor. Insisting that the U.S. is “actively trying to find al-Awlaki, the CIA must have more boots on the ground. Over-reliance on predator drone attacks in Pakistan has let renegades like Osama bin Laden and Mullah Mohammed Omar slip trough the cracks. They must be pursued relentlessly if the U.S. has any chance of making progress in the war on terror. Al-Awlaki, a son of U.S.- educated Yemen’s Agriculture minister, turned against the U.S. sometime around Sept. 11. U.S. officials must do a better job of profiling young Muslims vulnerable to the temptations made by full-fledged terrorists like al-Awlaki. Explaining why children of affluent families are draw toward Islamic terrorism is anyone’s guess.  
**White House officials must do a better job adapting U.S. assets to ever-shifting points of terrorism activity. Since going to war against the Taliban** in 2001, **the U.S. has made some wrong turns,** especially detouring into Iraq. Sometime next year, **Barack will fill a campaign promise to end the Iraq War. He must do the same in Afghanistan before wasting more U.S. assets and lives.** “As for the Americans, I will never surrender to them,” said al-Alwaki.. :If the Americans want me, let them come look for me. God is my protector,” daring Obama to go after Yemen and Somalia-based terrorists. **U.S. officials can’t afford to spread assets too thin in** Iraq and **Afghanistan, when they’ve got more pressing priorities in East Africa. Too much time has already elapsed with White House terrorism policy.** Al-Alwaki’s **new threats warrant an urgent redirection in the U.S. fight against terror.**

## TERRORIST ADD-ON

**TERRORIST ATTACK RISK FULL-SCALE NUCLEAR EXCHANGE.**

Louis Rene Beres, Professor of Political Science and International Law at Purdue, TERRORISM AND GLOBAL SECURITY, 1987, p. 42-3

**Nuclear terrorism could even spark a full scale war between states. Such a war could involve the entire spectrum of nuclear conflict possibilities, ranging from a nuclear attack upon a non-nuclear state to systemwide nuclear war.** How might such far reaching consequences of nuclear terrorism come about? Perhaps the most likely way would involve a terrorist nuclear assault against a state by terrorists hosted in another state. For example, consider the following scenario: Early in the 1990s, Israel and its Arab state neighbors finally stand ready to conclude a comprehensive, multilateral peace settlement. With a bilateral treaty between Israel and Egypt already many years old, only the interests of the Palestinians, as defined by the PLO, seem to have been left out. On the eve of the proposed signing of the peace agreement, half a dozen crude nuclear explosives in the one kiloton range detonate in as many Israeli cities. Public grief in Israel over the many thousand dead and maimed is matched only by the outcry for revenge. In response to the public mood, the government of Israel initiates selected strikes against terrorist strongholds in Lebanon, whereupon Lebanese Shiite forces and Syria retaliate against Israel. Before long, the entire region is ablaze, conflict has escalated to nuclear forms, and all countries of the area have suffered unprecedented destruction. Of course, such a scenario is fraught with the makings of even wider destruction. How would the United States react to the situation in the Middle East? What would be the soviet response? **It is certainly conceivable that a chain reaction of interstate nuclear conflict could ensue, one that would ultimately involve** the superpowers or even **every nuclear weapon state on the planet.**

## A2: HEGEMONY DISADVANTAGE

**NON-UNIQUE: U.S. MILITARY DOMINANCE IS ERODING**

**KREPINEVICH Pres of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments 2k9**

Andrew -, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Jul/Aug 2009, 18-33.

The **military foundations of the United States' global dominance are eroding.** **For the past several decades, an overwhelming advantage in technology and resources has given the U.S. military an unmatched ability to project power worldwide.** This has allowed it to guarantee U.S. access to the global commons, assure the safety of the homeland, and underwrite security commitments around the globe. **U.S. grand strategy assumes that such advantages will continue indefinitely. In fact, they are already starting to disappear.**

**TURN: PROTRACTED WAR KILLS RECRUITMENT**

**BACEVICH Prof of International Relations, BOSTON U. 2k8**

Andrew, THE LIMITS OF POWER: THE END OF AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM, 2008, 138.

**A reliance on volunteer-professionals places a de facto cap on the army's overall size.** The pool of willing recruits is necessarily limited. **Given a choice, most young Americans will opt for opportunities other than military service, with protracted war diminishing rather than enhancing any collective propensity to volunteer. It is virtually inconceivable that any presidential call to the colors, however impassioned, any PR campaign, however cleverly designed, or any package of pay and bonuses, however generous, could reverse this disinclination.**

**UNIQUENESS OVERWHELMS 🡪ZERO LINK TO THE AFFIRMATIVE**

U.S. nuclear deterrence sufficient and even a SCALE-BACK of forces would still be credible.

**PREBLE Dir of Foreign Policy Studies @ CATO Institute 2k9**

Christopher-, THE POWER PROBLEM: HOW AMERICAN MILITARY DOMINANCE MAKES US LESS SAFE, LESS PROSPEROUS, AND LESS FREE, 2009, 12.

A few hundred, and certainly less than one thousand, **nuclear weapons are more than sufficient to deter any state stupid enough to attack us directly.** Today **the U.S. arsenal includes nearly 5,000 nuclear warheads. If the nuclear deterrent proved insufficient**--and it hasn't for the past sixty years--**our Navy and Air Force would be sure to give a good fight to anyone who dared to challenge us directly, and this would still be true even if we scaled those forces back to a posture suited for self-defense.**

## A2: HEGEMONY DISADVANTAGE

**TURN: FOREIGN MILITARY PRESENCE WILL COLLAPSE EMPIRE**

**LUTZ Prof of International Studies @ Brown University 2k9**

Catherine-; THE BASES OF EMPIRE: THE GLOBAL STRUGGLE AGAINST U.S. MILITARY POSTS, 2009, 9-10.

States that invest their people's wealth in overseas bases have paid direct as well as opportunity costs, the consequences of which in the long run have usually been collapse of the empire. In The Rise and Fall of Great Powers, Kennedy notes that previous empires which established and tenaciously held onto overseas bases inevitably saw their wealth and power decay and that history demonstrates that military "security" alone is never enough. It may, over the shorter term, deter or defeat rival states ... [b]ut if, by such victories, the nation over-extends itself geographically and strategically; if, even at a less imperial level, it chooses to devote a large proportion of its total income to "protection," leaving less for "productive investment," it is likely to find its economic output slowing down, with dire implications for its long-term capacity to maintain both its citizens' consumption demands and its international position.

**AFFIRMATIVE IS THE ONLY WAY TO SUSTAIN U.S. HEGEMONY**

FAILURE TO ADDRESS OUR BLOATED MILITARY AND THE PROFLIGATED USE OF IT IN INAPPROPRIATE MISSIONS COLLAPSES THE U.S.

**JOHNSON President, Japan Research Institute 2k9**

Chalmers-; ASIA TIMES, Aug. 4, 2009. Retrieved Jan. 22, 2010 from www.atimes.com.

However ambitious United States President Barack Obama's domestic plans, one unacknowledged issue has the potential to destroy any reform efforts he might launch. Think of it as the 800-pound gorilla in the American living room: our longstanding reliance on imperialism and militarism in our relations with other countries and the vast, potentially ruinous global empire of bases that goes with it. The failure to begin to deal with our bloated military establishment and the profligate use of it in missions for which it is hopelessly inappropriate will, sooner rather than later, condemn the United States to a devastating trio of consequences: imperial overstretch, perpetual war and insolvency, leading to a likely collapse similar to that of the former Soviet Union.

**CASE TURNS IMPAX: ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS KEY TO HEGEMONY**

**GELB President Emeritus, Council on Foreign Relations 2k9**

Leslie-; FOREIGN AFFAIRS, May/June 2009, 58.

The bases of the United States' international power are the country's economic competitiveness and its political cohesion, and there should be little doubt at this point that both are in decline. Many acknowledge and lament faltering parts here and there, but they avoid a frontal stare at the deteriorating whole. It is too depressing to do so, too much for most people to bear. The federal deficit is now projected at $1.75 trillion for fiscal year 2009 and, with the costs of Medicare and Social Security skyrocketing, is likely to get even larger. The federal debt is already staggering: it tops $10 trillion. The United States is now the biggest debtor nation in history, and no nation with a massive debt has ever remained a great power. Its heavy industry has largely disappeared, having moved to foreign competitors, which has cut deeply into its ability to be independent in times of peril. Its public-school students trail their peers in other industrialized countries in math and science. They cannot compete in the global economy.

## A2: HEGEMONY DISADVANTAGE

**TURN: MASSIVE FOREIGN RESISTANCE TO U.S. BASES**

History of the United States being SENT PACKING

**LUTZ Prof of International Studies @ Brown University 2k9**

Catherine-; THE BASES OF EMPIRE: THE GLOBAL STRUGGLE AGAINST U.S. MILITARY POSTS, 2009, 14.

Between 1947 and 1990, the United States was asked to leave France, Yugoslavia, Iran, Ethiopia, Libya, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Algeria, Vietnam, Indonesia, Peru, Mexico, and Venezuela. Popular and political objection to the bases in Spain, the Philippines, Greece, and Turkey in the 1980s meant that those governments were able to negotiate significantly more compensation from the United States. Portugal threatened to evict the United States from important bases in the Azores unless it ceased its support for independence for its African colonies, a demand with which the United States complied. In the 1990s and later, the United States was sent packing, most significantly, from the Philippines, Panama, Saudi Arabia, Vieques, and Uzbekistan.

**U.S. BASES JUST MAKE THE POPULACE TARGETS FOR FOREIGN ATTACK**

**LUTZ Prof of International Studies @ Brown University 2k9**

Catherine-; THE BASES OF EMPIRE: THE GLOBAL STRUGGLE AGAINST U.S. MILITARY POSTS, 2009, 26-27.

Critical observers of U.S. foreign policy, Chalmers Johnson foremost among them, have thoroughly dissected and dismantled several of the arguments that have been made for maintaining a global military basing system. They have shown that the system has often failed in its own terms, that is, has not provided more safety for the United States or its allies, and U.S. apologists fail to characterize what the bases actually do: while said to provide defense and security, the U.S. presence has often created more attacks rather than fewer, as in Saudi Arabia or in Iraq. They have made the communities around the base a key target of Soviet or other nations' missiles, and local people recognize this. So on the island of Belau in the Pacific, site of sharp resistance to U.S. attempts to install a submarine base and jungle training center, people describe their experience of military basing in World War II: "When soldiers come, war comes." Likewise, on Guam, a common joke has it that few people but nuclear targeters in the Kremlin knew where their island is. Finally, U.S. military actions have often produced violence in the form of blowback rather than squelched it, undermining their own stated realist objectives.

**Supplying troops and promoting the war in Afghanistan promotes competition between the US, Russia, and China for control of resources in Central Asia.**

**Smith, Sep. ’09** (David Miller, Director of the Human Rights Campaign and Public Education Programs of the HRC Foundation, “Afghanistan, Ten Reasons to Resist”, <http://www.hrc.org/about_us/6031.htm>)

**Iraq Veterans against the War have framed the Afghanistan War in terms of its strategic importance to the US drive for control of a resource-rich region: “a primary motivation for the prolonged occupation of Afghanistan is competition between the U.S., Russia and China for control of oil and natural gas resources in Central Asia and the Caspian Sea**.”

Researchers have found that for the past 500 years, **climate change and conflict have been closely linked. Many experts predict that current climate trends are again likely to result in widespread global unrest and conflict in the near future. Yet** instead of finding real solutions, **our government is on target to spend $3.4 trillion directly contributing to the unrest**.

**“The US military is the largest single consumer of petroleum in the country, so as the military grows, so does addiction to fossil fuels.”**

# A2: HEGEMONY DISADVANTAGE (ECONOMICS KEY)

## Economic power is the foundation of US hegemony

David Mason, (Prof., Political Science, Butler U.), THE END OF THE AMERICAN CENTURY, 2009, 13.

The crux of the American problem is economic decline because much of America's global power and influence has been a function of its great economic wealth. In The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, Paul Kennedy puts it bluntly this way: "Wealth is usually needed to underpin military power, and military power is usually needed to acquire and protect wealth." Furthermore, economic wealth is an important dimension of "soft power" -- the ability to influence other countries without the exercise of raw military force, or "hard power." Thus, economic decline can adversely affect a country's international influence and standing.

## Economic strength is the foundation of US hegemony

Martin Jacques, (Visiting Sr. Fellow, London School of Economics), WHEN CHINA RULES THE WORLD: THE END OF THE WESTERN WORLD AND THE BIRTH OF A NEW GLOBAL ORDER, 2009, 5-6.

Military and political power rest on economic strength. As Paul Kennedy argued in The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, the ability of nations to exercise and sustain global hegemony has ultimately depended on their productive capacity. America's present superpower status is a product of its rapid economic growth between 1870 and 1950 and the fact that during the second half of the twentieth century it was the world's largest and often most dynamic economy. This economic strength underpinned and made possible its astonishing political, cultural and military power from 1945 onwards.

## Economic strength is a precondition for hegemony

Martin Jacques, (Visiting Sr. Fellow, London School of Economics), WHEN CHINA RULES THE WORLD: THE END OF THE WESTERN WORLD AND THE BIRTH OF A NEW GLOBAL ORDER, 2009, 6.

The precondition for being a hegemonic power, including the ability or otherwise to preside over a formal or informal empire, is economic strength. In the long run at least, it is a merciless measure. Notwithstanding this, imperial powers in decline are almost invariably in denial of the fact. That was the case with Britain from 1918 onwards and, to judge by the behaviour of the Bush administration (though perhaps not Obama's) -- which failed to read the runes, preferring to believe that the US was about to rule the world in a new American century when the country was actually in decline and on the eve of a world in which it would find its authority considerably diminished -- the US may well make the same mistake, perhaps on a much grander scale.

## Loss of our economic foundations will collapse US global hegemony

C. Fred Bergsten, (Dir., Peterson Institute for International Economics), FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Nov/Dec 2009, 20-38.

The U.S. government's continued failure to responsibly address the fiscal future of the United States will imperil its global position as well as its future prosperity. The country's fate is already largely in the hands of its foreign creditors, starting with China but also including Japan, Russia, and a number of oil-exporting countries. Unless the United States quickly achieves and maintains a sustainable economic position, its ability to pursue autonomous economic and foreign policies will become increasingly compromised.

## A2: CONSULT NATO COUNTERPLAN

**CONSULTATION PROCESS IRRELEVANT: U.S. ALWAYS ACHIEVES CONSENSUS**

Colin Powell, Secretary of State for the Bush Administration, 4-29-2003 [FDCH]

SEC. POWELL: The only other point I'd make, Senator Dodd, you know, even Iceland or Luxembourg could express an objection, and we not achieve consensus. SEN. DODD: No. SEC. POWELL: But the practice has tended not to be that way. SEN. DODD: I agree. SEC. POWELL: You tend to find a way forward. And the usual voting style of NATO is when there is an issue before the council, Lord Robertson sends it out to all of the member nations and say (sic), "Here's what we believe we ought to do, and does anybody want to break consensus on this by Monday morning at noon?" And so, we all work all through the weekend to talk to those who might be thinking of breaking consensus, and persuade them, and convince them and conjole them and go through all the diplomatic dance steps necessary to get consensus. And I play the perils of Pauline almost every other weekend since I got this job on some NATO proposal that we are worried about somebody breaking consensus. And sometimes consensus is broken and then we go through another week of debate. But usually, we can achieve consensus. And on those rare occasions where we cannot, then we find other ways to deal with the problem, as we did with the Turkey situation and went from the NAC down to the DPC.

**HEGEMONY TURNS GUT THE INTERNAL LINK TO THEIR NET BENEFIT**

Fred Chernoff, Associate Professor of Political Science at Colgate, 1995 *After Bipolarity* p. 223

On some occasions, policies are advocated and supported by several states but do not receive enough support to ensure that the policy is adopted. However, the support of more powerful states (e.g. a hegemon, if one is present) might offer a greater chance for a successful outcome. Realist theories, in particular, suggest that the support of a hegemon is an important factor**;** there is likely to be accord on the issue if the hegemon initially supports the proposa**l**. Thus, the question of whether the proposal is in the perceived interest of the hegemon would be an important one. If so, it is more likely that accord will result. The coding of this variable is based on the point at which the hegemon announced its support for the proposal. The proposal is taken as having the support of the hegemon if the United States was the initiator, or was a very early sponsor of the proposal, before more states indicated support. If the United States sponsored the proposal, the support value is high. The value is low if the United States actively opposed it. The value is medium in the remaining cases. Table 7.6 displays the results from the case studies of the hypothesized connection between the support of the hegemon and accord*.*

TURN: CONSULTING OUR ALLIES DESTROYS U.S. LEADERSHIP

Washington Post 8/10/93 l/n

The actual starting point of American policy appears to lie in the phenomenon called "multilateralism." That means consulting everyone -- allies, even in a sense adversaries, national governments and international organizations. It makes for an elaborate system of all checks and no capacity for movement and initiative. It takes the worthy purpose of consultation and converts it into a farcical invitation to doubters everywhere to paralyze American policy. It turns the idea of American leadership into a set of excuses for avoiding timely action in support of a community gasping for its last breath.

## A2: CONSULT NATO COUNTERPLAN

Obama is planning to totally ignore Europe

**Gaffney 2009**, Frank Gaffney Jr, president of the Center for Security Policy, 5/23/2009, “Gaffney: Facing nuclear realities,” Lexis

•Q: What do you think the future of NATO will be under the Obama administration? •A: I think the Obama administration will regard NATO as an **increasingly irrelevant** organization, one that has outlived its utility, that is a needless impediment to improving relations with the Russians, one that is unduly military in an era when that's so yesterday. And as it embraces the European Union as an alternative to NATO and supports the EU's efforts to build up its own sort of independent military apparatus, I think it will set the stage for the distancing of the United States from Europe ... exacerbate further trends that have already been going on for some time -- namely the growing hostility and chauvinism and even anti-Americanism of Europe.

NATO is dying – European nations don’t think it’s significant any more

**Jacobs 2009**, [MINDELLE JACOBS](mailto:mindelle.jacobs@sunmedia.ca), Columnist for the Edmonton Sun, 8/11/2009, “Is NATO now irrelevant?” http://www.edmontonsun.com/comment/columnists/mindelle\_jacobs/2009/08/11/10422461-sun.html

Canada, the U.S., Britain and the Netherlands are doing the lion's share of the fighting in Afghanistan which makes one wonder if NATO is particularly relevant anymore. In 1949, when NATO was formed, signatories to the treaty resolved to "unite their efforts for collective defence." Under the treaty, an attack against one NATO country is considered an attack against all of them. FOURTH TOURS Hello, NATO? Canada's getting burned out in Afghanistan. How about other countries stepping up to do the dangerous work for a change? Many Canadian soldiers are already on their fourth tours, notes retired maj.-gen. Lewis MacKenzie. "It's not a matter of if we stay in the combat role beyond 2011. We can't unless you really, really abuse the infantry in particular," he says. "This best little army in the world will have been in Afghanistan longer than World War I and World War II combined and it's ground the combat arms ... into the ground." European governments are afraid of committing more troops to Afghanistan for fear of losing elections, says MacKenzie. Canada took on the Taliban in Kandahar expecting a whole bunch of European nations to show up and they didn't, he adds. "NATO might not survive the wash-up when this thing is over," says MacKenzie. "Maybe some of the Europeans don't care any longer if it survives or not."

## A2: CONSULT NATO COUNTERPLAN

**WE CONTROL UNIQUENESS: U.S. LED CONSULTATIONS WILL NOT SOLVE NET BENEFIT**

**Nye**, Dean of Harvard’s JFK School of Government, **03**

Joseph, Foreign Affairs, July/August, p. 60

Both the neo-Wilsonian and the Jacksonian strands of the new unilateralism tend to prefer alliance a la carte and to treat international institutions as toolboxes into which U.S. policymakers can reach when convenient. But this approach neglects the ways in which institutions legitimize disproportionate American power. When others feel that they have been consulted, they are more likely to be helpful. For example, NATO members are doing much of the work of keeping the peace in the Balkans and in Afghanistan. **Nato works through many committees to achieve the standardization and interoperability that allow coalitions of the willing to be more than ad hoc groupings.** Without regular institutional consultation, the U**nited** S**tates** may find others increasingly reluctant to put tools into the toolbox. One day the box might even be bare. American-led coalitions will become less willing and shrink in size -- witness the two gulf wars.

**Consultation won’t overcome problems in the alliance 5 reasons**

**Wallace 2001** (William; Professor of International Relations London School of Economics) May/June Foreign Affairs l/n

**Most of the time**, this **multilateral dialogue works well**, driven by the mutual interest of all participants in maintaining free flows of goods, services, and information. For all the advances in transatlantic cooperation, **however, the common perception is of an increasingly fraught relationship**. Those policymakers who recognize the overriding imperatives of shared interests in an open economy and a stable international order struggle against a tide of hostile comment in the media and in national legislatures. **Five reasons can explain this gap** between perception and reality. **First**, having struck an implicit bargain in the late 1940s that underpinned their relations in the postwar era, **Americans and Europeans now define burden sharing and partnership differently**. **Second**, **an American overemphasis on political and military issues, and in particular a search for new potential enemies, has met a European overemphasis on economics**. Hence perceptions of threats have diverged sharply. **Third, a widening disjuncture over values has opened**. European elites criticize aspects of American society, and American elites vigorously reject such criticism. Assertions of American exceptionalism particularly irritate Europeans. **Fourth**, policymaking on both sides has become more unwieldy. **Divided centers of authority and multiple veto-wielders complicate multilateral cooperation**. Yet there is a mutual unwillingness to recognize the structural weaknesses within one's own system while criticizing problems on the opposite shore. **Finally, a gap increasingly separates transgovernmental cooperation from domestic debate**. Legislatures and publics are largely uninformed about the multilateral bargaining and the delicate compromises that characterize transatlantic relations. Senior officials survive politically by playing to domestic audiences interested primarily in domestic issues. The media on both sides of the Atlantic have followed popular preferences by paying less attention to international affairs. The result is a mutual democratic deficit, with publics mistrusting the multilateral deals that their governments strike behind closed doors in foreign countries.

**Consultation undermines cohesion**

**Schmitz 1987** (Peter; Fellow – National Defense University) Defending the NATO Alliance p. 76

**Consultation in NATO may not work too well** simply because it is not mandatory under the law of the Treaty. In reality, consultation is handled as an option rather than as an obligation. Its common definitions are too flexible to enforce the kind of cooperation needed to cope with the Alliance today. In addition, **appearing at times more as an incantation than as a seriously and meticulously followed diplomatic practice**, **consultation**, **when it malfunctions**, **has often become an issue in itself**.

## A2: CONSULT NATO COUNTERPLAN (1AR EXTNS: COHESION TURN)

**Consultation undermines cohesion**

**Schmitz 1987** (Peter; Fellow – National Defense University) Defending the NATO Alliance p. 75

The mutual **perceptions of the respective roles of America and Europe have played a significant part in the failures of political consultation** and cooperation for extra-European issues. **But the system itself, political consultation in NATO, may have contributed to some extent to these failures and to the subsequent crises within the Alliance**. The organizational structure of NATO and its system for political consultation may not suffice for a wider role. Different structures and instruments in the Alliance may be necessary to attempt more consensus, and hence policy coordination, on issues not closely related to the military defense of Europe.

**Consultation undermines the alliance.**

**Schmitz 1987** (Peter; Fellow – National Defense University) Defending the NATO Alliance p. 125

Ideally, the European members of the High-Level Consultative Group of the Alliance should be identical with those forming the Political Committee within the EPC. Their dual function could help take the sting out of the separate EPC consultations and would create the perfect interface between Alliance and EPC consultations. That linkage seems at the present to be missing. The more important Third World regions become fore Western Politics, the more EPC has to commit itself to these issues. This kind of **political consultation and cooperation in international relations of a group of Alliance members has already brought harmonization problems**. **NATO is supposed to establish and maintain political consultation and solidarity among all members** for essentially the same kind of issues. In the judgment of an informed observer, **though**, “**there has been neither harmonization nor cooperation**,” except in one or two cases, **and it may even be said that a certain degree of antagonism can be observed**.

**Consultation creates alliance friction**

**Ludlow 2001** (Peter; Director – Center for European Policy Studies) Summer Washington Quarterly l/n

As this episode revealed, many in Washington know how to deal with the EU on important issues. The kind of systemic shift required, however, is more far-reaching. President Bill Clinton's **frustration with** the semi-annual **EU** -- **U.S. summits was understandable, given the banality of many if not most of the agendas** during his administration. **The fact that the meetings were so often low-key**, however, **was** more a reflection of the value which even he placed on the partnership than, as his lieutenants frequently implied, **the necessary consequence of too many meetings**. If the leaders of the United States and the EU cannot find anything useful about which to talk, the notion of global governance has indeed a long way to go.

## A2: CONSULT NATO COUNTERPLAN (1AR EXTNS: HEG TURN)

Consultation Handcuffs U.S. Hegemony

Krauthammer 2003 (Charles; National Interest “The Unipolar Moment Revisited”) Winter l/n

This liberal internationalist vision-the multilateral handcuffing of American power-**is**, as Robert Kagan has pointed out, the dominant view in Europe.9 That is to be expected, given Europe's weakness and America's power. But it is a mistake to see this as only a European view. The idea of a new international community with self-governing institutions and self-enforcing norms-the vision that requires the domestication of American power-is the view of the Democratic Party in the United States and of a large part of the American foreign policy establishment. They spent the last decade in power fashioning precisely those multilateral ties to restrain the American Gulliver and remake him into a tame international citizen.10 The multilateralist project is to use-indeed, to use up-current American dominance to create a new international system in which new norms of legalism and interdependence rule in America's place-in short, a system that is no longer unipolar.

Unilateral action key to Coalition building

**Krauthammer 2003** (Charles; National Interest “The Unipolar Moment Revisited”) Winter l/n

The prudent exercise of power allows, indeed calls for, occasional concessions on non-vital issues if only to maintain psychological good will. Arrogance and gratuitous high-handedness are counterproductive. But we should not delude ourselves as to what psychological good will buys. Countries will cooperate with us, first, out of their own self-interest and, second, out of the need and desire to cultivate good relations with the world's superpower. Warm and fuzzy feelings are a distant third. Take counterterrorism. After the attack on the u.s.s. Cole, Yemen did everything it could to stymie the American investigation. It lifted not a finger to suppress terrorism. This was under an American administration that was obsessively accommodating and multilateralist. Today, under the most unilateralist of administrations, Yemen has decided to assist in the war on terrorism. This was not a result of a sudden attack of good will toward America. It was a result of the war in Afghanistan, which concentrated the mind of heretofore recalcitrant states like Yemen on the costs of non-cooperation with the United States.14 Coalitions are not made by superpowers going begging hat in hand. They are made by asserting a position and inviting others to join. What "pragmatic" realists often fail to realize is that unilateralism is the high road to multilateralism. When George Bush senior said of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, "this will not stand", and made it clear that he was prepared to act alone if necessary, that declaration-and the credibility of American determination to act unilaterally-in and of itself created a coalition. Hafez al-Asad did not join out of feelings of good will. He joined because no one wants to be left at the dock when the hegemon is sailing. Unilateralism does not mean seeking to act alone. One acts in concert with others if possible. Unilateralism simply means that one does not allow oneself to be hostage to others. No unilateralist would, say, reject Security Council support for an attack on Iraq. The nontrivial question that separates unilateralism from multilateralism-and that tests the "pragmatic realists"-is this: What do you do if, at the end of the day, the Security Council refuses to back you? Do you allow yourself to be dictated to on issues of vital national-and international-security?

## A2: CONSULT NATO COUNTERPLAN (1AR EXTNS: CONSULT NOT SOLVE)

**Consultation won’t save the alliance**

**Ludlow 2001** (Peter; Director – Center for European Policy Studies) Summer Washington Quarterly l/n

For the United States to become the kind of partner in global management that Europe and the rest of the world need, both the tone and the content of public debate and public policy must change. **Composing a wish list of specific policy areas where a new approach is most urgently required would be relatively easy**, if somewhat tedious, **but** a piecemeal discussion of this sort would only illustrate what is at stake. **It would not tackle the underlying causes of the present malaise, which has its source in a collective failure to appreciate how much the global agenda has changed**, and how the unbridled belief in the leadership of the world's only superpower -- and the narrow definition of national interest which is its corollary -- have ceased to be relevant or productive, in hard and soft security terms. The world neither needs nor wants an international order designed and maintained in Washington.

## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

**THE KRITIK LOSES ITS VALUE WITHIN CONTEST ROUND DEBATES**

Becoming Co-opted for the purpose of EVALUATION we forget the original critical stance posing CONSIDERABLE RISKS to the critical task.

**WALLERSTEIN distinguished Sociology Professor @ Yale 2000**

Immanuel-; *THE END OF THE WORLD AS WE KNOW IT: SOCIAL SCIENCE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY,* 2000, p. 198

**There is a second problem with critiques, especially critiques that are past the moment of initial shock and vigor.** **Critiques are not that difficult to pseudo-co-opt.** I have tried already to indicate the ways in which our terminology, or something close to it, is being used for purposes other than we had in mind, which then can have the effect of corrupting what we ourselves do. So then this becomes a question of “physician, heal thyself.” But I am making more than a general admonition always to be self-critical. I am suggesting that **there is a tendency to forget our own original critical stance, as we hail those who seem to be emulating us, and** that **this tendency poses considerable risks both to the critical task and to the putative task of reconstruction. At the end of the road, we risk finding ourselves in the situation of so many intellectual movements, a name that has become a shell.**

**PHILOSOPHY CANNOT BE ROOTED WITHIN AN EVALUATIVE FRAMEWORK**

Philosophy cannot evade the pardox of reflexivity and is no longer capable of ADJUCATION, it is LUDICROUS to use philosophy to dictate to others where their truth is and how to find it and RIDICULOUS when it steps forward to ADJUDICATE

**PRADO philosophy professor 1995**

C. G. Prado, Philosophy Professor, STARTING WITH FOUCAULT, 1995, p. 50

The hard fact is that **philosophy has no way of evading the paradox of reflexivity, no grounds on which to stand while it assesses the rationality of its own history or standards or new visions or redescriptions.** **Philosophy is simply no longer capable of maintaining itself as self-appointed adjudicator of reason because we have finally understood that it does not have resources to objective correctness-criteria.** This is why Foucault finds that **there is now “something ludicrous” about philosophy when it tries “to dictate to others, to them where their truth is and how to find it.** Rorty agrees wholeheartedly, saying that **“philosophy makes itself ridiculous” when fundamental interpretive issues arise and “it steps forward…to adjudicate.”**

## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

**THIS IS PARTICULAR TRUE WITH HILLMAN’S BRANCH OF PSYCHOLOGY**

Using Hillman as a Kritik Alternative merges an AUTONOMOUS IMAGE with the Soul which forces archetypal psychology to SABOTAGE ITSELF as a methodology.

**BOSTOCK doctoral candidate in Depth Psychology @ Pacifica Graduate Institute 2k2**

Cliff-M.A.; *DECODING HILLMAN: a critical look at the author of Soul’s Code*; JUNG SOCIETY OF ATLANTA;

<http://www.jungatlanta.com/DecodingHillman.html>

W hen James Hillman appeared before the Atlanta Jung Society a few years ago, his strongest impression on many of us had little to do with his reading from his best seller of the time, The Force of Character.

Instead, we were most struck by the virtual tantrum he pitched, demanding that a Society member stop snapping pictures of him for the newsletter. I couldn’t avoid noticing the multiple layers of irony in Hillman’s tantrum. As he acknowledged himself after he cooled down, he was well demonstrating the “heightened irritability” of the elderly cited in his book.

More important and ironic, though, was the way Hillman’s angry explosion expressed the full measure *and difficulty of* his archetypal psychology. **Like Jung, Hillman believes that image is psyche. "The soul is constituted of images… the soul is primarily an imagining activity,**" he writes in Archetypal Psychology: A Brief Account. Thus it’s no great stretch to say that, from Hillman’s perspective, the photographer was playing the anthropologist attempting to capture the soul of a shaman in his camera. “It’s my image!” Hillman shouted.

And that claim, while expressing the primacy of the image, also discloses the difficulty of archetypal psychology. For **Hillman maintains repeatedly that images have autonomy. They are the spontaneous production of the soul. Indeed, for him, psychotherapy itself is on behalf of the image, not on behalf of the self.** So, while one can argue that photography inhibits the essential movement of an image by freezing it, the fact is that Hillman, logician of the soul, attempted vainly (in all senses of the word) to control exhibition of the image that, in his terms, dreams him.

**This points** in a symptomatic way – if a tantrum can be called a symptom -- **to the underlying problem of archetypal psychology,** in my view. By taking its own metaphors too literally -- by “literalizing the process of deliteralizing,” to use Catherine Keller’s critical phrase -- **it often sabotages itself.**

## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

**THE KRITIK ALTERNATIVE IS “ANTI-THETICAL TO ARCHETYPAL PYSCHOLOGY”**

Hillman is POST JUNGIAN meaning that Wholeness and integration of self is ABANDONED for the psyche as inevitably PLURAL, comprised of DIFFERENT BEINGS, NIHILISTIC.

The Soul is a producer of IMAGES that seeks BEAUTY which is the equivalent of AWE. We are in the presence of beauty when our attention is STOPPED. Soulmaking is the CONTINUAL deepening of one’s sense of life’s beauty and should not be CONFUSED with SELF. The soul SEEKS and EXPRESSES DIFFERENCE, delighting in MULTIPLICITY, it is NOT “INSIDE” of us, it is an “OTHER”.

Archetypal Psychology REFUSES to VALORIZE wholeness. We see through but do not transcend.

**BOSTOCK doctoral candidate in Depth Psychology @ Pacifica Graduate Institute 2k2**

Cliff-M.A.; *DECODING HILLMAN: a critical look at the author of Soul’s Code*; JUNG SOCIETY OF ATLANTA;

<http://www.jungatlanta.com/DecodingHillman.html>

Before I explain that more fully, let me first outline in very simplified terms some of the reasons I revere **Hillman’s thinking,** which basically amount to the important ways he **departed from Jung.** The primary one is his rejection of monotheism. **Jung**, of course, was heavily influenced by Christianity, and his psychology **imagines the human evolving in a Christ-like way to what he calls the individuated Self, a kind of umbrella archetype under which our warring interior drives can be brought into dialogue and resolution. Thus the Jungian holds any pair of opposites in tension for the sake of constellating a third possibility. Jung is always pushing us to wholeness and integration – the “oneness” to which monotheism inevitably aspires.**

**Hillman instead** draws his inspiration from the Greeks and **advocates a polytheistic psychology. He effectively abandons the idea that we have a central Self. Instead, he argues, the psyche is inevitably plural – comprised of different beings,** personified as the gods in the ancient pantheon. He doesn’t purchase the idea that monotheism (or individuation) represents an evolutionary improvement over polytheism (or psychic plurality).

In destabilizing the Self, **Hillman is thoroughly postmodern and of course accused of nihilism.** What kind of life can we have without imagining ourselves as whole, evolving beings with access to universal truths if only we devote ourselves to the task?

For Hillman the answer is in aesthetics. **He insists that the soul, as producer of images, wants nothing more than beauty. Hillman’s beauty is not “pretty” but that which arrests our attention.** This follows because, **he says, the fundamental quality of images is their movement. We are in the presence of beauty when our attention is stopped. Beauty is awe.**

**For Hillman it is enough to continually deepen one’s sense of life’s beauty. This is soulmaking. We should not confuse the soul with the Self. The soul seeks and expresses difference. It delights in multiplicity. It confers meaning by processing images and, most important, it is not “inside” us. It is an "other." It is with us. It is connected to the soul of the world, but it is most definitely not “us.”** In Hillman’s world, we live as poets, not as Christs-in-training.

I find this approach to psychology deeply satisfying. **Archetypal psychology recognizes the thirst for “wholeness” as legitimate but refuses to valorize it above all others.** In archetypal psychology, every unpleasant experience does not become another battle. Every time Aphrodite causes us to throw our brains out the window or Hermes seizes our tongue and makes contrarians of us, we don’t have to pathologize ourselves as split-off. We can instead, like Lester in the film American Beauty, look on the spectacle of our naturally fractured lives with awe and compassion. **We learn, in Hillman’s terms to “see through” but not transcend.**

This approach certainly isn’t for everyone. It disrespects bliss and it is haunted by structural contradictions that can’t be dismissed as interesting paradoxes. The most obvious is that while Hillman abandons metanarratives of wholeness, he seems to fully purchase others, like the world soul. Still, in the way he calls himself a bricoleur, I am happy to align myself with Hillman’s notion of the soul as a process by which life gains beauty in difference rather than with the more traditional Jungian notion of the Self as an integrative process of wholeness.

## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

**PERMUTE: DO THE PLAN AS THE POLICY OPTION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE**

In other words, After EXPERIENCING the War in Afghanistan for WAR’s sake then the LOGICAL/RATIONAL policy option is to end WAR which is the plan.

****

## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

**THE PLAN IS THE BEST FOCUS OF THE DEBATE.**

While the Kritik has merit, REJECTION of the plan is not warranted. The alternative would be worse by ABANDONING focus on policy options.

**THEIR NOTION OF FIAT IS DANGEROUS**

REFLEXIVE FIAT ABANDONS TRAINING AND INSPIRATION OF STUDENTS TO FIND CAREERS IN THE HALLS OF POWER AND INSTEAD PURSUE MARGINAL SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AS A PRINCIPAL STRATEGY FOR SOCIAL CHANGE CEDING THOSE HALLS OF POWER TO THE RIGHT.

**COVERSTONE Dir of Debate @ Montgomery Bell Academy 2k6**

Alan-former debater @ Wake, MBA = private prep school in Nashville; “*Acting on Activism”*;

DEBATER’S RESEARCH GUIDE (DRG), National Service Topic; Stephen Bauschard, editor;

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtiarticlesIndex.htm>



## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

**THEIR NOTION OF FIAT IS AT BEST NO DIFFERENT THAN OURS AND MAY IN FACT BE WORSE FOR PUBLIC ACTIVISM**

ADVOCATING A UTOPIAN MOVEMENT FIAT ENCOURAGES PERSONAL REJECTIONISM THAT IS THE BASIS OF POLITICAL CYNICISM THAT CAUSES VOTER AND PARTICIPATORY ABSTENTION IN AMERICA

**COVERSTONE Dir of Debate @ Montgomery Bell Academy 2k6**

Alan-former debater @ Wake, MBA = private prep school in Nashville; “*Acting on Activism”*;

DEBATER’S RESEARCH GUIDE (DRG), National Service Topic; Stephen Bauschard, editor;

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtiarticlesIndex.htm>





## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

FIAT GOOD (Role playing better than individual fantasy)

* Imagining public advocacy/Role playing, is a great virtue and more empowering than complete abandonment. Contest debate can reward public activism if we get passed the belief that personal agency is undermined by role-playing in debate.

**COVERSTONE Dir of Debate @ Montgomery Bell Academy 2k6**

Alan-former debater @ Wake, MBA = private prep school in Nashville; “*Acting on Activism”*;

DEBATER’S RESEARCH GUIDE (DRG), National Service Topic; Stephen Bauschard, editor;

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtiarticlesIndex.htm>



## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

REFLEXIVE FIAT IS NOT NECESSARY TO MOVE DEBATERS INTO PUBLIC ACTIVISM

* Permutation is the best chance to expand the magic of competitive debate.

**COVERSTONE Dir of Debate @ Montgomery Bell Academy 2k6**

Alan-former debater @ Wake, MBA = private prep school in Nashville; “*Acting on Activism”*;

DEBATER’S RESEARCH GUIDE (DRG), National Service Topic; Stephen Bauschard, editor;

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtiarticlesIndex.htm>



## A2: HILLMAN KRITIK (GENERAL ANSWERS)

**TURN: HILLMAN’S EMBRACE OF WAR IGNORES GENDERED NARRATIVES**

**BOSTOCK doctoral candidate in Depth Psychology @ Pacifica Graduate Institute 2k2**

Cliff-M.A.; *DECODING HILLMAN: a critical look at the author of Soul’s Code*; JUNG SOCIETY OF ATLANTA;

<http://www.jungatlanta.com/DecodingHillman.html>

But **Hillman does break down in** some significant **ways.** I began to realize this when my doctoral dissertation led me to questions **of gender and sexual orientation – two discourses that have not been well examined by Jungian or post-Jungian thinkers.** (An exception is Andrew Samuels.) In fact, **Hillman has repeatedly refused to discuss gender** for precisely the same reasons the postmodern discourses have felt it necessary.

“I follow old Alfred Adler in considering all oppositional thinking to be a neurotic mental activity,” he writes in the Utne Reader. **“The male-female opposition was for him the most basic of the polar pairs**, and hence the most neurotic. Gender is a class concept, dividing the populace of the world into some three billion folks amassed on either side of a barbed conceptual fence.”

This is superficially an agreeable position from my perspective. (For one thing it points to another departure from Jung, since it ultimately disputes the necessarily contrasexual nature of the anima.) However, even Derrida, whose deconstructionist position is identical to Hillman’s in this context, recognizes the necessity of engaging opposites in not merely a dialogue, as Jung would, but in a discursive reversal of value, so that, in this case, female would be privileged above male. **Interestingly, early in his career, Hillman did** exactly that, often writing that psychology needs to “recover” from masculinity and **install the feminine.**

In a sense that’s what Hillman did by placing “anima mundi,” soul of the world, as a feminine principle at the center of his psychology. **However,** and here I get to the point with which I opened this essay, this principle becomes a densely concrete metaphor of feminine consciousness that borders on the New Age. In an essay in Post-Jungians Today, David Tacey compares Hillman’s situation to Jung’s description (in Symbols of Transformation) of a particular mother complex dominated by the “virgin anima…turned toward the inner sun.”

The interesting result of this is most evident in Hillman’s own life. While disputing the need to even discuss gender and installing his own mother complex at the center of his psychology, **he became deeply involved with Robert Bly’s “men’s movement”** during the last decade. That movement, guided by images of “Iron John,” explicitly enjoins men to reclaim what it has supposedly lost to women – to feminism and the cult of the mother. I don’t need to explain what underlies the bizarre reification of stereotyped genders by the same man who says gender is irrelevant. We have Hillman’s own words in The Myth of Analysis, cited by Tacey,: “Assertive masculinity is suspicious. Somewhere we know that it must be reactive to feminine attachment.”

**This** habit of concretizing, literalizing his own metaphors, like “soul of the world,” **sabotages much of Hillman’s work.** In the same way he concretizes his personal image and ends up in a tantrum of possessiveness, he literalizes the soul of the world as a nostalgic virgin mother and, overcome by his own attachment, he concretizes the male as a tantrum-throwing Iron John. The same thing occurs in his reading of the Persephone myth, where **he utterly refuses to see** the abduction of Demeter’s daughter as in part a comment on **women’s condition in a patriarchal society. Instead, he literalizes it as his own metaphor of soulmaking, at the cost of acknowledging women’s real-world suffering.** In other words, **he** identifies with Hades and **perpetuates the very masculine domination of psychology he recanted earlier.**

Where does this leave an admirer of Hillman’s psychology? The temptation is to say that his radical, self-contradictory split is exactly the result of not holding the opposites with more conscious intention. Thus one could, like Tacey, prescribe a return to Jung. But I’m not so sure. Jung, as every Jungian knows, suffered similarly.

But how to adopt polytheism and turn from the notion of the organizing, monotheistic Self without becoming overwhelmed by the voices within? I think **archetypal psychology needs to attempt a more conscious rapprochement with feminist** and other postmodern **discourses.** In my own work, I insist that whatever is present be reversed, in a kind of therapeutics based on Derrida’s notion of play. This subtraction and exchange of value is not unlike some varieties of Buddhism, whose object is “nothingness,” which is not nihilistic but sublime. In this way, we might say that Hermes or Dionysos consciousness becomes our guide, rather than the Self. I believe, really, this is what Hillman intends but, for all manner of reasons, including his attachment to Platonic thinking, he can’t quite bear to maintain. That is left for the next generation of archetypal psychologists

## A2: APPEASEMENT DISADVANTAGE

**NON-UNIQUE ALLIES ALREADY PERCEIVE OBAMA’S APPEASEMENT**

**KRAUTHAMMER 2K10**

Charles -;“Obama's many retreats signal U.S. weakness,” Washington Post, Friday, May 21, 2010,

Pg. http://www.commercialappeal.com/news/2010/may/21/charles-krauthammer-obamas-many-retreats-signal/?print=1]

WASHINGTON -- It is perfectly obvious that Iran's latest uranium maneuver, brokered by Brazil and Turkey, is a ruse.

Iran retains more than enough enriched uranium to make a bomb. And it continues enriching at an accelerated pace and to a greater purity (20 percent). Which is why the French foreign ministry immediately declared that the trumpeted temporary shipping of some Iranian uranium to Turkey will do nothing to halt Iran's nuclear program.

It will, however, make meaningful sanctions more difficult.

America's proposed Security Council resolution is already laughably weak -- no blacklisting of Iran's central bank, no sanctions against Iran's oil and gas industry, no nonconsensual inspections on the high seas.

Yet Turkey and Brazil -- both current members of the Security Council -- are so opposed to sanctions that they will not even discuss the resolution. And China will now have a new excuse to weaken it further.

But the deeper meaning of the uranium-export stunt is the brazenness with which Brazil and Turkey gave cover to the mullahs' nuclear ambitions and deliberately undermined U.S. efforts to curb Iran's program.

The real news is that already notorious photo: the president of Brazil, our largest ally in Latin America, and the prime minister of Turkey, for more than half a century the Muslim anchor of NATO, raising hands together with Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the most virulently anti-American leader in the world.

That picture -- a defiant, triumphant take-that-Uncle-Sam -- is a crushing verdict on the Obama foreign policy. It demonstrates how rising powers, traditional American allies, having watched this administration in action, have decided that there's no cost in lining up with America's enemies and no profit in lining up with a U.S. president given to apologies and appeasement.

They've watched President Obama's humiliating attempts to appease Iran, as every rejected overture is met with abjectly renewed U.S. negotiating offers.

American acquiescence reached such a point that the president was late, hesitant and flaccid in expressing even rhetorical support for democracy demonstrators who were being brutally suppressed and whose call for regime change offered the potential for the most significant U.S. strategic advance in the region in 30 years.

They've watched America acquiesce to Russia's re-exerting sway over Eastern Europe, over Ukraine (pressured by Russia last month into extending for 25 years its lease of the Black Sea naval base at Sevastopol) and over Georgia (Russia's de facto annexation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia is no longer an issue under the Obama "reset" policy).

They've watched our appeasement of Syria, Iran's agent in the Arab Levant -- sending our ambassador back to Syria even as it tightens its grip on Lebanon, supplies Hezbollah with Scuds, and intensifies its role as the pivot of the Iran-Hezbollah-Hamas alliance.

The price for this ostentatious flouting of the U.S. and its interests? Ever more eager U.S. "engagement."

They've observed the administration's gratuitous slap at Britain over the Falklands, its contemptuous treatment of Israel, its undercutting of the Czech Republic and Poland, and its indifference to Lebanon and Georgia.

And in Latin America, they see not just U.S. passivity as Venezuela's Hugo Chavez organizes his anti-American "Bolivarian" coalition while deepening military and commercial ties with Iran and Russia.

They saw active U.S. support in Honduras for a pro-Chavez would-be dictator seeking unconstitutional powers in defiance of the democratic institutions of that country.

This is not just an America in decline. This is an America in retreat -- accepting, ratifying and declaring its decline, and inviting rising powers to fill the vacuum.

Nor is this retreat by inadvertence. This is retreat by design and, indeed, on principle. It's the perfect fulfillment of Obama's adopted Third World narrative of American misdeeds, disrespect and domination from which he has come to redeem us and the world.

## A2: APPEASEMENT DISADVANTAGE

**NO INTERNAL LINK TO THE IMPAX – U.S. HAS DETTERENCE CAPABILITIES**

U.S. is developing a MAJOR non-nuclear alternative called Prompt Global Strikes, GREATLY strengthening Obama’s full spectrum MILITARY DOMINANCE

**Smith 10** [[Jack A. Smith](http://original.antiwar.com/author/jack-a-smith/), “Obama’s War Machine: The Pentagon's Game Plan,” Antiwar.com, May 07, 2010, pg. http://tiny.cc/z4rlg]

• The NPR’s second objective is "reducing the role of U.S. nuclear weapons." This does not mean reducing the number, deployed or in storage, just the role. And there is a very good reason to reduce the role: The U.S. is developing a major non-nuclear alternative. It’s called Prompt Global Strike (PGS) and sometimes Conventional Prompt Global Strike (CPGS).

The U.S. government realizes that there are serious problems about using nuclear weapons. Such weapons may be justified as a deterrent to avoid a nuclear exchange because strike and counter-strike would result in mutually assured destruction (MAD). But the entire world would object to a preemptive unilateral strike against a non-nuclear state. For instance, had the Bush Administration’s "shock and awe" terror bombing of Baghdad included nuclear weapons, the global outcry — substantial to begin with — would have been magnified a hundred fold, and the act would never be forgiven by much of the world. Indeed, it would spark proliferation as countries scrambled to build nuclear deterrents of their own, as did the DPRK, to forestall a possible nuclear attack.

The document barely mentions Prompt Global Strike, revealing only that the Pentagon "is studying the appropriate mix of long-range strike capabilities, including heavy bombers as well as non-nuclear prompt global strike." Global Strike usually means nuclear bombs and missile warheads. PGS or CPGS means conventional, i.e., non-nuclear.

Prompt Global Strike relies on high speed missiles, satellite mapping and other cutting edge military technology to launch a devastating non-nuclear payload from a military base in the U.S to destroy a target anywhere in the world in less than one hour. The purpose is to resolve the conundrum posed by the global inhibition toward the use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states, thus greatly strengthening the Obama Administration’s full spectrum military dominance.

**THIS MEANS OF DETTERENCE COULD RADICALLY REDUCE DEPENDENCE ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

**Gardels 10** – Senior advisor to the Nicolas Berggruen Institute [Nathan Gardels (editor-in-chief of NPQ, the journal of social and political thought), “[The Zero Nukes Conundrum](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nathan-gardels/the-zero-nukes-conundrum_b_587699.html),” The Huffington Post, Posted: May 24, 2010 04:06 PM, pg. http://tiny.cc/xhdm0]

Certainly, there is plenty of room to radically reduce arsenals, as the [new START treaty](http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2010/04/08/new-start-treaty-and-protocol" \t "_hplink) begins to do, starting with the destabilizing weapons and putting in place controls that prevent unauthorized or accidental launch of a nuclear-armed missile. As long as a minimal balance remains that ensures the capacity for mutual destruction, deterrence will hold.

The other focus should be on non-nuclear **means of deterrence**, though that too may generate instability if it creates a gap, real or perceived, with the capabilities of rival powers. The favored child of the Obama Pentagon is the ["Prompt Global Strike" (PGS) weapon](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article7107179.ece" \t "_hplink) -- a highly accurate inter-continental ballistic missile armed with a conventional warhead that can hit any target globally within an hour.

The advantages of such a weapon are self-evident -- it can strike at the heart of any enemy without annihilating its population or prompting a return nuclear attack. As such, its large-scale deployment could radically reduce dependence on nuclear weapons. At the same time, since its use will not be incommensurate with rational goals, it is far more likely to be used than a nuclear weapon.

## A2: APPEASEMENT DISADVANTAGE

**DETTERENCE DOES NOT REQUIRE MILITARY PRESENCE**

Reduction of U.S. troops would GREATLY reduce the TERRORIST THREAT to the United States 🡪 OFF SHORE BALANCING is the BEST STRATEGY

**Layne 07** – Professorship of international affairs @ Texas A & M University [Christopher Layne, “Who Lost Iraq and Why It Matters: The Case for Offshore Balancing,” WORLD POLICY JOURNAL • FALL 2007]

This policy of containment, and deterrence worked in 1990—and still was working in March 2003. To ensure no Gulf oil hegemon emerges in the future, Washington should make it clear that it would respond militarily to prevent a single power from gaining control over a majority of the region’s oil capacity. However, a deterrence strategy does not require an on-the-ground American military presence in the region, because the U.S. today (in contrast to 1990), can back-up its deterrent threat with long-range airpower, and sea-based cruise missiles.

Because the deployment of U.S. air and naval power would provide sufficient deterrent power to ensue that no oil hegemon emerges in the Persian Gulf, the United States could pull back its military forces from the Gulf, including Iraq, except for a naval presence in the Strait of Hormuz. This retraction of American forces from the Gulf would help greatly to reduce the terrorist threat to the United States.

Contrary to the administration, the presence of U.S. troops in Iraq and the Middle East increases American vulnerability to terrorism by reinforcing the widespread perception in the Islamic world that Washington is pursuing a neo-colonial policy to further its own imperial ambitions. The huge U.S. politico-military footprint in the region, including Iraq, is the primary driver of Middle Eastern terrorism, and has garnered thousands of recruits for various radical terrorist groups. Contrary to the administration, Islamic radicals do not hate the United States because of its freedom; they hate the United States because of its policies. As University of Chicago political scientist Robert Pape argues, offshore balancing “is America’s best strategy for the Persian Gulf ” because the “mere presence of tens of thousands of U.S. troops in the region is likely to fuel continued fear of foreign occupation that will fuel anti-American terrorism in the future.”39 Similarly, Harvard’s Stephen Walt who also favors a U.S. offshore balancing strategy in the Middle East, observes, “The U.S. does have important interests in the Middle East—including access to oil and the need to combat terrorism— but neither objective is well served by occupying the region with its own military forces.”40 Indeed, maintaining American military dominance in the Persian Gulf and overthrowing nasty regimes in the Middle East are not effective policies to reduce the terrorist threat to the United States. Tactically speaking, terrorism is best combated through good intelligence (including collaboration with U.S. allies), covert operations, and strengthening America’s homeland defenses. Pg. 46