# AFGHAN TROOP SWITCH DISADVANTAGE

Thesis: The thesis of this disadvantage is that a substantial reduction in the US military presence in the world will cause the troops to be reallocated to Afghanistan—worsening the terrorist risk and emboldening the Taliban. President Obama is currently launching a large troop surge in Afghanistan, which makes the country a likely target for troops that are reduced elsewhere. However, our troop presence in Afghanistan only causes an increase in civilian casualties and resentment among the people of Afghanistan, making the security situation worse. This disadvantage is particularly potent against teams that do not identify what will be done with the troops that are removed from one of the topic countries. The Negative can argue they will merely be reallocated elsewhere, preventing the benefits to overall troop readiness and morale, while making the situation in Afghanistan worse at the same time. Obviously, this disadvantage should only be run against non-Afghanistan cases, as the Affirmative plan in an Afghanistan case would be withdrawing all the troops from Afghanistan, making the impacts to the disadvantage advantages to the Affirmative case.
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# Afghan Troop Switch DA Shell (1/1)

## A. Uniqueness: A lack of troops is inhibiting the us ability to expand the war in Afghanistan.

UPI, 2010. “Report: Too few troops in Afghanistan.” April 29, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/International/2010/04/29/Report-Too-few-troops-in-Afghanistan/UPI-58271272548495/>

Even with additional U.S. troops deployed to Afghanistan, combat levels are inadequate to conduct operations in most key areas, a Pentagon report indicates. The congressionally mandated report released Wednesday said coalition forces decided to concentrate on 121 districts in Afghanistan, but have enough troops to operate in only 48 districts, Stars & Stripes reported.

## B. Link: Previous troop reductions in Iraq prove: Troop reductions in one country will merely cause a re-allocation of said troops to Afghanistan.

Robert Kagan, 2009 (senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), February 3, 2009, “No Time to Cut Defense.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 25, 2010 at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/02/AR2009020202618.html>

· Finally, everyone knows the U.S. military is stretched thin. Some may hope that Obama can begin substantially drawing down U.S. force levels in Iraq this year. No doubt he can to some extent. But this is an especially critical year in Iraq. The most recent round of elections is only one of three: District elections are in June and all-important parliamentary elections are in December. The head of U.S. Central Command, Gen. David Petraeus, is unlikely to recommend a steep cut with so much at stake. Moreover, any reduction of U.S. forces in Iraq is going to be matched by an increase of forces in Afghanistan. The strain on U.S. ground forces, even with reductions in Iraq, won't begin to ease until the end of next year. And that assumes that the situation in Iraq stays quiet, that there is progress in Afghanistan, that Pakistan doesn't explode and that no other unforeseen events require American action.

## C. Impacts: Expansion of the war in Afghanistan will devastate South Asian stability.

## 1. An increase in the US troop presence will cause greater civilian casualties and worsen instability in Afghanistan.

David Wildman & Phyllis Bennis, 2010 (Exec. Secretary for Human Rights, United Methodist Church/Fellow, Institute for Policy Studies), ENDING THE U.S. WAR IN AFGHANISTAN: A PRIMER, 2010, 155-156.

\*One of the surest ways to escalate violence and endanger Afghan communities and civilians in any given area is to increase the foreign troop presence. The Taliban and other insurgents know they cannot take on large numbers of US forces in frontal attacks so they rely heavily on IEDs, bombings of government buildings and marketplaces, which invariably lead to greater civilian casualties -- both from insurgent attacks and US strikes. The US military cannot expect to build trust with Afghan communities when the very presence of US troops increases instability.

## 2. Increased troops in Afghanistan risks destabilizing Pakistan.

Mark Landler, 2009 (Staff Writer), NEW YORK TIMES, Dec. 10, 2009, A18.

\*General Petraeus acknowledged that pouring more troops into Afghanistan would raise the risk of driving more militants across the border into Pakistan, where they could further destabilize that country.

## 3. Pakistani instability risks a nuclear war between India and Pakistan.

Thomas E. Ricks, 2001. (staff, Washington Post). October 21, 2001. Online. Internet. Accessed April 12, 2010 at http://cndyorks.gn.apc.org/news/articles/warconsequences.htm

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

# Uniqueness: US Lacks the Troops to Expand in Afghanistan Now

## Lack of troops in Afghanistan prevents expansion of the war into new districts.

Jeff Schogol, 2010 (staff writer). Stars and Stripes online edition. April 28, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.stripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=69668>

Despite the addition of more than 50,000 U.S. troops to Afghanistan over the past year, there still aren’t enough forces to conduct operations in the majority of key areas, according to a congressionally mandated report released Wednesday on progress in Afghanistan. Coalition forces have decided to focus their efforts on 121 key districts in Afghanistan, but right now, NATO has enough forces to operate in only 48 of those districts, the report said.

## NATO countries aren’t fulfilling their pledges—more troops must come from the United States.

Tom Bowman, 2010. National Public Radio. April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126311052>

The Pentagon is sending 800 more American soldiers to Afghanistan in the coming weeks to work as trainers for the Afghan security forces. The contingent is needed because other NATO countries still haven't fulfilled their pledges to send their own troops to train the Afghan army and police. A battalion of the 82nd Airborne Division will be heading to Afghanistan soon. The soldiers will work as trainers for at least several months. The unit is beyond the 30,000 additional troops that President Obama already approved for Afghanistan this year.

# Links: New Troops Will Go To Afghanistan

## The Pentagon will demand more troops for Afghanistan—making it the logical candidate for any reallocation.

Jason Ditz, 2010. “Pentagon Report: Still Not Enough Troops in Afghanistan.” April 29, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed May 1, 2010 at http://news.antiwar.com/2010/04/29/pentagon-report-still-not-enough-troops-in-afghanistan/.

After 15 months in office President Obama has increased the number of troops in Afghanistan by an almost impossible amount, going from 30,000 (itself the product of an end-of-term escalation by President Bush) to 86,000… with the troop level pushing 100,000 by the end of the summer. But in what is rapidly becoming the ultimate example of a mission that grows to exceed whatever resources it is given, the Pentagon’s latest report on Afghanistan is warning that they still don’t have enough troops to cover even half of the “key districts” in the nation, let alone the rest of the country.

## Obama is committed to transferring troops to Afghanistan.

Frank J. Gaffney, 2010 (president of the Center for Security Policy). April 6, 2010. Washington Times. “War’s outcome now in doubt; Redeployment of forces to Afghanistan is premature.” Accessed via Lexis/Nexis.

The prospects of any "great achievement" in Iraq are being diminished further by the direction to the Pentagon to shift personnel and equipment from Iraq to Afghanistan. The president himself reinforced that commitment during his speech to U.S. troops at Bagram Air Base last week. The detailed planning and ponderous logistics associated with such a transfer increasingly foreclose options to change course. Our commanders will soon be hard-pressed to preserve today's deployments of American forces in Iraq, let alone to have them take up once again the sorts of positions in the urban areas that they held to such therapeutic effect during the surge.

## Removal of troops from Europe proves: we’ll shift troops to other fronts--

Robert A. Pape, 2009 (professor of political science at the University of Chicago). “Empire Falls.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=20484>

Today, the cold-war framework of significant troop deployments to Europe, Asia and the Persian Gulf is coming unglued. We cannot afford to keep our previous promises. With American forces bogged down in Iraq and Afghanistan and mounting troubles in Iran and Pakistan, the United States has all but gutted its military commitments to Europe, reducing our troop levels far below the one hundred thousand of the 1990s. Nearly half have been shifted to Iraq and elsewhere.

# Links: South Korea Specific

## Pulling back from South Korea will cause the US to reallocate its efforts to other theaters.

Doug Bandow, 2010 March 30, 2010 (Senior Fellow, CATO Institute), “South Korea Needs Better Defense.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 1, 2010 at <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=11628>

Rather than accept a military position of quantitative inferiority, Seoul could use the threat of an arms build-up to encourage a more accommodating attitude in the North. Pyongyang can only squeeze its people so much to wring out more resources for the military. In any case, the ROK should spend as much as it takes to defend itself without subsidy from Washington. It also is in America's interest to shift responsibility for the South's defense back where it belongs. The U.S. spends almost as much as the rest of the world on the military, yet America's armed forces have been badly stretched by lengthy occupation duties in Iraq and continuing combat in Afghanistan. Washington should focus on potential threats from major powers, not more peripheral dangers that can be handled by allied and friendly states.

# **Answers to Link Turn: Expansion Allows for Withdrawal**

## Any decision by Obama to reverse the surge will occur independently of conditions on the ground—they can’t win that any stabilization will lead to withdrawal:

Frank J. Gaffney, 2010 (president of the Center for Security Policy). April 6, 2010. Washington Times. “War’s outcome now in doubt; Redeployment of forces to Afghanistan is premature.” Accessed via Lexis/Nexis.

The inadvisability of relocating U.S. forces from the strategically vital Iraqi theater to the marginal Afghan one is made all the greater by another grim prospect: the mounting evidence that our troops will be put in harm's way in Afghanistan simply to preside over the surrender of that country to one strain of Shariah-adherent Taliban or another. There, too, Mr. Obama has publicly promised to begin reversing his minisurge by next summer, again irrespective of conditions on the ground. And his insistence on "engaging" at least some of those who allowed the country to be used as a launching pad for al Qaeda's Sept. 11, 2001, attacks augurs ill for the Afghan people (especially the female ones) - and for us.

## **Handing over troops to Afghanistan won’t cause troop withdrawal.**

Press TV, 2010. April 23, 2010. “NATO mulls Afghanistanization plan.” Online. Accessed from: <http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=124191&sectionid=351020403>

NATO officials say US-led forces plan to gradually hand control of parts of Afghanistan to the government in Kabul. The plan was put forward on Friday during a meeting of NATO foreign ministers in Tallinn, Estonia. But the details on how it will pan out are not clear. NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen stated that the plan did not call for a withdrawal and added that foreign troops would remain in a supporting role long after they hand over command.

# Brinks: Now Key Time

## Now is the key time for stability in Afghanistan.

Dexter Filkins, 2010. (foreign correspondent for the New York Times). “Afghanistan’s ‘Make or Break’ Time. April 20, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 27, 2010 at <http://www.wbur.org/npr/126108594>

Filkins emphasizes that the next few months will determine the future of Afghanistan. "I don't think this is going to go on forever. It may, but this is make or break time in Afghanistan. This is it. The next 12 months to 24 months is really going to decide whether this is going to succeed or whether it's not." Filkins joined the Times in 2000. He covered the war in Afghanistan from 2001 to 2002 and reported on the Iraq war from 2003 to 2006. He recently returned to Afghanistan again. Filkins details his experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq in his book, The Forever War.

# **Internal Links: New Troops Will Go To Afghanistan**

## **Foreign countries plan on adding even more troops to Afghanistan this year.**

Press TV, 2010. April 23, 2010. “NATO mulls Afghanistanization plan.” Online. Accessed from: <http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=124191&sectionid=351020403>

Meanwhile, the 126,000 foreign soldiers currently deployed in the country have not been able to stabilize Afghanistan. But the occupiers still plan to deploy tens of thousands of additional foreign troops to the Central Asian country this year. However, pundits predict the troop surge will only lead to a surge in violence while peace remains a seemingly unattainable dream for the people of Afghanistan.

# Impacts: Escalating the War in Afghanistan Causes Terrorism

## A) Expanding the military presence in Afghanistan undermines the global fight against terrorism.

Gillian Losh, 2010. (staff writer). April 15, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed at

<http://badgerherald.com/news/2010/04/15/feingold_proposal_ca.php>

After eight years in Afghanistan, politicians such as Feingold are questioning whether a continued U.S. military presence is the best way to fight Al Qaeda, especially as the terrorist group scatters further into the mountains of neighboring Pakistan. “A large, open-ended presence in Afghanistan is **counterproductive to our global fight against Al Qaeda**,” Feingold said in a statement. “We need to be as agile as Al Qaeda, and we can’t do that if we are bogged down in Afghanistan.”

## B) Terrorists will use nuclear weapons triggering global nuclear war and extinction

Mohamed **Sid-Ahmed, 2004** ([**http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm**](http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm), 26 August - 1 September 2004)

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

## (--) Over-focusing resources on Afghanistan hinders the fight against Al Qaeda.

Katrina vanden **Heuvel, 2010** “The Nation: Demand The Afghanistan Exit.” April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126302837>

For McGovern, the reasons we need to withdraw from Afghanistan are clear. And it begins with the mission itself. "This mission -- whatever it is -- is not clear," he said. "And I don't think by any measure it is something that we should be investing so much in terms of human life and American taxpayer dollars." He noted that the war began as a response to those responsible for 9-11, but those perpetrators are no longer there. Al Qaeda, too, is establishing itself in other parts of the world like Yemen, not in Afghanistan . In fact, **focusing so many resources on Afghanistan hinders our ability to fight Al Qaeda.**

## (--) Collateral damage from escalating the war will fuel recruitment of terrorists:

Louise Slaughter, 2009 (U.S. Representative, New York), CONGRESSIONAL DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS, Dec. 3, 2009. Retrieved Dec. 14, 2009 from Nexis.

\*At the same time we are propping up the Karzai government we face an insurgency whose recruitment is driven by our own bombs. According to the field manual written by General Petraeus, there need to be 20-25 troops for every 1,000 residents in a country. A successful counterinsurgency in Afghanistan would require hundreds of thousands of troops, 600,000 to be exact, more than our nation could ever safely deploy at one time. Even if we had the resources, **the collateral damage from such an escalation would fuel recruitment for the international groups we are trying to defeat, even more so than our continued presence** has already enflamed those groups.

## (--) The war in Afghanistan is counterproductive in halting terrorism.

Nozar Alaolmolki, 2009 (Chair, Dept. of Political Science, Hiram College), MILITANT ISLAMISTS: TERRORISTS WITHOUT FRONTIERS, 2009, 188.

Suicide bombings were adopted and utilized by the Militant Islamists and Taliban fighters in the Afghan war. Since then there has been an increase in its use, specifically in 2006 and 2007. There were at least 99 suicide bombings in 2006, compare to at least 21 in 2005, and at least 60 suicide bombings as of June 28, 2007. Moreover, the use of suicide bombings spread to other Muslim nations, such as Algeria, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Turkey, and Qatar, in addition to the London bombings in July 2005 and the Glasgow Airport car attack by two Mus­lims in late June 2007.

## (--) Increased troops will only push the Taliban into Pakistan.

Greg Miller, 2009 (Staff Writer), LOS ANGELES TIMES, Dec. 2, 2009, A1.

\*Across the border in Pakistan, officials worry that a sharp increase in troop levels will only push the Taliban out of Afghanistan and into the wild tribal areas along their border.

# Impacts: Afghan Stability

## (--) Previous surges prove: Adding new troops to Afghanistan will intensify the conflict.

IRIN News, 2010. “AFGHANISTAN: Could foreign troop surge exacerbate vulnerability?” April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed May 1, 2010 at <http://www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?ReportId=87782>

Thousands of fresh foreign troops arrive in Afghanistan this year, but some prominent aid agencies are voicing concerns that this could lead to the intensification of the conflict, with dire humanitarian consequences. The civilian death toll has been mounting, and insecurity, attacks on, and intimidation of, aid agencies have also squeezed humanitarian space across the country, thus reducing or denying essential services to many vulnerable communities. “In our experience, **every massive increase in troops since 2005 has led to intensification and spreading of the conflict and an increase in civilian casualties,”** Reto Stocker, head of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) delegation in Afghanistan, told IRIN.

## (--) Expanding the conflict in Afghanistan creates widespread insecurity.

IRIN News, 2010. “AFGHANISTAN: Could foreign troop surge exacerbate vulnerability?” April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed May 1, 2010 at <http://www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?ReportId=87782>

IRIN asked spokespeople at the headquarters of the NATO-led forces in Kabul about the aid agencies’ concerns but received no specific answer. Further intensification of the conflict **could have a disastrous impact on civilians** that have already been badly affected by the fighting, aid agencies say. They also fear that they themselves could increasingly become targets, with the insurgents aiming to create a widespread sense of insecurity, thus making humanitarian work more risky and difficult. The troop surge could also increase the military’s involvement in civilian, humanitarian and assistance projects, further blurring civilian and military boundaries.

## (--) Escalation strategy is doomed to failure:

Steve Chapman, 2009 (Staff Writer, Chicago Tribune), A LOSING BET IN AFGHANISTAN, Dec. 14. Retrieved Dec. 14, 2009 from RealClearPolitics.com.

There are more reasons to think the strategy will fail than to believe it will work. The first is that you never get a second chance to make a good first impression. American forces arrived in Afghanistan with the advantage of not being the Taliban -- whose oppressive policies had alienated the populace. But today, **the locals associate us with eight years of disappointment**. It's not easy for a culturally alien outside power to win the support of a people with a long history of resistance to foreign invaders. It's even harder to win that support after we've spent the better part of a decade proving we don't deserve it. More U.S. troops are supposed to enhance security for ordinary Afghans, as well as facilitating civilian improvements that will win their allegiance. But **more U.S. troops also mean more deaths for innocent Afghan bystanders**, not to mention a greater daily irritant to nationalist sensibilities.

## (--) A large troop presence in Afghanistan won’t guarantee US security.

Gillian Losh, 2010. (staff writer). April 15, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed at

<http://badgerherald.com/news/2010/04/15/feingold_proposal_ca.php>

The three congressmen sent Obama a letter April 8 arguing a continued U.S. military presence in Afghanistan is no longer in the best interest of national security and an “open-ended, military-centric nation-building campaign” is **not necessary to ensure U.S. safety**.

## (--) Current troop failures illustrate the surge won’t stabilize Afghanistan.

Press TV, 2010. April 23, 2010. “NATO mulls Afghanistanization plan.” Online. Accessed from: <http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=124191&sectionid=351020403>

Meanwhile, the 126,000 foreign soldiers currently deployed in the country have not been able to stabilize Afghanistan. But the occupiers still plan to deploy tens of thousands of additional foreign troops to the Central Asian country this year. However, pundits predict the troop surge will only lead to a surge in violence while peace remains a seemingly unattainable dream for the people of Afghanistan.

# Impacts: Civilian Casualties

## Expanding the conflict in Afghanistan increases civilian casualties.

David Wildman & Phyllis Bennis, 2010 (Exec. Secretary for Human Rights, United Methodist Church/Fellow, Institute for Policy Studies), ENDING THE U.S. WAR IN AFGHANISTAN: A PRIMER, 2010, 8.

The situation on the ground eight years after the US invasion is deteriorating for civilians and armed forces alike. There is a basic formula in Afghanistan over the past 30 years of war that remains true today: the more guns there are -- no matter in whose hands the **more civilian deaths**. Each escalation of US, coalition, or Afghan military forces or armed opposition groups introduces more arms, with **invariably more casualties** and more destruction of infrastructure.

## Increased civilian casualties in Afghanistan worsens the instability.

Katrina vanden **Heuvel (2010).** “The Nation: Demand The Afghanistan Exit.” April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126302837>

"If you go to war, you should have a clearly defined mission -- a beginning, middle, transition period, and an end. I don't know what that is here. I can't tell you what success in Afghanistan means. I don't think the Administration can either." McGovern says one of the biggest obstacles advocates for this bill face is the "fear" legislators have that they will be vulnerable to the charge that they are "soft" on terrorism. But he argues that this war isn't making the country safer. "I believe it's having the opposite effect," he said. "We're draining our Treasury. We're putting our young men and women in uniform's lives at risk defending a corrupt leader. With each civilian casualty, more and more resentment grows towards the American forces and the Allied Forces that are there."

## Empirically, escalation increases civilian casualties.

Rick Rozoff, 2010 (Staff, Australia.to). WEST’S AFGHAN WAR: FROM CONQUEST TO BLOODBATH, Jan. 16, 2010. Retrieved Jan. 18, 2010 from http://australia.to/2010/.

On December 29 the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) released figures demonstrating that Afghan civilian deaths had risen by 10 percent in the first ten months of 2009, from 1,838 during the same period a year earlier to 2,038. The majority of the killings were attributed to insurgent attacks, including those directed against U.S., NATO and government targets, but almost 500 civilians were killed by American and NATO forces. Matters only grew worse last November and December, culminating in several massacres of Afghan civilians by Western forces at the end of the year. In early December a NATO air strike killed thirteen civilians in Laghman province. One account also documents a deadly raid by American special forces there.

## Increased troops will increase air strikes: worsening civilian casualty counts:

David Wildman & Phyllis Bennis, 2010 (Exec. Secretary for Human Rights, United Methodist Church/Fellow, Institute for Policy Studies), ENDING THE U.S. WAR IN AFGHANISTAN: A PRIMER, 2010, 25-26.

US and NATO air strikes have been particularly lethal for Afghanistan's civilians. A Human Rights Watch report in September 2009 that examined the impact of air strikes on Afghan civilians found that almost all the resulting deaths came from air strikes called in by troops on the ground having problems -- a phenomenon **likely to escalate with increases in US troops.** One HRW representative noted, "Mistakes by the US and NATO have dramatically decreased public support for the Afghan government and the presence of international forces providing security to Afghans."

## Empirically, increased attacks from the US have led to more civilian casualties:

David Wildman & Phyllis Bennis, 2010 (Exec. Secretary for Human Rights, United Methodist Church/Fellow, Institute for Policy Studies), ENDING THE U.S. WAR IN AFGHANISTAN: A PRIMER, 2010, 14.

Pashtun areas in the south and east of Afghanistan have born the brunt of CIA attacks, night raids, and air strikes, leading to much higher levels of civilian casualties. The number of civilian casualties has gone up each year since 2002, with over 2,100 killed in 2008. While more civilians have been killed by the Taliban and other armed opposition groups than by the US and its allies, **there is a growing public outcry in Afghanistan** against the escalating civilian deaths caused by US and NATO forces.

## **Expanding the war in Afghanistan to new areas risks an increase in violence.**

UPI, 2010. “Report: Too few troops in Afghanistan.” April 29, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/International/2010/04/29/Report-Too-few-troops-in-Afghanistan/UPI-58271272548495/>

The progress report said violence in Afghanistan increased 87 percent between February 2009 and March 2010, even though the country's deteriorating situation has leveled off, Stars & Stripes said. A senior Defense Department official attributed the increase in violence **to the presence of more troops who are moving into tougher areas**. The biggest challenge coalition forces face is training and fielding enough quality Afghan forces to assume responsibility for the country's security, the official said.

# Impacts: US Economy

## (--) The war in Afghanistan undermines the US economy.

Katrina vanden Heuvel (2010). “The Nation: Demand The Afghanistan Exit.” April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126302837>

And that cost of continuing this war isn't lost on McGovern or other advocates of this legislation. (In fact, if this legislation shortens the war in Afghanistan by a year, that would pay the two-year cost of the Local Jobs for America Act . "The hundreds of billions of dollars we spend over there on war.... All that -- mostly borrowed money -- means that we're not investing at home. It means our roads and our bridges aren't being fixed. It means our schools aren't being fixed. It means we're not investing in healthcare, and a whole range of other things that we need to do to get our economy back on track," he said. "When we talk about national security, that definition needs to be enhanced to include jobs, and the quality of education that we offer our people, and healthcare, and infrastructure, and roads and bridges, and the purity of our environment. All those things are a part of our national security."

## Collapse of the economy risks end of the planet:

T. E. Bearden, 2000 LTC, U.S. Army (Retired), CEO, CTEC Inc., Director, Association of Distinguished American Scientists (ADAS), Fellow Emeritus, Alpha Foundation's Institute for Advanced Study (AIAS) June 24, 2000 ("http://www.seaspower.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm" <http://www.seaspower.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm>)

As the collapse of the Western economies nears, one may expect catastrophic stress on the 160 developing nations as the developed nations are forced to dramatically curtail orders. International Strategic Threat Aspects 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 {[7]} 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 {[8]}. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

## The Afghan war is massively hiking up the deficit.

Katrina vanden Heuvel (2010). “The Nation: Demand The Afghanistan Exit.” April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126302837>

Democratic Congressman Jim McGovern, Republican Congressman Walter Jones, and Democratic Senator Russ Feingold have introduced legislation demanding an exit strategy and timetable for withdrawal from Afghanistan. The bill reads, "Military operations in Afghanistan have cost American taxpayers more than $200,000,000,000 in deficit spending since 2001." Over 1000 American soldiers have been killed and more than 5,600 wounded. In 2009 alone, 2400 Afghan civilians were killed according to the UN, and tens of thousands have lost their lives since the war began.

## High deficits will undermine consumer and market confidence.

Eamon Javers, 2010. (staff writer). “Ben Bernanke predicts moderate recovery.” April 14, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed May 1, 2010 at <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0410/35798.html>

Bernanke also warned about the danger of the deficit. “Although sizable deficits are unavoidable in the near term,” he said, “maintaining the confidence of the public and financial markets requires that policymakers move decisively to set the federal budget on a trajectory toward sustainable fiscal balance.”

# Afghan Troop Switch Answers

## (--) Turn: Expanding the war is necessary to lead to US withdrawal.

Tom Bowman, 2010. National Public Radio. April 27, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 29, 2010 at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126311052>

The mission is to prepare enough Afghan soldiers and police to begin taking responsibility for security by fall 2011, allowing U.S. and NATO forces to begin leaving the country. President Obama has said he wants to start bringing home U.S. troops as soon as July 2011. By October 2011, Afghanistan is supposed to field a force of 300,000 soldiers and police. If that doesn't happen, it could delay plans to bring home American troops.

## (--) Impacts are empirically denied: if the previous surge didn’t trigger the impacts, there is no reason additional troops will.

## (--) No link: Congress will prevent Obama from expanding the Afghanistan war:

James Sturcke, 2009 (staff writer). The Guardian. “Obama rules out Afghanistan troop cuts.” October 7, 2009. Online. Accessed from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/oct/07/obama-afghanistan-troops

Attendees at the closed-door event described tension, with some politicians reportedly airing concerns that accepting the general's recommendation would be costly in terms of both money and human life. "I think a lot of senators and congressmen need to ask themselves how much money they are willing to put on the table, for how long and for what strategy," the Democratic senator John Kerry told the paper. Congress must approve any additional resources but **much of the president's party is resisting calls for more combat troops**, forcing him to seek support from Republicans who favour McChrystal's strategy.

## (--) The current surge strategy is effective: denying their escalation claims:

E. Thomas **McClanahan, 1/8/2010** (staff writer, <http://voices.kansascity.com/node/7144>)

The general prognosis regarding Afghanistan is almost uniformly pessimistic, a view that **ignores what effect NATO's efforts have had** on the Taliban so far. We're making progress, judging by this report from Strategypage: The Taliban had a bad year in 2009, although they managed to play the media well enough to hide a lot of their problems. The biggest defeat for the Taliban was in a continued loss of support by the Afghan people. Opinion surveys have had the percentage of Afghan approving the Taliban going downward for several years, and it's now under ten percent. This is no surprise to anyone living in Afghanistan. The Taliban were always disliked by the majority of Afghans, but now their fellow Pushtuns overwhelmingly hate them as well. ...The U.S. and NATO attacks over the summer hit the drug gangs hard, depriving the Taliban of needed cash. The Pakistani Army has been attacking the Taliban on their side of the border since last August, which has cut off any hope of support from that direction. Afghanistan remains a major challenge, but so much of the comment coming out of Washington seems like thoughtless defeatism.

## (--) No Indo-Pak war: Mutually assured destruction checks the impact:

Jonathan **Tepperman,** 8/29/20**09** (staff writer). Online. Accessed From: http://www.newsweek.com/id/214248)

The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did **dramatically mellow their behavior**. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, **despite severe provocations** (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and **leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it.**

## (--) Nuclear weapons deter conflict between India & Pakistan:

Sumit **Ganguly, 2008** (professor of political science @ Indiana University). International Security, Fall 2008, accessed via JSTOR.

In this article I argue that, contrary to the views of the proliferation pessi- mists, nuclear weapons have reduced the risk of full-scale war in the region and have therefore contributed to strategic stability. I also contend that, bar- ring India’s acquisition and deployment of viable antiballistic missile capabili- ties, **nuclear deterrence in South Asia should remain robust**.10

## (--) No Indo-Pak escalation to a nuclear level:

**Business Today,** 2/3/20**02** (<http://archives.digitaltoday.in/businesstoday/20020203/features2.html>)

Will a full-blown war end in a nuclear scenario? K. Santhanam, the director of IDSA, believes that both countries will be **reluctant to exercise the nuclear option.** **''In the last three wars**, both India and Pakistan have **restricted their attacks** to the forward areas,'' points out Singh.