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# Consult NATO CP – Solvency – NATO Says Yes

## NATO already wants to transition NATO/U.S. forces to Afghan forces this year

**Goebel 10**

(Editor for Deutsche Well, Germany’s international broadcaster (4/23/10, Nicole, “NATO ministers agree plan for Afghanistan security handover,” <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,5497182,00.html>)

NATO ministers agreed on conditions for handing over security responsibilities in Afghanistan to Afghan forces this year. The alliance stressed that the transition would be gradual and that it would depend on the conditions being fulfilled rather than a timetable. "It will not be a pullout. It will not be a run for the exit," NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen told a news conference on Friday after the meeting of foreign ministers in the Estonian capital Tallinn. Rasmussen stressed there was a need for allies to provide more personnel to train Afghan forces. "What will happen is that we hand over lead responsibility to the Afghans and our soldiers will then move into a more supportive role," he said. Rasmussen added, "I foresee that the Afghan security forces will need our supportive assistance for quite some time so it will be a gradual process."

## NATO supports disarmament and troops withdrawal in Afghanistan

**NATO 2004**

(June 28th, “NATO Council Reaffirms Collective Defense Role in Europe and Beyond”, <http://www.antegotovina.com/default.aspx?clanak=2695&LID=1>)

5. In consultation with the Afghan authorities, we will continue to expand ISAF in stages throughout Afghanistan, through the establishment by lead nations of additional Provincial Reconstruction Teams. We will continue to coordinate and cooperate with Operation Enduring Freedom, as appropriate. The successful conduct of nation-wide elections will be a crucial milestone in the democratic development and peaceful evolution of Afghanistan. In response to President Karzai's request, ISAF is currently supporting the voter registration process and will provide enhanced support to the Afghan authorities in providing security during the election period, within means and capabilities. After the election, it will be for the government of Afghanistan to develop a forward-looking plan that fulfils the vision of the Bonn Agreement to promote national reconciliation, lasting peace, stability, and respect for human rights. ISAF has been assisting in disarming the militias and securing weapons. The Bonn process is on track and legitimate political institutions are developing. Reconstruction projects, security sector reform and other initiatives are improving the daily lives of many citizens. We strongly condemn the increasing attacks on civilian aid workers, who are making a valuable contribution to Afghanistan's future. 6. We call on the Afghan authorities to energetically pursue the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration process, and particularly the withdrawal of military units from Kabul and other urban centres. We will provide appropriate support, within ISAF's mandate, to the Afghan authorities in taking resolute action against the production and trafficking of narcotics. We are prepared to help the Afghan government to build a better future for Afghanistan, together with Operation Enduring Freedom, the UN Assistance Mission to Afghanistan, the European Union, and other international organisations on the ground. We also call on Afghanistan's neighbours to contribute to this effort consistent with the wishes of the Afghan authorities. We commend the role of Canada in ISAF and look forward to the future role of the Eurocorps.

## NATO will say yes, plan helps their nation-building efforts.

**Mull, Middle East correspondent for Enduring America, 6/16/10,**

(Josh, The Huffington Post, “Does An Afghanistan Exit Strategy Hurt our Allies?” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/josh-mull/does-an-afghanistan-exit\_b\_615036.html)

Normally when you see this myth, it's about our enemies rather than our allies. It's usually something along the lines of "if we tell the insurgents when we're leaving, they'll just wait until we're gone and start back up." That's wrong though. See, much like US senators, insurgents have to have legitimacy -that is, some right or justification for making decisions and taking actions on behalf of so many people. That doesn't necessarily mean that citizens vote for the insurgency, rather their legitimacy comes from the presence of the occupation. Take Iraq, for example. The Sunni Arab insurgency is able to support itself in its civil war against Kurds, Persians, Shi'a, etc partly because its "constituency" (not always the locals) supports their fight against the American occupation, in the name of Iraq and/or Islam. The US supports some of them, further tying their legitimacy to our presence, but also retarding the civil war which would inevitably destroy the insurgency. When the Americans withdraw, the Shi'a like Prime Minister Maliki, purportedly our allies, will be free to overtly reject reconciliation and prosecute the civil war against the Sunni (and any other dissenting Iraqi) as brutally as they like. That's why Sunni insurgents are increasing their violence just as US troops are re-deploying to Afghanistan, because US leaders gave vague promises about withdrawing "based on conditions on the ground." The insurgents want to change the conditions on the ground, increase the violence so we stay longer, thus keeping them in business another day. Otherwise they lose their legitimacy, they become not heroic freedom fighters or well-paid concerned local citizens but anti-Sadd- excuse me, anti-Maliki government criminals. And they will be annihilated. Our enemies are not waiting for us to leave, they desperately need us to stay. But what about the twist we have on Afghanistan? Is an exit strategy not only good for our enemies, but bad for our allies? Unfortunately no, it's just as stupid. Who are our allies? That would be NATO and Pakistan, both of which would benefit greatly from our exit strategy. NATO-member Canada is already in the process of replacing its military with an all-civilian program, and the UK has completely ruled out any more troops for Afghanistan. If the US military leaves, the development and "nation building" projects by our NATO allies will get better, not worse.
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NATO will say no, it makes them look weak.

**O’Neil, European Correspondent for National Post, 3/4/10**

(Peter, “Afghan Troop Withdrawal signals NATO crisis”)

Canada, despite its “robust” and “valiant” effort in Afghanistan, is among a group of countries contributing to a growing crisis caused by western allies who are failing to stay the course in that conflict, says the former secretary-general of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Lord George Robertson, a former British defence secretary who served as NATO’s top civilian leader from 1999-2004, said the planned Canadian pullout of combat troops next year is dangerously premature. “To get out when the job’s half-done is I think the wrong thing to do,” Lord Robertson told Canwest News Service on Friday. He said he empathizes with those who feel Canadian troops have suffered disproportionate losses because Canada, with its forces stationed in Kandahar, is one of the few countries willing to deploy troops in the country’s most dangerous areas. “But it’s the job that matters,” he said, noting Britain recently increased its troop contingent despite suffering a surge in casualties over the past year. “Debating whether other people are not doing it doesn’t mean to say you shouldn’t do it if you believe what is being done is right.” Lord Robertson, in a speech in Washington earlier this week, said Canada’s decision and the Dutch troop withdrawal this year signals a “crisis” in the alliance. “The Dutch and the Canadians . . . have both made valiant contributions to what has to be done in Afghanistan and there have been awful sacrifices with it. So I cast no aspersions on these two nations alone,” Lord Robertson told a gathering of diplomats, senior foreign policy and defence officials, and experts organized by the Atlantic Council, a think-tank. “But if these two robust allies, and those who may well be thinking of doing the same, and additionally those who contribute less than they should, if they can all shy away from their obligations . . . then what is it other than a crisis?” He said weak political leadership is at the root of a decline in public support for the Afghanistan mission among western allies. “We are on the edge of a precipice looking down on a world of growing disorder and discontent and only blunt talk and some straight language will save us from falling over it,” he said. Lord Robertson made the same argument U.S. President Barack Obama used to justify his 30,000 troop surge — that al-Qaida, the trans-national terrorist organization that planned the 9/11 attacks from its former base in Taliban-controlled Afghanistan, would strike again if it’s not defeated. “Rest assured,” Lord Robertson warned, “if the Taliban and their allies can defeat the most successful defence alliance in history, why should they stop at Afghanistan? They won’t. We all know all that.” He said the West needs politicians to emerge in the fashion of Winston Churchill, who rallied the British people against the more powerful Nazi enemy in the Second World War.

Chief of NATO does not support change in Afghanistan

**The Washington Post. September 30, 2009.**

(Advice from NATO, The alliance’s chief doesn’t believe in an Afghan ‘exit strategy.’ The Washington Post Lexis Nexis)

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S very public wavering over whether to stick with the strategy for Afghanistan that he adopted six months ago is producing some unusual spectacles. One is the awkward gap that has opened between the president and the military commander he appointed in June, Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, who drew up a plan to implement the strategy -- only to learn he had been left out on a limb that might be sawn off. Another is the lobbying of the president by NATO allies who find themselves trying to keep the United States from abandoning the mission they joined. Their spokesman in Washington this week has been the NATO secretary general, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, who in a diplomatic but direct way has been telling Mr. Obama that "we don't need a new strategy." Mr. Rasmussen, a former prime minister of Denmark who took over the NATO post in August, made that remark in a meeting with us Tuesday. The day before he delivered a speech at the Atlantic Council in which he said that the 41-member international alliance in Afghanistan we must "do more now, if we want to be able to do less later." While not specifically addressing Gen. McChrystal's request for the deployment of tens of thousands more U.S. troops, Mr. Rasmussen called for a greatly stepped-up effort to train the Afghan army and jump-start development programs through the Afghan government. "None of this will be easy," he said. "We will need to have patience. We will need more resources. And we will lose more young soldiers." In our conversation, Mr. Rasmussen made clear that he sees no alternative to the principles that Mr. Obama endorsed in March and that Gen. McChrystal made the basis of his plan: protection of the Afghan population and support for the creation of an effective and accountable Afghan government. "Basically I share [Gen. McChrystal's] view," Mr. Rasmussen said. "The essence of his view is to pursue a more population-centered approach." The right policy, Mr. Rasmussen said, "is definitely not an exit strategy. It's of crucial importance to stress that we will stay as long as it takes to stabilize the country." Mr. Obama recently questioned whether support for the Afghan government was an essential U.S. interest. But Mr. Rasmussen stressed that "we need a stable government in Afghanistan, a government that we can deal with. Otherwise we would be faced with constant instability in Afghanistan and in the region." Some in and outside the administration are advocating a more limited strategy centered on strikes against terrorist targets with drones and Special Forces troops. But Mr. Rasmussen said, "we need more than just hitting individual targets in the mountains. We need to stabilize the Afghan society. We need to create . . . a society with a government that reflects the will of the people." "I think it would be appropriate if I indicated that a [strategy] aimed at hitting some targets in the mountains and in Pakistan would not find broad support among the allies," said the NATO chief.Mr. Rasmussen pointed out that NATO is still deeply invested in the Afghan mission: There are 38,000 troops there from countries other than the United States, and soldiers from 13 armies are fighting alongside the Americans on the main southern battlefronts. If Mr. Obama decides to abandon or scale back the fight against the Taliban, not only U.S. and Afghan interests will be affected; the Atlantic alliance will suffer its own strategic setback.