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Text:

Read aff plan text and replace Afghanistan with Khorasan

1NC Shell

The name Afghanistan is the product of colonial domination

Rupee News 10 [Rupee News “The British constructed ‘Afghanistan’ as a buffer state from remnants of Khorasan”. July 15, 2010.http://rupeenews.com/2010/07/15/the-origins-of-the-british-construct-of-afghanistan-buffer-lie-in-the-state-of-khorasan/]

The Afghans did not create their own country. Afghanistan was created by a treaty between Russia and Great Britain. Throughout the 19th Century, the two major forces in Asia were the British, who were slowly moving North, and the Russians, who were slowly moving South. Britain gradually took over the entire Indian sub-continent and, during the same period of time, the forces of the Czar of Russia were taking over Turkic speaking areas, such as Samarkand and Bukhara. Peter the Great of Russia had decreed that Russia must find a warm-water port. The British feared that Russia would try to establish that warm water port in Karachi. Meanwhile, Yakub Beg, the ruler of Kashgar in Turkestan, wanted to establish a country called “Greater Turkestan”, which would encompass a two thousand mile long Turkish speaking area, from Urumqi in the Xinjiang Republic of China, to Istanbul. Both the Russians and the Chinese were terrified at the prospect of such a large country at their borders. Yakub Beg had invited the British to come to Kashgar and the Russians were worried about this. Therefore, the Russians and the British made a deal. The Russians would stay North of the Oxus River. The British would stay south of the crest of the Himalayas. In order to make sure that neither country would come into conflict with the other, a sort of no-mans land was set up. A buffer state was created which would be in between the Russian and the British Empires. The name of that Buffer State was Afghanistan, the place of the Afghans. No such country had existed previously. This is the reason why an arm of Afghanistan reaches out and touches China. That arm is called the Wakhan Corridor. There, the northern border of Afghanistan is the Oxus River. The southern border is the crest of the Himalayas and Hindu Kush mountains, which converge together at that point. It was important to the British that Russia never touch India. For this reason, the Wakhan Corridor, which is only eight miles wide at its narrowest point, was made part of Afghanistan and was extended to touch China. While these negotiations were going on, the Russians were holding the King of Afghanistan in jail. Pursuant to their agreement to set up the buffer state of Afghanistan, the Russians agreed to let King Abdul Rehman out of jail. They returned him to his country. In 1891, the British drew what became known as the Durand Line. Everything North and West of that line was Afghanistan. Everything South and East of the line was British India, an area which is now in Pakistan. Dr. Tajammal Naveed a fellow activist and investigative historian has researched the state of Afghanistan at length and has described the creation of the artificial state by the British. Afghanistan was created by imperial edicts of  Britain and Russia—and served to keep their armies away from each other. In a brilliant discourse, Dr. Tajammal Navved refutes the nonsense published by one of the most Anti-Pakistan sites on the internet—The Huffington Post. He repudiates the manufactured history narrated by the Neocon’s Neocon Dr. Rashid Ahmed. Dr. Rashid is a darling of the West,  because he says what the CIA wants to hear. Dr. Rashid works in a non-descript university in Islamabad known more for what happens after dusk than what happens after dawn. It is an open admission party school where the progeny of Islamabad’s spoilt party all night long, and sleep during the “classes”. Dr. Rashid and Dr. Hoodbhoy indoctrinate the spoilt brats in Anti-Pakistanism. Dr. Hoodbhoy almost came to blows with Imran Khan, when the PTI leader asked him if he was on the American payroll as a Security analyst. Dr. Hoodbhoy has criticized Islam and has publicly claimed that “he is not proud to be a Pakistani—he is one by happenstance”. The venom spewing out of the university in Islamabad has grave consequences—Dr. Rashid and Dr. Hoodbhoy are quoted by the worst Paksitanphobes in the world, and they use their claptrap for nefarious purposes. The Huff Post is run by a liberal Greek woman who is right on most issues—but her site spews Anti-Pakistan vitriol on a regular basis. Read the following and watch Dr. Tajammal Naveed decimate Michael Hughes—who seems like a paid agent of Bharat Inc. (aka India Inc). In summary the brillian Dr. navved esblaies the following facts: 1) The Afghan state was manufactured by the British 2) The original state was Khorasan which included Pakistan and Afghanisgtan 3) Wrong history is being taught to the progeny of the Khorasanis 4) The British allowed “Afghans” to enter the “Pakistan” (the latest avatar of the Indus Valley Civilization). This is a recent phenomenon in Subcontinental terms 5) The Pakistan Civilization (aka Indus Valley Civilization) is five thousand years old. It thrived as an urban civilization when most of Europe and America was frozen during the ice age.The people of the Indus lived, worked and prayed together when “Aghanistan” was arid desert and Hindustan (aka Bharat aka India) was jungle 6) Pakistan is five thousand years old—way before Afghanistan or India even existed—or could support human existence. In a sense the Paksitani Civilzation preceded the Chinese and the Egyptian civilization. In the IVC people up the river traded with people down the river. Thus the Kashmiris cut logs and send them down the Indus, and the Pakhtuns caught them, and built hoses in Punjab with them. The Sindhis and the Punjabis and Baloch lived on the same river and sent food up and down the river. 7) How can you balkanize geography. How can you break an eco system. How can you divide a living organism. Dr. Tajammal Naveed can define this more eloquently in the following words. Any academic discourse one needs to verify the facts before venturing to give a point of view. As far as the voicing of your opinion is concerned, it needs more in-depth study. Furthermore, as far as the feelings of your good friends from Qandahar are concerned; if they have been fed wrong history then they, too, are at fault for having read wrong books. Ahmed Rashid may be an author who appeals to your perceptions and has probably resulted in your present article under critique, as well, but whatever you may have read of him, I am sorry to say that the fellow, to my mind, is equally clueless of the subject. No wonder you took the liberty of writing such a nasty piece against our state. Likewise you may have studied various books on the history of Afghanistan, but it seems you never took time out to study the actual books which are regarded, till now, the main reference books on the subject matter. It is in these books that you will find the real geographic name of this region – now called Afghanistan or the rationale of its creation by the British Empire builders. Please keep in mind, no insult intended for your faulty perceptions – as will be explained subsequently by the references in my reply – that One learns all one’s life. So take it in that spirit, like a man. You had written an article on the dismemberment of my state, however, your reply to my critique is based on side issues focused on ‘’Afghanistan’ and the Naxalities , as well as your displeasure why I roped in Nazi Germany with the Hindutva State of Brahmans called India. Kindly remember that it was on account of the common

1NC (cont.)

Swastika symbol and the desire to purge all those races which do not follow their religion or dictates. You are further requested to reply back to my pointed critique and not to divert from the subject. Let me enlighten you on the subject of Afghanistan. To clear your mental fog, historically, the region now called as Afghanistan is known in history, as well as in historical geography, as ‘’Khurassan’’. The boundaries of the said region have varied during the Empires which held it. To answer your Qandahar friends, Ahmed khan who had been the Captain of the Guards of Nadir shah Afsar, and who on Nadir Shah’s assassination in 1747 had proclaimed himself King using the hoarded wealth of the said King – had proclaimed himself as “Badashah of Qandahar”. The Afghan entity did not exist then. You are further requested to read the volumes complied by A.U. AITCHISON, under the head of ‘’A collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads, relating to India & Neighboring Countries’’ published from Calcutta. If you study those volumes that cover the early period of the 19th century, only then will you comprehend the dates, as stated in my rebuttal. Next you are advised to read, “The Indian Borderland” a book by Sir Thomas Holdich, published in 1901, in which the author states on page-366, “We have contributed much to give a national entity to that nebulous community which ‘’WE’ call Afghanistan (but which afghans never call it, by that name) by drawing a boundary all around it and elevating it into the position of a buffer state between ourselves and Russia, all this has been done at great expense and with infinite pains…………..the Amir of Afghanistan since 1893 was on a RS.600,000/- subsidy from the British” (page-367). Holdich, to further explain the rationale for the creation of this new entity, states,(page-368) “The new boundary between British empire, Afghanistan and the Czarist Russia was ‘a visible expression of our present determination to set a limit to a ‘forward’ policy; and as such it may be accepted with satisfaction by large number of politicians’’ ……… Michael, keep in mind these figures, too, that are as per “The Imperial Gazetteer of India”(Afghanistan & Nepal ) edition of 1885 (pages-15-16-17) the total population of Afghanistan in that YEAR was, Ghalzi(1,500,000), Tajak(900,000), Hazara (500,000), Char Aimak (180,000), Osbegs (300,000), Kizilbashi(50,000), Hindu traders(35,000), Safis, Kashmiri, Laghmani, Arab, syed, Paracha & Kafirs(60,000). The Afghan/Pushtun numbered (1,245,000). In total the figure came to 4,770,000. In the third decade or so of the 19th century the population was much less. After the Fall of the house of main line Timurids, the Khorassan was divided into administrative provinces or ‘Subas’, with Sarkars and Bolaks. Now you will have to study ,’’An Atlas of The Mughal Empire’ by Irfan Habib, edition of 1982. In the year 1601,the political boundaries of ‘’Khurassan’ were as, ‘Subas of Balkh, Badakhshan, Kabul & Qandahar. By 1648 the Mughals had lost Qandahar Suba to Iranian Safavids. Earlier the regions across Helmand i.e Farah, Qila Fatah and Seistan were already with Iran inclusive of Herat. And by 1738/39 the only Suba under control of Mughal was Kabul. Kindly now read a few other books, though I can refer many more from my personal library, however, the following will suffice for now; Tabakat e Nasiri translation by Raverty- 1881 edition, authored by Mulanna Minhaj Usman (1260AD), Tariekh e Tabri by al Tabri (900 AD) 43 volumes in English or the limited 9 volume English translation of Shah Nama e Firduasi. The answer in all these will show that the area in dispute has always been, ’’KHURASSAN’’.

1NC (cont.)

Using the name “Afghanistan” endorses a history of violence and colonization

Nazary, ‘ 6 [Ali Maisam Nazary is a student in Politics at UCLA who was born in Kabul. He is a contributor to Khawaran Magazine and has a weekly TV show. June 2006. “Name Change in Afghanistan.” <http://archive.khawaran.com/Engl_AliMuslimNazari_NameChangeInAfghanistan.htm>. mrs]

Even to this day most people did not know when the name “Afghanistan” was initially used. However, the name has caused rifts and tension between people, especially Pashtuns and non-Pashtuns. Today in Afghanistan **we have a so-called Theocratic Democracy and so** it is the people’s right and responsibility to choose the name of their own country. We know that “Afghanistan” means “land of Afghans” or “land of Pashtuns” and the non-Pashtun majority were never asked whether or not they wish to accept this name. This is one of the major reasons why Afghanistan has always had ethnic tensions and ethnic discriminations. Non-Pashtuns feel that their rights as citizens have been undermined or taken away by naming this land “The land of Pashtuns.” Unlike other countries in the region, Afghanistan is made up of ethnic minorities and there has never been an ethnic majority. Nowadays when a Tajik or Hazara says “We need a name change” the government labels them as foreign agents and “sellouts.” One example is Latif Pedram, the co-founder of the National Congress Party of Afghanistan. During the presidential elections Pedram said that the country needed a name change and as a consequence he was almost thrown out of the elections. The word “Afghanistan” was first mentioned in English. When the British invaded Afghanistan their invasion spread from Attock to Kabul. Most of the invaded lands were predominantly Afghans or Pashtuns and therefore the British had no clue that there were also non-Pashtuns in other parts of the country. When the British overthrew Dost Mohammad Khan they proclaimed Shah Shuja the king of the Afghans and they started calling this little kingdom which was from Kabul to the Indus River “Afghan land.” This proves that it wasn’t the Pashtuns who named this country “Afghanistan” but the foreign imperialist British. But this name was not officially recognized and when Dost Mohamad Khan becomes Amir again he named himself “Amir e Khorasan” or “Amir of Khorasan.” The oldest recorded document that has the Farsi version of Afghan land is the Gandomak Treaty signed by Sher Ali Khan, grandson of Dost Mohamad Khan. The Farsi version of the Gandomak Treaty has the word Afghanistan written on it. “Afghan” is synonymous with Pashtun and “Istan” translates to “land” in Persian. This treaty was dictated and written by the British. This illustrates that Afghanistan was not a name that the citizens chose or even agreed upon. Instead, it was a name that Imperialist powers forced upon us. The first time which a ruler proclaimed that the official name of this land was Afghanistan was during the era of Abdur Rahman Khan. After the Durand Treaty in 1893, the government of Afghanistan officially recognized the name “Afghanistan.” Abdur Rahman Khan tried to Pashtunize the country by forcing non-Pashtuns – especially those in the south and east – to move northward. He also started the Hazara Genocide which killed 75% of the Hazara population. Praising the name “Afghanistan” is praising Abdur Rahman Khan and the English and their actions. Today most non-Pashtuns have started organizations, website, and have written books on why we need a name change. They understand that if the name isn’t changed then there will never be national unity. It is the people’s choice, and not the government, on what the name of the country should be. It is, after all, where they live, work, and die. We need to understand that democracy guarantees this right. And if democracy truly exists in Afghanistan then we need to act now or the country will face the consequences in the future with civil and sectarian violence.

1NC (cont.)

Rejection of the name “Afghanistan” in favor of “Khorasan” is a prerequisite to rejecting linguistic colonialism and domination

Tajikam ‘ 8 [Team Tajikam is a team of Tajiks who are upset with the current oppression and Pashto domination. February 5 2008. “I am Tajik, not Afghan.” http://www.fravahr.org/spip.php?article424. mrs]

The threat of being called a “traitor” and a “foreigner” hangs over those who dare tread upon the topic of national identity. For the longest time, the term “Afghan” has been pushed upon every ethnic group of Afghanistan and for years, that is what Tajiks, Hazaras, Uzbeks, Turkmans, and other non-Pashtuns were known by the rest of the world. Today, however, it needs to be made clear that “Afghan” is not the rightful national identity for the country. The history behind the word “Afghan” is disputable due to various sources of where it originated from. However, one thing is clear: “Afghan” has always been synonymous with Pashtun. Writers and travellers to and from the country have stated that the word “Afghan” was always used to distinguish between the Pashtuns and non-Pashtuns such as the Tajiks, Hazaras, etc. The name of country is believed to have been given by the British when they first invaded it in the 19th century. The areas that they encountered were predominantly Pashtun and since they knew “Afghan” as synonymous with “Pashtun”. They therefore erroneously declared the entire country as “Land of the Afghan” or Afghanistan. And even though the majority of Afghanistan isn’t even Afghans, the name has stuck since then. Before the invention of the “Afghanistan”, the land used to be known as other names: Ariana and Khorasan, with the most recent being Khorasan. The region was called Khorasan for 1500 years and the name was fairer and represented the state as well as the people better. It clearly doesn’t favour one ethnicity over another. As Khorasan, the region was once an advancing civilization and embodied many ethnicities. However, as the Pashtun nomads entered and invaded the regions, they scattered and spread over, imposing their existence as well as a need for a country. Now, it doesn’t take a Ph.D. — self-taught or not — to figure out that those events were not just. And no matter what changes the country and the people have gone through, the term “Afghan” is not a legitimate one. Tajiks and Hazaras and Uzbeks and other non-Pashtuns were never and will never be Afghan. When the literal term of a word obviously means something you are not why would you be crazy enough to fight for the right to be called one? By non-Pashtuns adamantly choosing to call themselves Afghan just because they want peace and quiet, they are inadvertently throwing their rights and their heritage away. Losing your identity as a Hazara or a Tajik, Uzbek, or Turkman, you are being oppressed and your heritage and history is being rewritten to those who crawled out of the Suleiman Mountains. When you don’t even speak the language of an Afghan (supposedly Pashto) then why call yourself one? There are a lot of people that will threaten you if you refuse to call yourself an Afghan when you aren’t one. They will call you a “traitor” or “foreigner” and try to get the mass against you. There is a full culture and history behind the names of “Tajik” and “Hazara”, etc. When the world thinks of “Afghans” hardly anything good will come to mind. It is often associated with the horrors of Ahmad Shah Abdali, paedophilia, the Taliban, and now drug dealers. Though there are some bad within non-Pashtuns, they, however, have contributed greatly to the world and to civilization. When you begin to associate yourself with what you rightfully are, you will see just how rich your past is. Rumi, Avicenna, Ferdowsi, they were not Afghans and would never have called themselves one. The national identity is constantly surrounded by lies and deceit. Pashto is trying to be pushed upon those who have no need for it, the word Afghan is insisted upon even though the majority of Afghanistan isn’t even Pashtun. Afghans have always and will always be known as Pashtuns only. A Tajik and an Uzbek and other non-Pashtuns are separate and they should be known as separate. When this comes to light, only then will the people be able to gain the rest of their rights. Only then will the name of the country be forced to change because it isn’t a fair representation of the majority of the people. The people who don’t wish to call themselves Afghan are not trying to start trouble. Instead, they have opened their eyes and trying to open the eyes of others to the mistake and the lie that has covered the entire people. Issues like these need to be discussed because even though they might seem minor, they are in fact major. If the name non-Pashtuns choose to call themselves isn’t such a “big deal” then why are people trying so hard to fight those that decline the name Afghan?

1NC (cont.)

Naming is not benign—the naming of a land naturalizes colonization

Stuckey and Murphy, ‘1 [MARY E. STUCKEY, an associate professor of communication and political science at Georgia State University, AND JOHN M. MURPHY, an associate professor of speech communication at the University of Georgia, “By Any Other Name: Rhetorical Colonialism in North America,” Journal American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25, 4 / 2001, Pages 73-98]

 Nations, as Ernest Gellner notes, are not inevitable. There are a variety of ways for humans to organize themselves and their lives, and doing so around the idea of nationality is but one such way, reflecting one set of historical, political, and economic circumstances.(FN27) The idea of a nation embodying a people is, as many have argued, a fiction, a creation brought about by a specific sort of historical necessity and specific kinds of rhetorical action.(FN28) Once invented, however, nations require certain elements for their sustenance and growth, and a certain sort of language with which to maintain and perpetuate themselves.(FN29) In the colonial context of North America, this language reflected, reinforced, and received support from the very fact of colonization.(FN30) The ways in which the colonists understood, spoke, and wrote about the land and its inhabitants justified the colonial project, which in turn set in motion processes that reinforced the colonists' understanding of themselves and the world.(FN31) In do doing, naming naturalized the process of colonization, reflecting and reinforcing colonial power.

Colonial language produces physical violence and justifies oppression of the colonized

Stuckey and Murphy, ‘1 [MARY E. STUCKEY, an associate professor of communication and political science at Georgia State University, AND JOHN M. MURPHY, an associate professor of speech communication at the University of Georgia, “By Any Other Name: Rhetorical Colonialism in North America,” Journal American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25, 4 / 2001, Pages 73-98]

The fragile ability of resident cultures to resist colonialization does not deny the fact of colonization, nor does it reduce its violence: "Colonization is violence, and there are many ways to carry out that violence."(FN35) The imposition of a particular linguistic world is one such way. A terminology may allow colonizers to see their new nation as unified, but that pretense is based upon the denial of indigenous identity, a denial that is violent. As Paulo Friere says, Cultural invasion, which serves the ends of conquest and the preservation of oppression, always involves a parochial view of reality, a static perception of the world, and the imposition of one world view upon another. It implies the "superiority" of the invader and the "inferiority" of those who are invaded, as well as the imposition of values by the former, who possess the latter and are afraid of losing them.(FN36)

Must Read Extension Evidence

What we do and say here matters. Policy making should be secondary to discourse focus—only the criticism alone can solve and create better policy outcomes

Doty, 93 [Roxanne Lynn Doty, Arizona State University, Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post- Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sep., 1993), pp. 297-320]

A discourse, i.e., a system of statements in which each individual statement makes sense, produces interpretive possibilities by making it virtually impossible to think outside of it. A discourse provides discursive spaces, i.e., concepts, categories, metaphors, models, and analogies by which meanings are created. The production of discourses and of subjectivity and sociality is indissoluble (Henriques et al., 1984:106). This is because discourses create various kinds of subjects and simulta- neously position these subjects vis-a-vis one another. For example, a traditional discourse on the family would contain spaces for a subject with traits con- ventionally defined as "male" and another kind of subject with traits conventionally defined as "female." These subjects would be positioned vis-a-vis one another in a particular way, e.g., female subservient to male. Within the traditional discourse on the family it is impossible to think outside of these categories except in terms of deviance or abnormality. Within this discourse, there is no discursive space for the single mother by choice or the gay or lesbian couple with children except as departures from the "normal" family or as deviants. Subjects, then, can be thought of as positions within particular discourses, intelligible only with reference to a specific set of categories, concepts, and practices. Policy makers also function within a discursive space that imposes meanings on their world and thus creates reality (Shapiro, 1988:100, 116). An approach that focuses on discursive practices as a unit of analysis can get at how this "reality" is produced and maintained and how it makes various practices possible. The analytic question addressed is not why particular decisions are made; the policy decision in itself becomes a secondary concern. What is central is the discourse(s) which construct a particular "reality." An analysis of discourses can reveal the necessary but not sufficient conditions of various practices. Applying this approach to the study of foreign policy, not only do we broaden our conception of what foreign policy is, the sites of foreign policy, i.e., where foreign policy takes place, also become much more extensive. This approach suggests that what foreign policy is need not be limited to the actual making of specific decisions nor the analysis of temporally and spatially bounded "events." Similarly, "foreign policy makers" need not be limited to prominent decision makers, but could also include those rather anonymous members of the various bureaucracies who write the numerous memorandums, intelligence reports, and research papers that circulate within policy circles. The discourse (s) instantiated in these various documents produce meanings and in doing so actively construct the "reality" upon which foreign policy is based. Moreover, foreign policy making can also extend beyond the realm of official government institutions. The reception as meaningful of statements revolving around policy situations depends on how well they fit into the general system of representation in a given society. Even speeches and press conference statements produced for specific purposes, in order to be taken seriously, must make sense and fit with what the general public takes as "reality." Thus, the analysis of statements can entail the examination of what was said and written within broad policy-making contexts as well as statements made in society more generally.

Language used in foreign policy precludes the possibility of alternative discourses—use of one pushes out others

Doty, 93 [Roxanne Lynn Doty, Arizona State University, Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post- Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sep., 1993), pp. 297-320]

I have attempted to show how a foreign policy discourse created spaces for certain kinds of subjects. Through representational practices that relied upon a series of oppositions and other relations a hierarchy of subjects was created which, in turn, made certain practices possible and precluded others. I have tried to show that given the world constructed in these policy discourses some kind of intervention would be imperative. I have also attempted to broaden our conception of what foreign policy making is. The "foreign," the "exotic," the "other," with whom foreign policy makers deal, are always being created at various sites. To the extent that similar kinds of subjects are reproduced in various sites and over periods of time, this result tells us something about the prevalence of particular representations that construct a hierarchical world. Since this study has only dealt with one particular site of foreign policy in a relatively narrow time frame, I can only claim to have shown that in this particular case, a hierarchical world was constructed.19 What needs to be done is to analyze other discourses in other settings and during different time periods.

“Afghanistan” Links

“Afghanistan” is the product of colonialism

Times of Kabul 10 [“Balkanizing ‘Afghanistan’ to fix it: Returning parts to original owners”. July 18, 2010 http://www.timesofkabul.com/?p=131]

There is no such thing as an Afghan people. Afghanistan is a colonial construct, cobbled together by the British in the 19th century to create a buffer state between the Russian empire and British India. The British created Afghanistan as a Pashtun empire, which was resented by other ethnic groups. The real political, economic and social history of Afghanistan begins in the 18th century with the rise of the Pakhtun tribes  (known as *Afghans* in Farsi). In 1709 the Hotaki dynestay established its rule in Qandhar and, more specifically, when Ahmed Shah Durrani carved out his empire in 1747. However by 1893 the country had disintegrated and carved away by all neighboring states. After the British went up to the Amu Darya, and then withdrew back to the Indus, the tribes continued to create falling and rising fiefdoms. British wars fought 1839–42, 1878–80, and lastly in 1919 defined British policy in the region. The Afghans did not create their own country. Afghanistan was created by a treaty between Russia and Great Britain. Throughout the 19th Century, the two major forces in Asia were the British, who were slowly moving North, and the Russians, who were slowly moving South. Britain gradually took over the entire Indian sub-continent and, during the same period of time, the forces of the Czar of Russia were taking over Turkic speaking areas, such as Samarkand and Bukhara. Peter the Great of Russia had decreed that Russia must find a warm-water port. The British feared that Russia would try to establish that warm water port in Karachi. Meanwhile, Yakub Beg, the ruler of Kashgar in Turkestan, wanted to establish a country called “Greater Turkestan”, which would encompass a two thousand mile long Turkish speaking area, from Urumqi in the Xinjiang Republic of China, to Istanbul. Both the Russians and the Chinese were terrified at the prospect of such a large country at their borders. Yakub Beg had invited the British to come to Kashgar and the Russians were worried about this. Therefore, the Russians and the British made a deal. The Russians would stay North of the Oxus River. The British would stay south of the crest of the Himalayas. In order to make sure that neither country would come into conflict with the other, a sort of no-mans land was set up. A buffer state was created which would be in between the Russian and the British Empires. The name of that Buffer State was Afghanistan, the place of the Afghans. No such country had existed previously.

Rejecting the name Afghanistan is key to stability

Khan 09 [Khorasani Khan, Prince Wasee Panah Khan, direct descendant from the Persian (Tajik) Sovereign Princely family of the Panah Khan from Khorasan. holds an MBA from the Haas School of Business (University of California, Berkeley) speaks seven Languages fluently and is an advisor to several Think Thanks AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN: The Real Problem AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN:The Real Problem]

When the whole world—including the UN—acknowledges something as simple as the border that separates Afghanistan and Pakistan, and ethno-centric groups of Pashtuns in Afghanistan cannot, then the country will never fully recover.  Karzai and the ethno-centric Pashtuns groups need to stop thinking emotionally and recognize what is best for the country, instead of what is best just for one minority ethnic group that they descend from.  They need to be practical and realize when they are wrong.  If not, then the people of Afghanistan will continue to suffer from the Taliban and foreign interference from Pakistan which would lead to the partition of the so called "Afghan"-istan. A name that needs to be changed anyways if the country wants to stay together as present and build a common national unity, which to date doesn't exist due to the fascistic approach of the Afghans (Pashtuns) against 70 % of the rest of the population.

The name “Afghanistan” is invalid

Khan 09 [Khorasani Khan, Prince Wasee Panah Khan, direct descendant from the Persian (Tajik) Sovereign Princely family of the Panah Khan from Khorasan. holds an MBA from the Haas School of Business (University of California, Berkeley) speaks seven Languages fluently and is an advisor to several Think Thanks AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN: The Real Problem AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN:The Real Problem]

If the Durand Line treaty is to be invalidated then every other British treaty should be as well and that would ultimately mean that the name "Afghanistan" would cease to exist.  The name "Afghanland" was first mentioned by the British in the Gadamak Treaty, set on May 26, 1879 between Sir Pierre Louis Napolean Cavagnari for the British and Amir Yaqub Khan of the "Afghans."  Before that time, the region was known as Khorasan.  Even the Pashtun Kings called themselves the Kings/Rulers/Amirs of Khorasan.  So therefore, the name "Afghan/Afghanistan" would be just as invalid as the Durand Line. The name of "Afghanistan" has already had its own controversy and adding the Durand Line topic would only serve to the Pashtuns' disadvantage.  The region of modern-day Afghanistan was a forceful occupation by Ahmed Shah Abdali and just as the ethno-centric Pashtuns want to claim that the Durand Line is illegal and invalid, one can also argue that Afghanistan's creation was illegal because of the fact that it was land belonging to the Safavids/Samanids which was basically stolen by Abdali and his tribes of Abdali and Gheljai.

Racism Impacts

Racist dichotomies grant states the power to exterminate – this is the root of all war

Mendieta, 2002 [Eduardo Mendieta, , “To Make Live and to Let Die – Foucault and Racism. 2002]

This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state. They are two sides of one same political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes and medicalizes war. Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture. As I wrote somewhere else, racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other, of others, an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

Colonialism cannot be disconnected from racism

Go 04 [Julian Go, Prof Department of Sociology, University of Illinois “Racism” and Colonialism: Meanings of Difference and Ruling Practices in America’s Pacific Empire http://www.bu.edu/sociology/files/2010/04/Jgo-QualSoc.pdf]

It would seem indisputable that modern colonialism in the early twentieth century involved racism. Indeed, during colonial occupation, colonizing groups were granted political, economic, and social privileges denied to the colonized, and the hierarchy was typically sustained by claims that the latter were racially inferior. The historian Partha Chatterjee refers to this as “the rule of colonial difference”—the colonized, by virtue of their biology, were represented “as incorrigibly inferior” (1993, pp. 19, 33). Traditional scholarship has thus treated racism as “a built-in and natural product [of colonialism], essential to the social construction of an otherwise illegitimate and privileged access to property and power” (Stoler 1992, p. 322). More recent scholarship in the humanities has added that the very purpose of colonial discourse was “to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin; in order to justify conquest” (Bhabha 1994, p. 70). Almost by definition, then, modern colonialism entailed “racism”: “The display of contempt or aggressiveness toward other people on account of physical differences (other than those of sex)” (Todorov 1986, p. 370).

Racism Impacts (cont.)

Racism must be rejected at all costs

Barndt 91 [Joseph Barndt, co-director of Crossroads, a ministry to dismantle racism, 1991, "Dismantling Racism: The Continuing challenge to White America," p. 155-6.]

To study racism is to study walls. We have looked at barriers and fences, restraints and limitations, ghettos and prisons. The prison of racism confines us all, people of color and white people alike. It shackles the victimizer as well as the victim. The walls forcibly keep people of color and white people separate from each other; in our separate prisons we are all prevented from achieving the human potential God intends for us. The limitations imposed on people of color by poverty, subservience, and powerlessness are cruel, inhuman, and unjust; the effects of uncontrolled power, privilege, and greed, which are the marks of our white prison, will inevitably destroy us as well. But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. We are not condemned to an inexorable fate, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. Brick by brick, stone by stone, the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural racism can be destroyed. You and I are urgently called to join the efforts of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism. The danger point of self-destruction seems to be drawing even more near. The results of centuries of national and worldwide conquest and colonialism, of military buildups and violent aggression, of overconsumption and environmental destruction may be reaching a point of no return. A small and predominantly white minority of the global population derives its power and privilege from the sufferings of vast majority of peoples of all color. For the sake of the world and ourselves, we dare not allow it to continue.

Extinction Impact

Continued colonialist oppression will compound the genocidal effects ending in extinction

Porter 98(Robert B. Porter, Seneca and Professor of Law and Director of the Tribal Law and Government Center,

University of Kansas, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the Sac and Fox Nation, 21 University of Michigan Journal

of Law and Reform, 1998)

Nonetheless, this otherwise natural process was dramatically altered by colonization. These colonizing efforts were accomplished by force and often with great speed, producing dramatic changes within Indigenous societies and interfering with the natural process of adaptation and change. This disruption has had a genocidal effect; groups of Indigenous peoples that existed 500 years ago no longer exist. There should be no doubt that their extinction was not an accident – it was the product of a concerted effort to subjugate and eliminate the native human population in order to allow for the pursuit of wealth and manifest destiny. As a result, extinction is the most dramatic effect of colonization. Allowed to run its full course, colonization will disrupt and destroy the natural evolutionary process of the people being colonized to the point of extinction.

AT: Language Use Inevitable

The discourses of imperialism are not inevitable—use of counterdiscourses allow us to construct a new reality

GUSTERSON ET AL IN 1999 [Jutta Weldes, lecturer in international relations at University of Bristol, Mark Laffey, independent scholar, Hugh, Gusterson, professor of anthropology at MIT, AND Raymond Duvall, professor of political science at University of Minnesota, George Marcus, professor of anthropology at Rice, Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger, 1999, pg. 16-17]

 The fact that cultures are composed of multiple discourses or codes of intelligibility, and that the world therefore can be and is represented in different, and often competing, ways, has significant implications. In particular, it means that any representation can poten-tially be contested and so must actively be reproduced. Meanings are not given, static, or final; rather, they are always in process and always provisional. The production of insecurities thus requires considerable social work—of production, of reproduction, and, possibly, of transformation. Dominant discourses must constantly reproduce themselves to answer challenges to their constructions of the world and their identification of those insecurities worthy of a response. Defining security and insecurity requires considerable ideological labor. Contesting discourses, in turn, attempt to rearticulate insecurities in ways that challenge the dominant representations (see, for example, Ballinger, this volume). In addition, discourses are themselves not perfectly coherent but always entail internal contradictions and lacunae. These contradictions make possible both resistance to a dominant discourse and the transformation of discourses. It is in this sense, then, that culture can be viewed as a field on which processes of discursive contestation are set. It should be noted that, in analyzing such constructive processes, we are not examining mere rhetoric. It is in any case misleading to associate the notions of culture, of discourse, or of codes of intelligibiliry with the ―merely linguistic.‖ As Laclau and Mouffe have argued (1987: 82—84), discourses are composed of linguistic and nonlinguistic (that is to say, material) practices, both of which are indispensable to the production of worlds and of insecurity.17 After all, discursive articulations, including the construction of insecurities, are always ―materialized in concrete practices and rituals and operate through specific state [and other] apparatuses‖ (Hall, 1988: 46). Discourses and their codes of intelligibility have concrete, and significant, material effects. They allocate social capacities and resources and make practices possible. We use the terms construction and production loosely to maintain the distinction between linguistic and nonlinguistic practices. Linguistically, discourses are the vehicle for the construction of categories (of difference, of identity, of threat, etc.). Through both linguistic and nonlinguistic practices, they are the vehicle for the production of social facts (such as insecurities).

AT: Lang. Irrelevant/PM Key

The language of policy makers results in tangible outcomes—certain framings increase the likelihood of violence and death

Doty, 93 [Roxanne Lynn Doty, Arizona State University, Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post- Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sep., 1993), pp. 297-320]

By ignoring the textual mechanisms at work in discourse and thereby discounting any role they might play in foreign policy, scholars lose the opportunity to take a more critical stance. Said (1978) poses the crucial question, "Can we divide human beings into certain types and not suffer the consequences?" While the consequences in the particular case I have examined in this study were not so severe as in other cases, this does not detract from the argument being made. In light of the fact that "realities" often give rise to policies that result in the deaths of both "us" and "them," a more critical approach to the analysis of foreign policy practices, one that examines the social construction of "us" and "them," is warranted

AT: Pics bad

1. Pics are good—They are the only way to promote the educational benefits to precision in language—The aff gets to choose the words in the plan and should be responsible for the choices they make
2. They enhance policy making—Debate is a process of searching for the best policy option and artificially excluding competitive options perverts that process
3. Net Benefits check abuse—We have to win a net benefit and they can always get offense by turning the net benefit
4. They assure reciprocity—The aff always get to make permutations that are pics to a counterplan because a perm always includes some or all of the c-plan- we should get to include parts of the plan
5. They are real world—In real world policy debates alternatives are offered that include some to all of the parts of a policy—The Republican health care plan included many elements of the Democrats health care plan—Democrats would look idiotic on the floor of congress calling the counterproposal illegitimate because it included parts of their plan
6. Language pics are uniquely real world—Empirically debates over a single word are the focus of policy debate

Kemp 10 [John Kemp is a Reuters market analyst COLUMN-What’s in a word? Senate battle on derivatives: John Kemp May 10, 2010 http://blogs.reuters.com/financial-regulatory-forum/2010/05/10/column-whats-in-a-word-senate-battle-on-derivatives-john-kemp/.]

May or shall. Even one small word can make a big difference. Lobbyists for financial services firms and officials from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the U.S. Treasury are sparring over a single word in the derivatives reform legislation being considered by the U.S. Senate. At issue is the Commission’s authority to impose position limits on major energy contracts. The Commission believes it has all the authority it needs to impose limits on exchange-traded energy contracts under Section 4a of the Commodity Exchange Act. It is currently asking Congress to extend that authority to over-the-counter (OTC) markets and derivatives traded on foreign exchanges so it can impose aggregated limits. By contrast, industry representatives insist the Commission cannot act because it has made no factual finding that limits are “necessary” to diminish, eliminate or prevent speculation — or even that excessive speculation is a real threat to big and liquid energy markets. The industry has asked the CFTC to postpone further rule-making until the outcome of the congressional debate is known. In the meantime, both sides are struggling to change the text of derivatives legislation before Congress in a bid to boost their argument before the Commission takes a final vote, and ahead of any court challenge.

AT: Perm Call it both

1. There is no net benefit to the perm—the counterplan alone solves all of the case—there is no reason to include the word “Afghanistan”
2. The perm still links—It still endorses use of the British name Afghanistan which endorses the colonialist history -- that’s the Nazary evidence
3. It still links— The historical process of naming signifies the entitlement to control a name—The names we use shape our reality preventing alternative interpretations from surfacing

Stuckey and Murphy, ‘1 [MARY E. STUCKEY, an associate professor of communication and political science at Georgia State University, AND JOHN M. MURPHY, an associate professor of speech communication at the University of Georgia, “By Any Other Name: Rhetorical Colonialism in North America,” Journal American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25, 4 / 2001, Pages 73-98]

In its most fundamental sense, naming enacts our desire to "notice, recognize, and label certain elements or qualities in ourselves and our surroundings."(FN10) Names order our world and direct our attention, but reliability and validity do not mark this effort. In Kenneth Burke's famous phrase, "Even if any given terminology is a reflection of reality, by its very nature as a terminology, it must be a selection of reality; and to this extent, it must function also as a deflection of reality."(FN11) Burke's perspective reveals the paradox of naming; even as we seek to reflect the world, we cannot help but deflect it. Our names cannot quite define our situations Instead, as Charles Kauffman notes, "Names entitle situations."(FN12) They provide strategic and stylized answers to the questions posed by the world.(FN13) Given their brevity, names act as "linguistic shortcuts," as "receptacles of personal attitudes and social ratings due to the fact that language is a social product and thus builds the tribe's attitudes into its 'entitlings' and into their 'abbreviations' as words for things."(FN14) Such shortcuts cohere into complex sets of entitlements, sizing up situations, ordering the "tribe's attitudes," and shaping visions of the world.(FN15) The orientations that result from entitlements not only size up our situations, but also assert a kind of ownership over them. Burke's ceaseless shuffling between "name," "entitle," and "title" addresses the power of naming. An entitlement names a right. As the Random House Thesaurus says, to entitle is to "give the right to, authorize, qualify, make eligible, allow, permit, enable, title, name, designate, call, etc."(FN16) The power explicit in the entitlement to name is present in many cultural traditions. In Genesis, for example, the Judeo-Christian God gives Adam dominion over the earth, a power enacted through his ability to name.(FN17) For members of many cultures indigenous to North America, moreover, breath is not only considered sacred, but the very act of speaking has creative power; one shapes the world by naming the world.(FN18) Names, then, are powerful forces, for they are the loci of negotiations over social authority and cultural identity.(FN19)

AT: Perm do the c-plan

1. It is a subtraction perm—They get rid of the word Afghanistan from the plan—Subtraction perms are illegitimate because they create moving targets—
2. The aff is responsible for the choices they made in writing the plan
3. That would be a reason to vote for us—If they concede that the counterplan alone is a better idea you would vote for us because we advocated it first.
4. This would eliminate all c-plan ground because the aff could always say do the

c-plan.

AT: Avoiding words is Counterproductive (Dirty Words-Butler)

1. This evidence does not apply—this is not a dirty word argument—we are saying that the historical culture and context of the name of the country has consequences for the way we construct the world
2. Our evidence is specific to the importance of language in foreign policy debates—their evidence is not about foreign policy debates—That’s the Stucky and Murphy evidence
3. Their evidence is not about the importance of language in policy contexts—our Doty evidence is specific to policy makers and language choices facing other countries
4. It doesn’t assume we create an alternative word that focuses on Khorasan
5. Focus on naming is necessary to unsettle the hierarchy of domination

Doty, 93 [Roxanne Lynn Doty, Arizona State University, Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post- Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sep., 1993), pp. 297-320]

In international relations, hierarchy has been more of a background condition from which analyses proceed rather than something which is itself in need of examination. For example, classical realism tacitly accepted the right of Great Powers to special privileges within the international community. Neorealism, despite its conception of the international realm as anarchical, sees states linked to one another hierarchically based upon power differentials. Marxist-oriented approaches to international relations begin with the assumption that capitalist relations of production and/or exchange result in a hierarchical world consisting of both classes and nation-states.9 All of these approaches exhibit an unspoken agreement not to problematize the construction of the subjects that constitute the world and the categories through which these subjects and objects are constructed. I suggest that we need to denaturalize hierarchy. We need to examine the content(s) of hierarchy, or, more accurately, of specific hierarchies, the practices that produced them, and the practices they make possible.

**AT: Put it Under Erasure**

1. This is an intrinsic perm—This involves putting a line through the word and erasure is not in the original plan or context—intrinsicness perms are bad because they are unpredictable and go beyond the given texts

Boyd 08

[Mark, MFA from Univ of Maryland Things Under Erasure http://theorynow.blogspot.com/2008/09/things-under-erasure.html. d.a. 7-30-10]

One question that proved fruitful was how I came to this technique of text-bisection. I recounted my discovery of Jacques Derrida’s expansion on Martin Heidegger’s “unique device” for acknowledging a word’s “inaccuracy” by crossing it out.(1) Derrida extends this idea of [sous rature](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sous_rature) - placing the word “under erasure” – to all words.

More evidence

Lee (no date given) [Yoon Lee (Ewha Womans University) The Rhetorical Effect of the Dualistic Language in 1QM From a Deconstructive Reading]

Derrida clarifies that a strategy of inversion or reversal does not aim at simply reversing the position, but at displacing and further deconstructing the present system of hierarchical power. The present system of power and the present logic of power are “under erasure.” Derrida borrows this term from Heidegger. Here I simply quote Spivak, the English translator of Derrida’s book, Of Grammatology: “This is to write a word, cross it out, and then print both word and deletion” (Of Grammatology, xiv, e.g. Being). The crossed-out word tells that the word is inaccurate, yet it is still necessary. For Heidegger, the crossed-out Being shows that the familiar notion of the seemingly absolutely stable concept of Being reflects only a part of Being, i.e., an inarticulable presence. For this unstable and the on-going presence, Derrida uses a word, “trace,” for the “mark of the absence of presence, an always already absent present, of the lack at the origin” (Of Grammatology, xvii).

1. Putting Afghanistan under erasure doesn’t solve—It leaves the traces of the word and precludes true deconstruction of the term

By "erasing" the absence through repression of speech, Derrida's "indelibility of certain traces" is only further pronounced... somehow the originary source has an invitational aspect to it, an appellation, something that calls forth to the subject in order to traverse the distance between the trace and its origins... What erupts in the presence of working in relation to Freud is a merging of the subject toward the horizon of the disappearing trace. (Morgan, 1988, p.48) To expose the trace is also one of Derrida's specific uses for writing 'under erasure', and as such can be seen as a central concern in Derrida's work (see, for example, the essay Differance in Derrida, 1982, p.12) However, erasure is perhaps a technique and a writing that is only 'readable' in these ways within the context of a deconstructive text. The actual marking of the erasing lines brings the associations of deconstruction closer to the art work that I am examining, but is it possible to say that the writing of words under erasure in art constitutes deconstruction? It certainly makes it easier to make a deconstructive reading of these works. But is deconstruction actually at work within the work? Does this depend on proving the intentions of the artists, and even then, is there enough happening with a single erasure? The writing of words 'under erasure' in deconstructive texts is a small part of the deconstructive strategy (that can be seen as representative of the whole), but an erasure standing alone, without being part of a broader deconstructive approach must surely be limited.

AT: Textual Competition bad

1. It is functionally competitive—The plan text functions to reify linguistic colonialism and the c-plan functions to reject it—While the mechanics of the plan may be the same the language of the plan plays a functional role because language plays a role in shaping reality—That is our Doty evidence
2. It competes as an opportunity cost—The plan is an opportunity cost of rejecting the term “Afghanistan”
3. Textual competition is good—It is the only way to test whether or not the ideas are exclusive
4. Textual competition is better for the aff—It allows them to eliminate counterplans that add words like consultation to the plan—They can always use scrabble perms to make other c-plans not compete—
5. Debates about textual choices are real world—Real world policy debates often focus on what words are best to put in a piece of legislation—it is better for educational purposes to learn those debates

AT: C-Plan Doesn’t solve because we don’t know where to pull the troops from

1. This argument is silly—Khorasan has a long history for the geographic region
2. If anything we solve better because Khorasan is a larger geographic region than the area known as “Afghanistan”