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FYI – Defining COIN and CT

The goal of a COIN strategy is to undermine public support for the insurgency.

Boyle, IR prof @ University of St. Andrews, 2010

MICHAEL J. Lecturer in International Relations and a Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews. “Do counterterrorism and counterinsurgency go together?”

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/123318677/PDFSTART>, date accessed: 7/26/2010

Such an approach is distinct from a traditional counterinsurgency model, which focuses alternately on direct (or coercive) and indirect (or ‘hearts and minds’) ways to separate insurgents from the local population.46 The counterinsurgency model of warfare is typically presented as a competition between the government and insurgents for the loyalties of the local population.47 This competition can be waged through a variety of means, including the use of force but also involving the provision of security, governance and development. The goal of the COIN approach to warfare is to undermine public support for the insurgency and to build the capacity of the local government. Where its proponents tend to differ is on the best means towards achieving that end. *Some advocate the direct use of force to destroy the insurgency before it can threaten the government*; others advocate *starving the insurgency of popular support by winning the ‘hearts and minds’ of the population*. In contrast with counterterrorism approaches, which focus on the sporadic but ruthless use of force against terrorist operatives to degrade their capabilities, both COIN schools of thought emphasize the discriminate use of violence against insurgents over a longer time period. The differences between these schools of thought are more stylistic than substantive. Both agree that the ultimate objective of counterinsurgency is to draw the population away from the insurgency and towards the government.

The post 9-11 era has developed a more offensive/militarized counterterrorism model

Boyle, IR prof @ University of St. Andrews, 2010

MICHAEL J. Lecturer in International Relations and a Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews. “Do counterterrorism and counterinsurgency go together?”

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/123318677/PDFSTART>, date accessed: 7/26/2010

Today both counterterrorism and counterinsurgency can be understood as distinct models of warfare, with different starting assumptions and characteristics. To some extent, the development of counterterrorism as a model of warfare is new to the post-September 11 era. While counterinsurgency has long been recognized as a unique type of warfare, counterterrorism has traditionally been understood more broadly as offensive measures undertaken to stop an adversary from employing terrorism. As normally defined, it is a catch-all term that incorporates a wide range of political, legal, diplomatic, financial and military instruments designed to prevent attacks or inhibit the operations of terrorist networks.41 While a military dimension has always been present within counterterrorism, the war model of counterterrorism has generally been less salient than law enforcement or intelligence instruments. Military force tended to be used for counterterrorism tasks in support of policing/COIN operations (as in Northern Ireland), for hostage rescue, or through air strikes in response to terrorist provocations (for example, the US bombing of Libya in 1986 in response to the bombing of a West Berlin disco).42

One of the unexpected consequences of a declaration of ‘war on terror’ has been to militarize counterterrorism and give rise to a set of practices which make counterterrorism a form of warfare in its own right.43 This increased salience of a military or war model of counterterrorism was in part driven by the threat posed by Al-Qaeda, which operates both within western societies and in theatres of war abroad. It has been reinforced by experience, particularly that of US and allied forces in combating terrorist organizations embedded in existing forces or operating as participants within wars (for example, Al-Qaeda’s 055 brigade, which was integrated into the Taleban’s army during 1996–2001).44 The result of this experience and the ensuing militarization of counterterrorism is marked; today, even law enforcement and intelligence officials employ technology (such as signals intercepts and Predator drone strikes) that was once reserved for the military. This emerging military model of counterterrorism relies on a combined package of air power, special forces, and the sophisticated use of intelligence to kill enemy opera- tives and disrupt terrorist networks. Current US military doctrine is explicit about the warfighting dimension of counterterrorism. It identifies it as a form of irreg- ular warfare and, in an echo of COIN language, argues that the military–strategic approach to this problem ‘is to focus military operations in such a way as to assist other instruments of national power to undermine the terrorists’ centre of gravity: extremist ideology’.45 The military model of counterterrorism is designed to keep relentless pressure on terrorist operatives, often through targeted and kinetic strikes against their operatives, networks and key resources, while supporting other government efforts to undermine the legitimacy and appeal of their claims.

Counterterrorism = “enemy-centric”

Counterinsurgency = “population-centric”

IAC – Inherency

Observation One: Inherency

Obama’s recent appointment of Petraeus to take the lead in Afghanistan underscores his renewed commitment to a counterinsurgency strategy

Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, July 26, 2010

Newsweek: “We're Not Winning. It's Not Worth It. Here's how to draw down in Afghanistan”

Lexis, date accessed: 7/26/2010

The war being waged by the United States in Afghanistan today is fundamentally different and more ambitious than anything carried out by the Bush administration. Afghanistan is very much Barack Obama's war of choice, a point that the president underscored recently by picking Gen. David Petraeus to lead an intensified counterinsurgency effort there. After nearly nine years of war, however, continued or increased U.S. involvement in Afghanistan isn't likely to yield lasting improvements that would be commensurate in any way with the investment of American blood and treasure. It is time to scale down our ambitions there and both reduce and redirect what we do.

Obama will stay the counterinsurgency course – July 2011 is unlikely to result in a substantial reduction of troops

Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, July 26, 2010

Newsweek: “We're Not Winning. It's Not Worth It. Here's how to draw down in Afghanistan”

Lexis, date accessed: 7/26/2010

The decisions that flowed from this were equally contradictory. On the one hand, another 30,000 U.S. troops were pledged, both to warn the Taliban and to reassure the shaky government in Kabul. Yet the president also promised that "our troops will begin to come home" by the summer of 2011--to light a fire under that same government, as well as to placate antiwar sentiment at home.

Today the counterinsurgency strategy that demanded all those troops is clearly not working. The August 2009 election that gave Karzai a second term as president was marred by pervasive fraud and left him with less legitimacy than ever. While the surge of U.S. forces has pushed back the Taliban in certain districts, the Karzai government has been unable to fill the vacuum with effective governance and security forces that could prevent the Taliban's return. So far the Obama administration is sticking with its strategy; indeed, the president went to great lengths to underscore this when he turned to Petraeus to replace Gen. Stanley McChrystal in Kabul. No course change is likely until at least December, when the president will find himself enmeshed in yet another review of his Afghan policy.

This will be Obama's third chance to decide what kind of war he wants to fight in Afghanistan, and he will have several options to choose from, even if none is terribly promising. The first is to stay the course: to spend the next year attacking the Taliban and training the Afghan Army and police, and to begin reducing the number of U.S. troops in July 2011 only to the extent that conditions on the ground allow. Presumably, if conditions are not conducive, Petraeus will try to limit any reduction in the number of U.S. troops and their role to a minimum.

This approach is hugely expensive, however, and is highly unlikely to succeed. The Afghan government shows little sign of being prepared to deliver either clean administration or effective security at the local level. While a small number of Taliban might choose to "reintegrate"--i.e., opt out of the fight--the vast majority will not. And why should they? The Taliban are resilient and enjoy sanctuary in neighboring Pakistan, whose government tends to view the militants as an instrument for influencing Afghanistan's future (something Pakistan cares a great deal about, given its fear of Indian designs there).

The economic costs to the United States of sticking to the current policy are on the order of $100 billion a year, a hefty price to pay when the pressure to cut federal spending is becoming acute. The military price is also great, not just in lives and material but also in distraction at a time when the United States could well face crises with Iran and North Korea. And the domestic political costs would be considerable if the president were seen as going back on the spirit if not the letter of his commitment to begin to bring troops home next year.

Thus the plan,

The United States federal government should reduce military presence necessary for the counterinsurgency mission in Afghanistan.

The United States federal government should phase down its commitment in Afghanistan to training local security forces and counterterrorism.
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The First Advantage is Hegemony – we’ll isolate three internal links

One is force depletion – Afghanistan is a war of attrition -- a continued counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan will end U.S. primacy

it is the ONLY risk of a full scale Taliban resurgence.

A transition to a counterterrorism strategy solves for morale, strategic reserves, and extremists.

Kuhner, President of Edmund Burke Institute of American Renewal, 2009

Jeffrey T. Kuhner is a radio host in Washington DC on WTNT, a columnist and writer. He is a regular contributor to the commentary pages of The Washington Times, where he writes a weekly column. He is also the president of the Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal, a Washington D.C. think tank devoted to integrating minorities into the conservative movement.

The Washington Times: “Obama's quagmire; U.S. should look to its own interests” September 7, 2009, Lexis, date accessed 7/27/2010.

America is losing the war in Afghanistan. Rather than change course, President Obama is sending 21,000 additional U.S. troops. This will bring the total to 68,000 American soldiers fighting in Afghanistan, bolstering coalition forces to 110,000.

The troop surge, however, will not work. Afghanistan has become Mr. Obama's Vietnam - a protracted quagmire draining precious American blood and treasure. August was the deadliest month for U.S. forces, with 47 soldiers killed by Taliban insurgents. More than 300 coalition troops have died in 2009. This is the highest toll since the war began in 2001, and there are still four months to go.

The tide of battle has turned against the West. The Taliban is resurgent. It has reasserted control over its southern stronghold in Kandahar. The Taliban is launching devastating attacks in the western and northern parts of the country - formerly stable areas. U.S. casualties are soaring. The morale of coalition forces is plummeting. Most of our allies - with the exception of the Canadians and the British - are reluctant to engage the Islamist militants. American public support for the war is waning.

The conflict has dragged on for nearly eight years. (U.S. involvement in World War II was four years, World War I less than one.) Yet, America's strategic objectives remain incoherent and elusive.

The war's initial aim was to topple the Taliban and eradicate al Qaeda bases from Afghan territory. Those goals have been achieved. Washington should have declared victory and focused on the more important issue: preventing Islamic fundamentalists from seizing power in Pakistan, along with its nuclear arsenal.

Instead, America is engaged in futile nation-building. Mr. Obama, like President George W. Bush before him, believes Afghanistan must be transformed by erecting a strong central government, democracy and a modern economy. Washington argues this will prevent terrorism from taking root and bring about lasting "stability."

Hence, following a recent reassessment of the war by Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, U.S. commander in Afghanistan, the Obama administration is contemplating deploying 20,000 to 40,000 U.S. troops - on top of the 21,000 already pledged. Moreover, billions have been spent building irrigation canals, schools, hospitals and factories. Civilian advisers are being sent to encourage farmers to grow other cash crops besides opium poppies. Western aid money has been used to establish a massive Afghan army, a large police force and a swollen government bureaucracy.

Gen. McChrystal said this week that the situation is "serious," but not impossible. He still believes victory is within reach. His new strategy is to protect Afghan civilians from Taliban attacks. He also wants to create a lucrative jobs programs and improve local government services. The goal is to win the "hearts and minds" of the Afghan people. Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says we must combat Afghanistan's "culture of poverty." Call it humanitarian war through social engineering.

Mr. Obama's policy will result in a major American defeat - one that will signal the end of America as a superpower and expose us to the world as a paper tiger. Afghanistan is the graveyard of empires. The mighty British and Russian armies were humiliated in drawn-out guerrilla campaigns. The country's mountainous geography and primitive tribal culture are ideally suited for insurgent warfare. By sending in more troops, Washington is playing right into the Taliban's hands: We are enabling the Taliban to pick off our forces one by one as they wage a campaign of attrition.

The Taliban blend with the local population, making it almost impossible for U.S. forces to distinguish combatants from civilians. American counterinsurgency efforts are thus alienating some of the locals. Initially welcomed as liberators, we are now viewed in some quarters as occupiers. Moreover, much of the West's aid money is siphoned off by greedy politicians in Kabul.

President Hamid Karzai's government is corrupt, venal and ineffective. It barely controls one-third of the country. It is despised by many Afghans for its brutality and incompetence. In addition, Mr. Karzai's vice-presidential running mate is a drug trafficker.

The West's efforts to forge a cohesive national state based on federalism and economic reconstruction have failed. Warlords are increasingly asserting power in the provinces. The country is fractured along tribal and ethnic lines. The center cannot hold: Afghanistan remains mired in anarchy, blood feuds and weak, decentralized rule.

U.S. troops should be deployed to defend U.S. national interests. Their lives should never be squandered for an experiment in liberal internationalism. In fact, such a policy is morally grotesque and strategically reckless.

Mr. Obama should quickly withdraw most U.S. forces from Afghanistan. American air power and small, flexible Special Forces units are more than enough to wipe out al Qaeda terrorists. The Taliban is too hated to reoccupy the country - unless our huge military and economic footprint drives numerous Afghans into the evil, welcoming arms of extremists.

Afghanistan has been ungovernable and impoverished for centuries. No country - including America - can conquer or heal this strange, cursed land.
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And, High tempo requirements of a counterinsurgency strategy have depleted our military moral and materials to the lowest levels of this quarter century – our increasing display of weakness is provocative – rivals will increasingly exploit our strategic paralysis if the U.S. does not abruptly transition from a counterinsurgency strategy to a counterterrorism strategy

Pyne, Columnist and Legal Analyst, 2009

David T. Pyne. Esq. is a conservative commentator, campaign consultant, veterans' advocate, strategic forecaster and policy expert. He currently serves as Vice Chairman of the Utah State Legislative Compensation Commission and Executive Vice President of the Utah Republican Assembly. He also serves as a Vice President of the Association of the United States Army's Utah chapter and as a Vice President of the Salt Lake Total Force Chapter of the Military Officers Association of America.

WesternFrontAmerica: “Obama failing our troops in Afghanistan,” <http://westernfrontamerica.com/2009/11/07/obama-failing-troops-afghanistan/>, November 7, 2009, date accessed: 7/27/2010

Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) gets high marks for demonstrating an uncommon degree of common sense on issues of war and peace as compared to most other US policymakers. During his campaign, Chaffetz stated that while in retrospect invading Iraq was probably a mistake, he likely would have voted to authorize the war had he been in Congress in 2002. Now he says he believes pursuing a more Al Queda-focused counterterrorist strategy in Afghanistan, as opposed to nation-building which has failed wherever it has been tried during the past six decades, might be a better course.

In a recent Salt Lake Tribune article entitled, Obama’s choice: Ramp up or wind down war in Afghanistan,h Chaffetz expressed reservations about sending more troops saying, “Adding tens of thousands of additional troops shouldn’t be the default answer. I don’t know that it would be a total failure to come home.” Chaffetz was right about the war in Iraq before and he is right about the war in Afghanistan today.

Chaffetz is not alone. In a recent Washington Times editorial, two prominent conservative Republican Congressman–Rep. Pete Hoekstra (R-MI) and Rep. John Shadegg (R-AZ) penned a scathing indictment of the President saying, “Obama intelligence and military tactics are endangering our troops on the ground. There is no demonstrated presidential commitment to winning. Given these conditions, can we support keeping American military men and women in Afghanistan? The answer is no. If the Obama administration’s priority isn’t providing our troops with the tools to do the job and win, we shouldn’t be there.”

In Iraq and Afghanistan, Bush and now Obama have demonstrated that they have had no idea how to win wars or no intention of allowing our troops to be victorious. In both cases, we were initially victorious in our mission objectives, but lost the wars when we overstayed our welcome and our never-ending occupation of both countries caused our enemies to multiply and provoked growing and increasingly bold insurgencies in a classic failure of counterinsurgency strategy. We should have brought our troops home to a ticker tape parade after we nabbed Saddam in December 2003 and after we overthrew the Taliban two years earlier rather than snatch defeat from the jaws of victory as we have done.

Since we invaded Iraq six and a half years ago and Afghanistan eight years ago, we have lost nearly 7,000 American soldiers and contractors killed in action with tens of thousands more severely wounded at the cost of a trillion dollars thus far. October has been the single deadliest month for US forces since the war began. It shouldn’t take a military strategist to realize that after fighting a war for over eight years without any real idea how to win, it might be time to consider a drastic change in strategy. This should include a sober assessment of the cost/benefit analysis of staying and fighting at a rising cost in American blood and treasure versus conserving our military strength and bringing our troops home to defend America from terrorist attack.

The Soviets fought an eight year long war in Afghanistan before finally realizing that victory was not a possibility in a conflict which some say began a chain of events that resulted in the collapse of the Evil Empire thanks to Reagan’s support of proxy forces against the Soviet invaders. If the Soviet Union could not win after eight years of fighting in Afghanistan, what makes our leaders think that we can? The longer we keep large numbers of our troops fighting no-win counterinsurgency wars of attrition in Iraq and Afghanistan, the weaker and more vulnerable we will become to the point where eventually the American Empire, as some call it, may decline precipitously or perhaps even collapse altogether. Worse yet, America’s increasing military weakness highlighted further by Obama’s ongoing demolition of our nuclear deterrent might invite a catastrophic attack from our from our Sino-Russian alliance enemies. Already some of our retired generals have stated that they believe our Army and Marine Corps ground forces have been broken by their over-deployment in the desert sands of Iraq and Afghanistan.

This high tempo of deployments has resulted in much of our military equipment to break down while procurement and readiness are at their lowest levels over the past quarter century. Our national security always suffers when we get bogged down in wars where our troops are asked to bleed and die, but are not permitted by our political leaders to win. Our brave soldiers should never be allowed to sacrifice in this way without the hope of victory! The best way to support our troops is to bring them home to their families and make a commitment that we will not let a week go by without thanking a soldier for their willingness to risk life and limb to defend us all.

What is it going to take to get our political leaders to realize that the costs of staying and fighting the long war in Iraq and Afghanistan greatly outweigh the costs of redeploying out of theater? The same voices we hear calling for us to send another 40,000 to 100,000 troops to Afghanistan are the ones that would have called for us to keep surging and fighting in Vietnam in perpetuity at the cost of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers lives. It didn’t make sense to do that then and it doesn’t make sense to do so now. Ronald Reagan won the Cold War against the Evil Soviet Empire in part by employing proxies to fight and win our battles for us. We need to learn from Reagan and re-employ a strategy of arming and supporting proxiesboth states and insurgent movements to fight our wars so our troops don’t have to.

America needs to conserve its military strength for a time when we they may be called upon to fight great power enemies, not waste it bogged down fighting Vietnams in the desert as we have been doing the past several years. Until we do, we will remain in a state of imperial overstretch and strategic paralysis with no reserve forces to fight new hypothetical wars of necessity and with a continuing window of vulnerability which our enemies will undoubtedly continue to exploit. North Korea has already been exploiting our window of vulnerability with their ongoing nuclear missile buildup as has the Islamic Republic of Iran is doing with its near imminent development of weaponized nukes. Even Russia has done so with their invasion of US-ally Georgia this past year.

Contrary to popular opinion, the surge did not win in Iraq where our Iranian enemies have triumphed in our undeclared war with Tehran with their Shiite Islamist proxies in total control of the country with the second largest oil reserves in the world. As Fareed Zakaria recently pointed out, we are already on our third surge in Afghanistan in less than two years and this surge is even less likely to succeed where the previous two failed since as General McCrystal has stated the situation in Afghanistan is fast deteriorating. McCrystal also openly asked in his report whether gany number of additional troops can compensate for the corrupt Afghan government which blatantly attempted to steal their recent presidential election. In a recent Washington Post article, conservative columnist George Will echoed his concern in noting that one of the prerequisites to the success of our nation-building strategy in Afghanistan is the creation of an effective central government, something that Afghanistan has never had.

We need to follow the America First strategy for victory in our just war against Islamist terrorists that renowned counterterrorist expert Michael Scheuer has advocated in his excellent book, Marching Toward Hell. Scheuer is willing to confront the harsh reality that our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have essentially already been lost due to the incompetence of our political leaders, but concludes it is not too late to defeat Al Queda if we make a course correction right away. I would encourage all Americans, and our policymakers in particular, to read Schemer’s book to better understand the true origins of our current war against Al Queda and what we must do if we are to win it.
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Two is expenses -- The cost of a large presence in Afghanistan is undermining the dollar’s hegemony risking U.S. superpower status

Corn, phd and state department analyst, 2009

Dr. Tony Corn is the author of “World War IV as Fourth-Generation Warfare” (Policy Review, January 2006). He is currently on leave from the State Department and writing a book on The Long War. This article is a follow-up to “The Art of Declaring Victory and Going Home: Strategic Communication and the Management of Expectations” published in Small Wars Journal on September 18, 2009.

Small Wars Journal: “Toward a Kilcullen-Biden Plan? Bounding Counterinsurgency in Afghanistan”

<http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/312-corn.pdf>, 2009

Taking a closer look, the McChrystal’s report is all the more justified in that its recommended “jump” is in fact closer to an open-ended escalation than to a temporary surge, and that its implicit price tag guarantees that the Afghan war would end up costing (in treasure, if not in blood) as much as the Vietnam War.

Just do the math - with 63,000 troops on the ground, the cost for the U.S. of the Afghan War is already 6.7 billion dollars a month. With a hypothetical 40,000 troop increase, it would rise to more than 10 billion a month. For how long? Though it gives a time estimate for the possibility of failure (12 months), the report does not provide any timeline as to the possibility of actual success. Most counterinsurgency experts appear to be in agreement that it will take more than two years to know whether the plan has a chance of succeeding, and at least an additional three years for the plan to actually succeed. In short, the recommended jump is a 500 billion dollar gamble that would come on top of the Iraq trillion dollar war.

In these conditions, any responsible Administration - be it Democrat or Republican - would be justified in taking a closer look. That “endless money forms the sinews of war” (Cicero) is a timeless truth. The question is to what extent does the U.S. have endless money at this particular juncture?

Among the numerous analogies made between the wars in Afghanistan and Vietnam lately, the one that has yet to surface concerns the monetary dimension. The first casualty of the Vietnam War was not the Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society project – it was the mighty dollar itself. Though the dollar had been the undisputed currency of the world ever since WWII, the Vietnam folly eventually forced Nixon to decouple the dollar from gold. From 1971 until roughly 2001, the dollar’s new status did not seem to matter much, since the European Croesus could always be expected to bankroll the American Caesar.4

Not anymore. Today, Croesus no longer speaks German and French, but Mandarin and Arabic; and Croesus is increasingly vocal in its call to put an end to the status of the dollar as the world’s reserve currency. Ironically, the only people on earth who don’t seem to realize the incredible advantage derived by America from the dollar’s status are the American people themselves.

In last instance, America’s military “command of the commons” rests on America’s monetary command of the common currency.5 The fact that, five years from now, the implementation of the McChrystal plan could actually lead to “victory” at the theater-strategic level is a distinct possibility. The fact that, five years from now as well, the dollar would no longer be the world’s reserve currency is a quasi-certainty. The end of America as a monetary superpower would spell the end of America as a superpower tout court – the ultimate defeat at the national-strategic level.
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And, Afghanistan is particularly expensive – this makes hegemonic decline inevitable

Chalmers Johnson is an American author and professor emeritus of the University of California, San Diego. He was a consultant for the CIA from 1967–1973, and led the Center for Chinese Studies at the University of California, Berkeley for years – Mother Jones – July 30th, 2009 – http://motherjones.com/politics/2009/07/three-good-reasons-liquidate-our-empire?page=2

According to a growing consensus of economists and political scientists around the world, it is impossible for the United States to continue in that role while emerging into full view as a crippled economic power. No such configuration has ever persisted in the history of imperialism. The University of Chicago's Robert Pape, author of the important study Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism (Random House, 2005), typically writes: "America is in unprecedented decline. The self-inflicted wounds of the Iraq war, growing government debt, increasingly negative current-account balances and other internal economic weaknesses have cost the United States real power in today's world of rapidly spreading knowledge and technology. *If present trends continue*, we will look back on the Bush years as the death knell of American hegemony." There is something absurd, even Kafkaesque, about our military empire. Jay Barr, a bankruptcy attorney, makes this point using an insightful analogy: "Whether liquidating or reorganizing, a debtor who desires bankruptcy protection must provide a list of expenses, which, if considered reasonable, are offset against income to show that only limited funds are available to repay the bankrupted creditors. Now imagine a person filing for bankruptcy claiming that he could not repay his debts because he had the astronomical expense of maintaining at least 737 facilities overseas that provide exactly zero return on the significant investment required to sustain them… He could not qualify for liquidation without turning over many of his assets for the benefit of creditors, including the valuable foreign real estate on which he placed his bases." In other words, the United States is not seriously contemplating its own bankruptcy. It is instead ignoring the meaning of its precipitate economic decline and flirting with insolvency. Nick Turse, author of The Complex: How the Military Invades our Everyday Lives (Metropolitan Books, 2008), calculates that we could clear $2.6 billion if we would sell our base assets at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean and earn another $2.2 billion if we did the same with Guantánamo Bay in Cuba. These are only two of our over 800 overblown military enclaves. Our unwillingness to retrench, no less liquidate, represents a striking historical failure of the imagination. In his first official visit to China since becoming Treasury Secretary, Timothy Geithner assured an audience of students at Beijing University, "Chinese assets [invested in the United States] are very safe." According to press reports, the students responded with loud laughter. Well they might. In May 2009, the Office of Management and Budget predicted that in 2010 the United States will be burdened with a budget deficit of at least $1.75 trillion. This includes neither a projected $640 billion budget for the Pentagon, nor the costs of waging two remarkably expensive wars. The sum is so immense that it will take several generations for American citizens to repay the costs of George W. Bush's imperial adventures — if they ever can or will. It represents about 13% of our current gross domestic product (that is, the value of everything we produce). It is worth noting that the target demanded of European nations wanting to join the Euro Zone is a deficit no greater than 3% of GDP. Thus far, President Obama has announced measly cuts of only $8.8 billion in wasteful and worthless weapons spending, including his cancellation of the F-22 fighter aircraft. The actual Pentagon budget for next year will, in fact, be larger, not smaller, than the bloated final budget of the Bush era. Far bolder cuts in our military expenditures will obviously be required in the very near future if we intend to maintain any semblance of fiscal integrity. 2. We Are Going to Lose the War in Afghanistan and *It Will Help Bankrupt Us* One of our major strategic blunders in Afghanistan was not to have recognized that both Great Britain and the Soviet Union attempted to pacify Afghanistan using the same military methods as ours and failed disastrously. We seem to have learned nothing from Afghanistan's modern history — to the extent that we even know what it is. Between 1849 and 1947, Britain sent almost annual expeditions against the Pashtun tribes and sub-tribes living in what was then called the North-West Frontier Territories — the area along either side of the artificial border between Afghanistan and Pakistan called the Durand Line. This frontier was created in 1893 by Britain's foreign secretary for India, Sir Mortimer Durand.
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Three is mixed doctrine – Failure to correct the current mixed doctrine will trend strategy toward COIN when CT is more appropriate – this will makes overextension inevitable

Boyle, IR prof @ University of St. Andrews, 2010

MICHAEL J. Lecturer in International Relations and a Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews. “Do counterterrorism and counterinsurgency go together?”

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/123318677/PDFSTART>, date accessed: 7/26/2010

Finally, this emphasis on a fused threat between terrorists and insurgents can incorrectly imply that the response must also draw in equal measure on counter- terrorism and counterinsurgency strategy. Such an approach tends to see each emerging terrorist threat as a new front in a global counterinsurgency effort and imply that the US and its allies need to be concerned with winning the ‘hearts and minds’ of the local populations to prevent its development. This is a funda- mentally offensive approach in which the US and its allies need to take the fight to the terrorists wherever they may be while simultaneously persuading the Muslim world to reject Al-Qaeda and its political programme. The obvious risk of such an approach is that it will lead to strategic overreach, especially if the US winds up fighting small wars and engaging in costly nation-building as a method of preventing Al-Qaeda from gaining ground in distant conflicts.

As an example of this danger, consider the conflation of terrorism and insur- gency that marked the discussion over the failed attack on a US airline on 25 December 2009. Reports that the failed bomber, Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, had received instruction in explosives from Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) immediately raised questions about whether American combat operations would be needed to fight Al-Qaeda-linked insurgents in Yemen. In the US, Senator Joseph Lieberman called Yemen ‘tomorrow’s war’ and urged pre-emptive action against Al-Qaeda operatives there.38 An alternative chorus of voices insisted that additional US funds and civilian trainers would be needed to improve the security forces and governance in that remote country.39 The fact that AQAP activity was intertwined with the tribal revolts which had been threat- ening the stability of the country appeared to lend superficial support to a quasi- counterinsurgency approach as a way to deal with the threat posed by Al-Qaeda in the peninsula. But the attempted attack was a terrorist act on a US-bound flight from Europe by an African citizen. It is entirely unclear whether improving policing capacity and governance in Yemen would have interrupted the attack, which was carried by a small number of operatives with only limited ties to the local community. The conflation of threats meant that the US looked like sleepwalking into a quasi-COIN strategy in that country, potentially assuming responsibility for areas that may have been irrelevant to Abdulmutallab’s ability to launch a terrorist attack. Worse still, such an expanded role would be viewed with hostility by the local population, which is already suspicious of American encroachment on the country.40 Because current policy is premised on the intellectual error that an interlinked threat demands a comprehensive response, and specifically on the notion that terrorism can be solved through counterinsurgency techniques, US strategy tends to drift towards counterinsurgency—and over-extension in foreign conflicts—when a more limited counterterrorism response might be more appropriate.

IAC – Hegemony Advantage

U.S. hegemony prevents nuclear wars in every corner of earth and there is no alternative.

Robert Kagan, he’s qualified, July 19, 2007. “End of Dreams, Return of History,”

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/07/end\_of\_dreams\_return\_of\_histor.html

By the same token, foreign policy failures do not necessarily undermine predominance. Some have suggested that failure in Iraq would mean the end of predominance and unipolarity. But a superpower can lose a war -- in Vietnam or in Iraq -- without ceasing to be a superpower if the fundamental international conditions continue to support its predominance. So long as the United States remains at the center of the international economy and the predominant military power, so long as the American public continues to support American predominance as it has consistently for six decades, and so long as potential challengers inspire more fear than sympathy among their neighbors, the structure of the international system should remain as the Chinese describe it: one superpower and many great powers. This is a good thing, and it should continue to be a primary goal of American foreign policy to perpetuate this relatively benign international configuration of power. The unipolar order with the United States as the predominant power is unavoidably riddled with flaws and contradictions. It inspires fears and jealousies. The United States is not immune to error, like all other nations, and because of its size and importance in the international system those errors are magnified and take on greater significance than the errors of less powerful nations. Compared to the ideal Kantian international order, in which all the world 's powers would be peace-loving equals, conducting themselves wisely, prudently, and in strict obeisance to international law, the unipolar system is both dangerous and unjust. Compared to any plausible alternative in the real world, however, it is relatively stable and less likely to produce a major war between great powers. It is also comparatively benevolent, from a liberal perspective, for it is more conducive to the principles of economic and political liberalism that Americans and many others value. American predominance does not stand in the way of progress toward a better world, therefore. It stands in the way of regression toward a more dangerous world. The choice is not between an American-dominated order and a world that looks like the European Union. The future international order will be shaped by those who have the power to shape it. The leaders of a post-American world will not meet in Brussels but in Beijing, Moscow, and Washington. The return of great powers and great games If the world is marked by the persistence of unipolarity, it is nevertheless also being shaped by the reemergence of competitive national ambitions of the kind that have shaped human affairs from time immemorial. During the Cold War, this historical tendency of great powers to jostle with one another for status and influence as well as for wealth and power was largely suppressed by the two superpowers and their rigid bipolar order. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has not been powerful enough, and probably could never be powerful enough, to suppress by itself the normal ambitions of nations. This does not mean the world has returned to multipolarity, since none of the large powers is in range of competing with the superpower for global influence. Nevertheless, several large powers are now competing for regional predominance, both with the United States and with each other. National ambition drives China's foreign policy today, and although it is tempered by prudence and the desire to appear as unthreatening as possible to the rest of the world, the Chinese are powerfully motivated to return their nation to what they regard as its traditional position as the preeminent power in East Asia. They do not share a European, postmodern view that power is passé; hence their now two-decades-long military buildup and modernization. Like the Americans, they believe power, including military power, is a good thing to have and that it is better to have more of it than less. Perhaps more significant is the Chinese perception, also shared by Americans, that status and honor, and not just wealth and security, are important for a nation. Japan, meanwhile, which in the past could have been counted as an aspiring postmodern power -- with its pacifist constitution and low defense spending -- now appears embarked on a more traditional national course. Partly this is in reaction to the rising power of China and concerns about North Korea 's nuclear weapons. But it is also driven by Japan's own national ambition to be a leader in East Asia or at least not to play second fiddle or "little brother" to China. China and Japan are now in a competitive quest with each trying to augment its own status and power and to prevent the other 's rise to predominance, and this competition has a military and strategic as well as an economic and political component. Their competition is such that a nation like South Korea, with a long unhappy history as a pawn between the two powers, is once again worrying both about a "greater China" and about the return of Japanese nationalism. As Aaron Friedberg commented, the East Asian future looks more like Europe's past than its present. But it also looks like Asia's past. Russian foreign policy, too, looks more like something from the nineteenth century. It is being driven by a typical, and typically Russian, blend of national resentment and ambition. A postmodern Russia simply seeking integration into the new European order, the Russia of Andrei Kozyrev, would not be troubled by the eastward enlargement of the EU and NATO, would not insist on predominant influence over its "near abroad," and would not use its natural resources as means of gaining geopolitical leverage and enhancing Russia 's international status in an attempt to regain the lost glories of the Soviet empire and Peter the Great. But Russia, like China and Japan, is moved by more traditional great-power considerations, including the pursuit of those valuable if intangible national interests: honor and respect. Although Russian leaders complain about threats to their security from NATO and the United States, the Russian sense of insecurity has more to do with resentment and national identity than with plausible external military threats. 16 Russia's complaint today is not with this or that weapons system. It is the entire post-Cold War settlement of the 1990s that Russia resents and wants to revise. But that does not make insecurity less a factor in Russia 's relations with the world; indeed, it makes finding compromise with the Russians all the more difficult. One could add others to this list of great powers with traditional rather than postmodern aspirations. India 's regional ambitions are more muted, or are focused most intently on Pakistan, but it is clearly engaged in competition with China for dominance in the Indian Ocean and sees itself, correctly, as an emerging great power on the world scene. In the Middle East there is Iran, which mingles religious fervor with a historical sense of superiority and leadership in its region. 17 Its nuclear program is as much about the desire for regional hegemony as about defending Iranian territory from attack by the United States. Even the European Union, in its way, expresses a pan-European national ambition to play a significant role in the world, and it has become the vehicle for channeling German, French, and British ambitions in what Europeans regard as a safe supranational direction. Europeans seek honor and respect, too, but of a postmodern variety. The honor they seek is to occupy the moral high ground in the world, to exercise moral authority, to wield political and economic influence as an antidote to militarism, to be the keeper of the global conscience, and to be recognized and admired by others for playing this role. Islam is not a nation, but many Muslims express a kind of religious nationalism, and the leaders of radical Islam, including al Qaeda, do seek to establish a theocratic nation or confederation of nations that would encompass a wide swath of the Middle East and beyond. Like national movements elsewhere, Islamists have a yearning for respect, including self-respect, and a desire for honor. Their national identity has been molded in defiance against stronger and often oppressive outside powers, and also by memories of ancient superiority over those same powers. China had its "century of humiliation." Islamists have more than a century of humiliation to look back on, a humiliation of which Israel has become the living symbol, which is partly why even Muslims who are neither radical nor fundamentalist proffer their sympathy and even their support to violent extremists who can turn the tables on the dominant liberal West, and particularly on a dominant America which implanted and still feeds the Israeli cancer in their midst. Finally, there is the United States itself. As a matter of national policy stretching back across numerous administrations, Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, Americans have insisted on preserving regional predominance in East Asia; the Middle East; the Western Hemisphere; until recently, Europe; and now, increasingly, Central Asia. This was its goal after the Second World War, and since the end of the Cold War, beginning with the first Bush administration and continuing through the Clinton years, the United States did not retract but expanded its influence eastward across Europe and into the Middle East, Central Asia, and the Caucasus. Even as it maintains its position as the predominant global power, it is also engaged in hegemonic competitions in these regions with China in East and Central Asia, with Iran in the Middle East and Central Asia, and with Russia in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus. The United States, too, is more of a traditional than a postmodern power, and though Americans are loath to acknowledge it, they generally prefer their global place as "No. 1" and are equally loath to relinquish it. Once having entered a region, whether for practical or idealistic reasons, they are remarkably slow to withdraw from it until they believe they have substantially transformed it in their own image. They profess indifference to the world and claim they just want to be left alone even as they seek daily to shape the behavior of billions of people around the globe. The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying -- its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War ii would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even today Europe 's stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war.

People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that 's not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world 's great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States. Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United States weakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China 's neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene -- even if it remained the world's most powerful nation -- could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe -- if it adopted what some call a strategy of "offshore balancing" -- this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances. It is also optimistic to imagine that a retrenchment of the American position in the Middle East and the assumption of a more passive, "offshore" role would lead to greater stability there. The vital interest the United States has in access to oil and the role it plays in keeping access open to other nations in Europe and Asia make it unlikely that American leaders could or would stand back and hope for the best while the powers in the region battle it out. Nor would a more "even-handed" policy toward Israel, which some see as the magic key to unlocking peace, stability, and comity in the Middle East, obviate the need to come to Israel 's aid if its security became threatened. That commitment, paired with the American commitment to protect strategic oil supplies for most of the world, practically ensures a heavy American military presence in the region, both on the seas and on the ground. The subtraction of American power from any region would not end conflict but would simply change the equation. In the Middle East, competition for influence among powers both inside and outside the region has raged for at least two centuries. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism doesn 't change this. It only adds a new and more threatening dimension to the competition, which neither a sudden end to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians nor an immediate American withdrawal from Iraq would change. The alternative to American predominance in the region is not balance and peace. It is further competition. The region and the states within it remain relatively weak. A diminution of American influence would not be followed by a diminution of other external influences. One could expect deeper involvement by both China and Russia, if only to secure their interests. 18 And one could also expect the more powerful states of the region, particularly Iran, to expand and fill the vacuum. It is doubtful that any American administration would voluntarily take actions that could shift the balance of power in the Middle East further toward Russia, China, or Iran. The world hasn 't changed that much. An American withdrawal from Iraq will not return things to "normal" or to a new kind of stability in the region. It will produce a new instability, one likely to draw the United States back in again. The alternative to American regional predominance in the Middle East and elsewhere is not a new regional stability. In an era of burgeoning nationalism, the future is likely to be one of intensified competition among nations and nationalist movements. Difficult as it may be to extend American predominance into the future, no one should imagine that a reduction of American power or a retraction of American influence and global involvement will provide an easier path.

IAC – Hegemony Advantage

Exhaustion of U.S. power empirically causes isolationism – depleted military and capital reserves threaten U.S. response capabilities – ending the Afghanistan COIN strategy solves

Kretkowski 2010

Mr. Paul D. Kretkowski is a consultant and journalist based in San Francisco who writes on a range of topics including soft power, U.S. foreign policy, Middle Eastern politics and information warfare. His writing credits include, among others, Mother Jones, Wired, Business For Diplomatic Action and SFGate.com. Beacon, Mr. Kretkowski's blog, is devoted to exploring the concept and applications of " Soft Power" as articulated by political scientist Joseph Nye.

Beacon: “Against COIN, for CT in Afghanistan and Elsewhere” January 7, 2010

<http://softpowerbeacon.blogspot.com/2010/01/against-coin-for-ct-in-afghanistan-and.html> date accessed 7/26/2010

Over the winter break I had an epiphany about the interrelation of U.S. hard and soft power: I now oppose a counterinsurgency (COIN) strategy in Afghanistan and advocate a purely counterterror (CT) strategy (PDF link) there instead.

Blame history—or histories—that I've read recently, starting with Livy's works on early Rome (books I-V) last spring and Donald Kagan's The Peloponnesian War at the end of 2009. I've taken occasional dips back into Robert Kaplan's Warrior Politics and his source materials (Churchill, the Federalists, Machiavelli, Sun Tzu, and several others).

What I've taken from that reading is that the U.S. must pull back from its current efforts to remake Iraq and Afghanistan in the image of a Western democracy, or risk long-term political and economic exhaustion.

What follows is not an argument about morality, and readers may find much of it amoral. It is about making cold-blooded political and economic calculations about where U.S. national interests will lie in the next decade. They do not lie in an open-ended COIN mission.

The history of the Peloponnesian War is particularly relevant here. Athens began fighting Sparta with the resources of an empire and thousands of talents of silver in the bank—enough to fight expensive, far-flung naval and land campaigns for three years without lasting financial consequences.

Athens was rich, and if peace with Sparta had come by the end of the third year, Athens would have continued to prosper and rule over much of the Mediterranean. (Athens had a "hard"—conquered or cowed—empire as opposed to the "soft" empire of alliances and treaties the U.S. currently has.)

But the war with Sparta dragged on for decades, despite occasional peace overtures by both sides. By war's end—despite the spoils of battle and increased taxes and tribute extracted from its shrinking dominion—Athens was broke, depopulated by fighting and plague, bereft of its empire, and could no longer project power into the Mediterranean. Where its former interests ranged from Black Sea Turkey to southern Italy, it spent decades as a small-bore power and never regained its former strength or influence.

I worry that the U.S. is similarly locked into an open-ended commitment to democratize a nation that is of regional rather than global importance—a parallel to Athens convincing itself that it had to conquer distant, militarily insignificant Sicily.

"Winning" in Afghanistan

The U.S. could "win" in Afghanistan where victory is defined as a stable, legitimate central government that can project power within its own borders. I don't doubt that the U.S. and its allies could accomplish this given enough time and resources. But I think—as many COIN experts also do—that it will take at least another decade or more of blood and treasure to produce such a result, if ever.

Of course I'd like to see the results of a successful COIN campaign: a stable democracy, women's rights, and general prosperity for Afghans, who among all Asia's peoples surely deserve those things. I certainly want to end al-Qa'ida's ability to operate freely in South Asia and elsewhere.

The U.S. is the only country that would both conceive of these missions and attempt to carry them out. But goals beyond keeping al-Qa'ida on the run don't serve the long-term interests of the U.S., and I am more interested in regaining and preserving U.S. hard power than I am in the rewards that would come from "winning" a lengthy COIN war.

I fear the U.S. people and government becoming exhausted from the costs of a lengthy COIN effort, just as they are already exhausted from (and have largely forgotten about) the Iraq war. I worry that if this fatigue sits in, the U.S. will abandon foreign-policy leadership as it has done periodically throughout history.

This outcome would be worse than a resurgent Taliban, worse than Afghan women and men being further oppressed, and worse than al-Qa'ida having plentiful additional caves to plot in.

Here are some signs of an exhaustion of U.S. power: The U.S. is already overextended, with commitments in Iraq (shrinking for now), Afghanistan (expanding), Yemen (pending) and Iran (TBD). At home, the U.S. economy remains feeble and in the long term is increasingly hostage to other nations for goods and services it no longer produces (and increasingly, no longer can produce).

Even more worrisome is the U.S. credit situation. The wars, and much other U.S. government spending, are now heavily underwritten by other countries' purchases of debt the U.S. issues. It has borrowed trillions from foreign countries and especially China, which continues its steady, highly rational policy of promoting exports while freeriding under the American security umbrella (just as the U.S. once rode for free beneath Britain's).

Over time, those countries accrue enough debt to have a say in U.S. policies that may threaten the dollar's value, which is why you now see high U.S. officials flying to Beijing to soothe PRC nerves and explain why America keeps borrowing money.

At home, there are few resources to apply following a major disaster, such as a Katrina-style hurricane or a major earthquake.

The U.S. needs to start rebuilding its reserves—of capital, of credit, of political goodwill abroad, of military force—to be ready for these and more serious crises, for which we currently have few resources to spare. Such challenges may involve humanitarian crises (think Darfur, a Rwanda-style genocide, Indian Ocean tsunamis); Latin American instability (Mexico, Venezuela, post-Castro Cuba); rogue-state nuclear development (Iran, North Korea); or complex challenges from a rising power (China, a reinvigorated Russia).

IAC – Stability Advantage

The Second Advantage is stability.

The mixed COIN-CT doctrine makes failure inevitable and guarantees the collapse of both the government of Afghanistan and Pakistan – four reasons: popular backlash, mission creep, legitimacy gap and leverage

Boyle, IR prof @ University of St. Andrews, 2010

MICHAEL J. Lecturer in International Relations and a Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews. “Do counterterrorism and counterinsurgency go together?”

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/123318677/PDFSTART>, date accessed: 7/26/2010

The models presented here are ideal types and are often intermixed in practice. Most of today’s conflicts—including those in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq— exemplify this mixed COIN–CT approach, in which counterterrorism operations against Al-Qaeda are conducted concurrently with counterinsurgency missions against a diverse range of local opponents. These experiences have made it clear that such missions can run concurrently and can have a number of complementary effects. For instance, the so-called Sunni Awakening—in which local Sunni tribes rose up against Al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI)—demonstrates that counterinsurgency practices can have spillover effects which help to impede, and even destroy, terrorist organizations.51 Yet the underlying assumption that CT and COIN are fully compatible or mutually reinforcing may not be justified. What is often left unexplored is whether each of these two different models of warfare produces offsetting effects that blunt the effectiveness of the other when both are deployed together in a theatre of war. In Afghanistan, there are at least four potentially offsetting effects which can be identified at the tactical and strategic level.

Popular backlash

First, the application of sudden, lethal force in counterterrorism operations can inflame public opinion against the local government, thus making it more difficult to win the population over to its side. Evidence for this can be found in the use of both commando raids and air strikes in Afghanistan. Since 2001 the US has fielded commando raids (by, for example, Navy Seals, Delta Force and CIA operatives) inside Afghanistan to capture or kill the remnants of Al-Qaeda and high-ranking Taleban officials. The tempo of operations has varied over time, but on occasion has climbed to several dozen per week.52 By definition, such operations are covert and conducted with little or no notice because they are based on fresh intelligence. But these raids come at a cost. A UN report specifically blames commando raids within Afghanistan for a 40 per cent increase in civilian casual- ties from 2007 to 2008.53 Commando raids have become a flashpoint issue, causing protests in the streets of major cities and increasing pressure on President Karzai to rein in foreign forces.54 While these raids have been effective in detaining and killing Al-Qaeda and Taleban operatives, they have been widely criticized for transgressing Afghan cultural norms about the sanctity of the homestead.55 The Taleban have also cleverly exploited these raids to portray NATO, and by exten- sion the Karzai government, as insensitive and disrespectful of local traditions. The concern over political fallout has become so serious that the US halted some commando operations in early 2009 for fear that night-time raids would cause more civilian casualties.56

Similarly, NATO’s air strikes—employed as part of both counterterrorism missions (targeting Al-Qaeda and senior Taleban targets) and counterinsurgency operations (in support of ground operations)—have generated a popular backlash because of civilian casualties. In 2009, according to the UN, 596 civilians were killed by pro-government forces (including NATO’s): roughly 25 per cent of the total number of civilians killed that year (2,412).57 Air strikes accounted for 61 per cent of all of the civilian deaths attributed to the government and NATO.58 An ABC news poll in 2009 found that 66 per cent of Afghans believed that NATO air strikes were ‘unacceptable’.59 While public opinion polls reveal that Afghans split the blame for civilian casualties between NATO and the Taleban, the Karzai government has come under increasing public pressure to stop these air strikes.60 Concerned that it would appear to be enabling the violence and doing the bidding of its foreign backers, the Karzai government has recently condemned the air strikes and called on NATO to cease these operations entirely. Recognizing that the use of air strikes carried with it ‘the seeds of our own destruction’ if it under- mined the Karzai government, General McChrystal has tightened US policy on their use to avoid operations in populated areas that might risk killing civilians and undermining the counterinsurgency effort.61

The problem of offsetting costs here is clear. Within Afghanistan, the raids and air strikes have yielded success against Al-Qaeda, even in regions considered strongholds of the Taleban.62 But an aggressive counterterrorism approach does not allow time to use force delicately; the urgency of the threat and elusiveness of a target demand an immediate, often lethal response that works directly against the choreographed use of force that is supposed to characterize counterinsurgency. As a result, the use of force for counterterrorism operations can produce an offsetting cost for counterinsurgency by stoking public anger and making it harder for the local government to win the loyalties of the population.

Countermobilization of enemy networks

A second, and related, problem is that the target set for the application of lethal force tends to expand over time from counterterrorism targets to ones associated with the counterinsurgency effort. Such an expansion is often justified on the grounds that militant networks in the insurgency operate in tandem with, or otherwise support, a terrorist organization and vice versa. However, the expansion of the target set produces a range of direct and indirect offsetting costs to the counterinsurgency mission by increasing the ranks of one’s enemies and by realigning existing militant networks against the foreign power.

The effects of this ‘mission creep’ can be seen with commando raids and the use of Predator drones in Pakistan. These were originally used sparingly and only against Al-Qaeda operatives; then the US gradually broadened its target set to include senior Taleban officials in Afghanistan.63 By 2009, aware that high-ranking Taleban were operating freely across the border in Pakistan, the US expanded commando raids into its tribal regions.64 At least four raids were conducted, two of which were directed against so-called ‘high-value targets’ near the border. Similarly, in 2008 the US expanded the target list for Predator drone strikes to include Taleban officials and related hostile Islamist networks (such as the Haqqani network) operating across the Pakistani border. In summer 2009, concerned over growing threats to the stability of Pakistan, the US began to direct strikes against factions of the Tehrik-i-Taleban in Pakistan (TTP) and eventually killed its leader, Baitullah Mehsud.65 From 2007 to 2009, the change in the number of strikes and the target set has been dramatic. According to an analysis by Peter Bergen and Katherine Tiedmann, in 2007 the US launched only five drone strikes, three against Taleban targets and two against Al-Qaeda. By contrast, in the first ten months of 2009 it launched 43 strikes against a variety of targets, including 18 against the Taleban, 16 against Baitullah Mehsud, seven against Al-Qaeda and four against the Haqqani network.66 Under the Obama administration, the number of Predator strikes and the diversification of the targets has actually increased.67

There is considerable evidence that these raids and drone strikes have been successful in degrading Al-Qaeda’s capabilities.68 Obama administration officials believe that they have eliminated more than half of the top Al-Qaeda targets over the last year.69 There are numerous anecdotal reports that Al-Qaeda has been demoralized by the strikes, which they see as causing disarray in their ranks.70 But the blowback effects have been significant. The immediate reaction to the drone strikes and commando raids in Pakistan has been public outrage. A recent Pew study revealed that 58 per cent of Pakistanis did not believe that missile strikes were necessary, and 93 per cent believed that they killed too many civilians.71 Even though the Pakistani government approves some drone strikes, approximately 58 per cent of Pakistanis now believe that the US conducts them without the autho- rization of the government in Islamabad.72 What influence the US has is now seen as negative: 64 per cent of Pakistanis now believe the US is their country’s enemy.73 The commando and Predator drone operations have reinforced a percep- tion that the government is weak and cannot say no to the US even when the latter conducts unsanctioned air strikes and ground incursions on Pakistani territory.74

The growing sense that the Pakistani government is paralysed in the face of US intervention has contributed to the countermobilization of militant networks.75 This was precisely the fear of the Pakistani military, who warned after the first major US commando raid that ‘such action[s] are completely counterproductive and can

result in huge losses because it gives the civilians a cause to rise against the Pakistani military’.76 At present, there is only anecdotal evidence to suggest that recruitment into militant networks has increased out of a desire for revenge for commando raids and drone strikes.77 Since no reliable data on the supply of militant recruits to Pakistani Islamist networks exist, no one knows whether the use of commando raids and drones creates more enemies than it kills.78 But it is clear that the expansion of these strikes has accelerated the radicalization of existing militant groups and encouraged them to make common cause with jihadi groups. The result has been a political realignment among existing militant groups in opposition to the US and its alleged puppet government in Pakistan. The TTP, formed out of a coalition of disparate militant networks in December 2007, now comprises more than 40 militant groups, and has developed operational links with long standing Kashmiri and Punjabi groups, which themselves are showing increasing susceptibility to jihadi ideologies. The use of commando raids and Predator drone strikes has pushed the TTP closer to Al-Qaeda, the Haqqani network and its counterpart in the Afghan Taleban. Together, these groups now form an inchoate insurgency against the Zadari government. These strikes have also transformed the priorities of the Pakistani networks and turned some that were exclusively focused on challenging or overthrowing the incumbent regime in Islamabad towards actively countering the US and NATO in Afghanistan. Worse still, Al-Qaeda appears to gain from this dynamic: Hakimullah Mehsud, the former leader of the TTP, stated unequivocally in October 2009 that ‘we have respect for Al-Qaeda and the jihadist organizations—we are with them’.79 He also declared his allegiance to Afghan Taleban leader Mullah Omar as the ‘amir’ of his movement. The use of commando raids and drone strikes against militant networks in Pakistan has furthered the radicalization of existing groups and expanded the international horizons of militant groups whose focus was previ- ously the Pakistani government or Kashmir. Ironically, the result of the expansion of strikes into Pakistan may be to encourage the process of fusion that Kilcullen described and to pull these groups even closer to Al-Qaeda.

The expansion of raids and strikes in Pakistan has added to the ranks of the enemies that the US is now fighting. In doing so, it has turned the US into a party to the counterinsurgency effort in Pakistan, as the bureaucratic designa- tion ‘AfPak’ recognizes. But such involvement has direct and indirect costs to the counterterrorism effort. The direct cost becomes apparent when Al-Qaeda and Pakistani militant networks target US counterterrorism assets, as occurred on 30 December 2009 when the Jordanian Khalil Abu-Mulal al-Balawi blew himself up at a meeting with CIA agents in Afghanistan, killing seven American and one Jordanian intelligence officials. This attack was facilitated by Hakimullah Mehsud, who declared that the attack was ‘revenge’ for the killing of Baitullah Mehsud in a Predator drone strike.80 This attack was particularly costly for the CIA, which lost senior operatives with the highly specialist skills needed to pursue high-ranking Al-Qaeda members.81

The indirect costs are numerous. It is hard to measure what the US loses from the strikes, but it is obvious that it gains no intelligence from dead (as opposed to captured) operatives. It also loses the moral high ground if the strikes acciden- tally kill high numbers of civilians. But perhaps the greatest indirect cost is its contribution to instability in Pakistan. The pressure placed on Al-Qaeda and its affiliates has accelerated the crisis facing the Pakistani government and encour- aged local militant networks (including ethnic separatist and tribal groups) to form tactical and ideological alliances with Al-Qaeda, thus magnifying the threat they pose. As a result, the US is now stumbling into a war across South Asia with a growing number of militant Islamist networks, many of whom have strong familial and tribal ties with the local population and stronger regenerative capabilities than Al-Qaeda. The creeping expansion of the target set has transformed a set of tactics originally reserved for counterterrorism operations into a tool for fighting an ever-widening circle of insurgents in Pakistan. The dilemma is that, while the counterterrorism benefits of these operations are clear, in adding to the ranks of its enemies the US now faces a more durable network of militants that will fuel the Taleban’s insurgency against the United States, Pakistan and the Karzai government.

Legitimacy gap

Another set of offsetting effects emerges if counterinsurgency efforts entrench an illegitimate state, thereby making compliance with key demands of counterter- rorism activity more costly. A central tenet of the modern thinking on counter- insurgency holds that success will require a strong and representative central state that can command the loyalties of the population. By contrast, counterterrorism depends on a state conducting, authorizing or at least tolerating potentially costly strikes against dangerous operatives on its territory. Both counterinsurgency and counterterrorism, then, depend on political capital, but in different ways. A counterinsurgency strategy is designed to build the political capital of the local government, while a counterterrorism strategy requires that government to use its political capital in authorizing costly or unpopular missions. Seen in this light, these missions work at cross-purposes, for one builds political capital while the other uses it. But if a counterinsurgency strategy inadvertently produces a govern- ment with a legitimacy gap, that government will have diminished political capital and face higher costs for complying with counterterrorism demands. Indeed, the local government may even have an incentive to publicly reject the overtures of its foreign backers to improve its legitimacy in the eyes of its population.

This dynamic has been particularly apparent in Afghanistan since the elections in August 2009. Since 2001, the US counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan has depended on the presence of a legitimate government in Kabul. Such a situation is not new in counterinsurgencies, but in previous cases the focus was usually on bolstering the legitimacy of an existing government rather than creating one from scratch. In Afghanistan, however, over 20 years of war had left no state to speak of. Once the Taleban was overthrown, the US and its NATO allies faced the unenviable task of not only crafting a state but also vesting it with some local legitimacy. As Rory Stewart has pointed out, their approach was to create a strong central state, something for which there was no precedent in Afghanistan.82 After the initial election of Hamid Karzai in December 2001, it looked as if this gamble would pay off. The convening of the first loya jirga in Bonn in 2001, and the presi- dential elections in 2004 and parliamentary elections in 2005, provided some shreds of legitimacy for the Karzai government. But mounting allegations of misman- agement, incompetence and corruption in the last four years have widened the legitimacy gap facing the Karzai government. The August 2009 elections, now widely acknowledged to be fraudulent, stripped the Karzai government of even the fragile legitimacy that it had accrued since the overthrow of the Taleban.83 NATO had gambled on the democratic process to provide legitimacy to the Karzai government, but underestimated the extent to which this could backfire if the supporters of that government engaged in voter fraud and intimidation to return their party to power.

This legitimacy gap has had two consequences that have undermined the counterterrorism effort in Afghanistan. First, the elections left President Karzai with diminished political capital and a powerful incentive to find new reasons to say ‘no’ to America. Following the elections, he distanced himself from the US by pointedly refusing American entreaties to reform and heightening his criticisms of NATO’s air strikes.84 He recently called for an end to all air strikes in the country, even though this would deprive the US of a key counterterrorism tool.85 While he has not refused to authorize US counterterrorism operations in his country, there is precedent for such behaviour. The Iraqi government of Nouri al-Maliki tried to improve its domestic legitimacy by rebuking the US and condemning its counter- terrorism air strikes along the border with Syria and elsewhere in Iraq.86 Now that the elections have revealed the legitimacy deficit that his government faces, Presi- dent Karzai will be loath to use his political capital to defend American counter- terrorism missions; indeed, he will have a strong incentive to grandstand against his American backers for conducting these operations at all. Second, the flawed elections inadvertently confirmed the narrative that the Taleban and Al-Qaeda employ against the Karzai government: that an illegitimate American puppet regime was put in power under a pretence of democracy. This created a serious dilemma for the United States. It needs to back the Karzai government if it is to prosecute its counterinsurgency strategy, which presumes that the Afghan people can be made more loyal to the government. But to do so while the Karzai govern- ment faces a legitimacy gap is to risk committing the cardinal sin of counterter- rorism: validating the enemy’s narrative. The ironic result of using democratic elections as a means to produce legitimacy is that the US, in its counterinsurgency effort, is now chained to a less cooperative government that actually validates Al-Qaeda’s narrative.

Leverage

Finally, a counterinsurgency mission can have offsetting effects on counter- terrorism goals if it sends a signal of commitment that inadvertently reduces the leverage the foreign backer has over its partner government. Just as the US learned to its peril with South Vietnam, each decision to send additional troops and resources reveals how much the US needs to win, thereby reducing its leverage over its local partner.87 This is problematic because counterterrorism cooperation depends on leverage, especially when the foreign backer asks the local government to undertake or authorize costly operations to capture or kill suspected terrorists.

There is certainly evidence that this dynamic is in play in respect of Pakistan, which has received $15 billion in aid from the US, much of it earmarked for counterterrorism support, only to find that the funds are diverted into weapons to be used against India.88 Pakistan has refused to end its tacit support for the Afghan Taleban, who operate freely in Quetta, and there are unconfirmed reports that the Taleban still receive funds from its intelligence service.89 Similarly, President Obama’s declaration of Afghanistan as a ‘necessary war’ and his decision to send 30,000 additional US troops appear to have made the Karzai regime less willing to accede to American demands over corruption reform and improved governance. Rory Stewart has pointed out that ‘the more we give, the less influence we have over the Afghan government, which believes we need it more than it needs us. What incentive do Afghan leaders have to reform if their country is allowed to produce 92 percent of the world’s heroin and still receive $20 billion of interna- tional aid?’90 It remains to be seen whether this lack of compliance will spill over into responses to counterterrorism demands, but it is worth asking whether this renewed commitment to COIN strategies in the AfPak region will leave the US punching beneath its weight with both governments. The US is so heavily invested in stopping the spread of violence in the region—to the point that it will tolerate both Afghanistan and Pakistan exploiting their crises for profit—that it may find it lacks the leverage needed to achieve its essential counterterrorism goals.

IAC – Stability Advantage

And emboldened insurgency causes extinction, three scenarios:

One is Pakistan

US presence in Afghanistan now poses the greatest existential threat to Pakistan stability

Akhtar, IR prof @ Karachi University, 2010

“Pakistan's Instability: The US War Factor: Analyzing The US War Impact on Pakistan's National Security”

[http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?c=Article\_C&cid=1262372328640&pagename=Zone-English-Muslim\_Affairs/MAELayout#\*\*1](http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?c=Article_C&cid=1262372328640&pagename=Zone-English-Muslim_Affairs/MAELayout#**1), January 26, 2010, date accessed: 7/26/2010

 America's War

The sinister motive behind such acts of terror is to incite sectarian violence in Pakistan and lay the blame at the doors of religious extremists. As one can see, it was America's war that was imposed upon Pakistan. Whether Pakistan could have avoided the war is a matter of controversy among politicians and political observers. But the war has fuelled insurgency in Pakistan's hitherto peaceful tribal territory adjacent to Afghanistan.

This insurgency shows no sign of abatement, as terrorist attacks on military and civilian centers in the capital and major cities of the North-West Frontier Province and Punjab continue with a vengeance, posing threat to the security of the state.

In the meantime, routine predator strikes by the US in Waziristan have taken a heavy toll of civilian lives amid accusations of Islamabad's complicity in the piratical attacks on tribespeople, which prompts them to resort to retaliatory strikes on the perpetrators.

Not satisfied with Pakistan's military operations in the tribal region, the US Administration has compelled Islamabad's fragile government to pull out its troops from the tense Indo-Pak border and deploy them in the restive tribal belt along the Pak-Afghan border.

Now Pakistan faces existential threat from the Taliban and not India, a perception which the country's military leadership is not prepared to share, given the unresolved disputes with New Delhi, which triggered four wars during the last 62 years.

State collapse risks take-over by extremist entities in Pakistan

Arianna Huffington is an author and syndicated columnist. She is best known as co-founder of the news website The Huffington Post. For the relevant portion of the evidence, she internally quotes Robert Baer, a former CIA field operative – LA Times – October 14th – 2009 – http://www.latimes.com/sns-200910141852tmsahuffcoltq--m-a20091014oct14,0,6163789,full.story

The number of those on both sides of the political spectrum who share Biden's skepticism is growing. At the beginning of September, George Will called for the U.S. to pull out of Afghanistan and "do only what can be done from offshore, using intelligence, drones, cruise missiles, air strikes and small, potent Special Forces units." Former Bush State Department official and current head of the Council on Foreign Relations Richard Haas argued in The New York Times that Afghanistan is not, as Obama insists, a war of necessity. "If Afghanistan were a war of necessity, it would justify any level of effort," writes Haas. "It is not and does not. It is not certain that doing more will achieve more. And no one should forget that doing more in Afghanistan lessens our ability to act elsewhere." In "Rethink Afghanistan," Robert Greenwald's powerful look at the war (and a film Joe Biden should see right away), Robert Baer, a former CIA field operative says, "The notion that we're in Afghanistan to make our country safer is just complete bulls--t. . . . What it's doing is causing us greater danger, no question about it. Because . . . the more we fight in Afghanistan, the more the conflict is pushed across the border into Pakistan, the more we destabilize Pakistan, the more likely it is that a fundamentalist government will take over the army . . . and we'll have al-Qaida-like groups with nuclear weapons."

IAC – Stability Advantage

The risk of extremists running Pakistan forces India’s hand – causing pre-emptive nuclear conflict in South Asia

Thomas Ricks is the author of Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq, 2003-05, which was a no. 1 New York Times bestseller and a finalist for the Pulitzer Prize in 2007. He is special military correspondent for The Washington Post, senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security and a contributing editor for Foreign Policy magazine. Washington Post – October 21, 2001 – http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A27875-2001Oct20?language=printer

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.

IAC – Stability Advantage

India-Pakistan conflict is extremely bad – no restraint, and smoke yields that risk extinction

Dr. Alan Robock is a professor of climatology in the Department of Environmental Sciences at Rutgers University and the associate director of its Center for Environmental Prediction. Prof. Robock has been a researcher in the area of climate change for more than 30 years.. His current research focuses on soil moisture variations, the effects of volcanic eruptions on climate, effects of nuclear war on climate, and regional atmosphere/hydrology modeling. He has served as Editor of climate journals, including the Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology and the Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres. He has published more than 250 articles on his research, including more than 150 peer-reviewed papers and Owen Brian Toon is professor of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and a fellow at the Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics (LASP) at the University of Colorado.[1] He received his Ph.D. from Cornell University – From the January 2010 Scientific American Magazine – http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=local-nuclear-war

**Nuclear bombs dropped on cities** and industrial areas **in a fight between India and Pakistan would start firestorms that would put massive amounts of smoke into the upper atmosphere**. **The particles would** remain there for years, **block**ing **the sun, making the earth’s surface cold, dark and dry.** Agricultural collapse and mass starvation could follow. Hence, global cooling could result from a regional war, not just a conflict between the U.S. and Russia. Cooling scenarios are based on computer models. But observations of volcanic eruptions, forest fire smoke and other phenomena provide confidence that the models are correct. **Twenty-five years ago** international teams of **scientists showed that a nuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union could produce a “nuclear winter.**” The smoke from vast fires started by bombs dropped on cities and industrial areas would envelop the planet and absorb so much sunlight that the earth’s surface would get cold, dark and dry, killing plants worldwide and eliminating our food supply. Surface temperatures would reach winter values in the summer. International discussion about this prediction, fueled largely by astronomer Carl Sagan, forced the leaders of the two superpowers to confront the possibility that their arms race endangered not just themselves but the entire human race. Countries large and small demanded disarmament. Nuclear winter became an important factor in ending the nuclear arms race. Looking back later, in 2000, former Soviet Union leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev observed, “Models made by Russian and American scientists showed that a nuclear war would result in a nuclear winter that would be extremely destructive to all life on earth; the knowledge of that was a great stimulus to us, to people of honor and morality, to act.” Why discuss this topic now that the cold war has ended? Because as other nations continue to acquire nuclear weapons, smaller, regional nuclear wars could create a similar global catastrophe. **New analyses reveal that a conflict between India and Pakistan,** for example, in which 100 nuclear bombs were dropped on cities and industrial areas—only 0.4 percent of the world’s more than 25,000 warheads—**would produce enough smoke to cripple global ag**riculture. A regional war could cause widespread loss of life even in countries far away from the conflict. Regional War Threatens the World **By deploying modern computers and modern climate models**, the two of us and **our colleagues have shown that not only were the ideas of the 1980s correct but the effects would last** for at least 10 years, **much longer than previously thought**. And by doing calculations that assess decades of time, only now possible with fast, current computers, and by including in our calculations the oceans and the entire atmosphere—also only now possible—we have found that the smoke from even a regional war would be heated and lofted by the sun and remain suspended in the upper atmosphere for years, continuing to block sunlight and to cool the earth. **India and Pakistan**, which together have more than 100 nuclear weapons, **may be the most worrisome adversaries capable of a regional nuclear conflict today.** But other countries besides the U.S. and Russia (which have thousands) are well endowed: China, France and the U.K. have hundreds of nuclear warheads; Israel has more than 80, North Korea has about 10 and Iran may well be trying to make its own. In 2004 this situation prompted one of us (Toon) and later Rich Turco of the University of California, Los Angeles, both veterans of the 1980s investigations, to begin evaluating what the global environmental effects of a regional nuclear war would be and to take as our test case an engagement between India and Pakistan. The latest estimates by David Albright of the Institute for Science and International Security and by Robert S. Norris of the Natural Resources Defense Council are that India has 50 to 60 assembled weapons (with enough plutonium for 100) and that Pakistan has 60 weapons. Both countries continue to increase their arsenals. Indian and Pakistani nuclear weapons tests indicate that the yield of the warheads would be similar to the 15-kiloton explosive yield (equivalent to 15,000 tons of TNT) of the bomb the U.S. used on Hiroshima. Toon and Turco, along with Charles Bardeen, now at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, modeled what would happen if 50 Hiroshima-size bombs were dropped across the highest population-density targets in Pakistan and if 50 similar bombs were also dropped across India. **Some** people **maintain that nuclear weapons would be used in only a measured way. But in the wake of chaos,** fear **and broken communications that would occur once a nuclear war began, we doubt leaders would limit attacks in any rational manner. This likelihood is particularly true for Pakistan, which** is small and **could be quickly overrun in a conventional conflict.** Peter R. Lavoy of the Naval Postgraduate School, for example, has analyzed the ways in which a conflict between India and Pakistan might occur and argues that **Pakistan could face a decision to use all its nuclear arsenal quickly before India swamps its military bases with traditional forces.** Obviously, we hope the number of nuclear targets in any future war will be zero, but policy makers and voters should know what is possible. Toon and Turco found that more than 20 million people in the two countries could die from the blasts, fires and radioactivity—a horrible slaughter. But the **investigators were shocked to discover that a tremendous amount of smoke would be generated, given the megacities in the two countries**, assuming each fire would burn the same area that actually did burn in Hiroshima and assuming an amount of burnable material per person based on various studies. They calculated that the 50 bombs exploded in Pakistan would produce three teragrams of smoke, and the 50 bombs hitting India would generate four (one teragram equals a million metric tons). Satellite observations of actual forest fires have shown that smoke can be lofted up through the troposphere (the bottom layer of the atmosphere) and sometimes then into the lower stratosphere (the layer just above, extending to about 30 miles). Toon and Turco also did some “back of the envelope” calculations of the possible climate impact of the smoke should it enter the stratosphere. The large magnitude of such effects made them realize they needed help from a climate modeler. It turned out that one of us (Robock) was already working with Luke Oman, now at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, who was finishing his Ph.D. at Rutgers University on the climatic effects of volcanic eruptions, and with Georgiy L. Stenchikov, also at Rutgers and an author of the first Russian work on nuclear winter. They developed a climate model that could be used fairly easily for the nuclear blast calculations. Robock and his colleagues, being conservative, put five teragrams of smoke into their modeled upper troposphere over India and Pakistan on an imaginary May 15. The model calculated how winds would blow the smoke around the world and how the smoke particles would settle out from the atmosphere. The smoke covered all the continents within two weeks. The black, sooty smoke absorbed sunlight, warmed and rose into the stratosphere. Rain never falls there, so the air is never cleansed by precipitation; particles very slowly settle out by falling, with air resisting them. Soot particles are small, with an average diameter of only 0.1 micron (µm), and so drift down very slowly. They also rise during the daytime as they are heated by the sun, repeatedly delaying their elimination. The calculations showed that the smoke would reach far higher into the upper stratosphere than the sulfate particles that are produced by episodic volcanic eruptions. Sulfate particles are transparent and absorb much less sunlight than soot and are also bigger, typically 0.5 µm. The volcanic particles remain airborne for about two years, but smoke from nuclear fires would last a decade. Killing Frosts in Summer **The climatic response to the smoke was surprising**. Sunlight was immediately reduced, cooling the planet to temperatures lower than any experienced for the past 1,000 years. The global average cooling, of about 1.25 degrees Celsius (2.3 degrees Fahrenheit), lasted for several years, and even after 10 years the temperature was still 0.5 degree C colder than normal. The models also showed a 10 percent reduction in precipitation worldwide. Precipitation, river flow and soil moisture all decreased because blocking sunlight reduces evaporation and weakens the hydrologic cycle. Drought was largely concentrated in the lower latitudes, however, because global cooling would retard the Hadley air circulation pattern in the tropics, which produces a large fraction of global precipitation. In critical areas such as the Asian monsoon regions, rainfall dropped by as much as 40 percent. **The cooling might not seem like much, but even a small dip can cause severe consequences**. Cooling and diminished sunlight would, for example, shorten growing seasons in the midlatitudes. More insight into the effects of cooling came from analyses of the aftermaths of massive volcanic eruptions. Every once in a while such eruptions produce temporary cooling for a year or two. The largest of the past 500 years, the 1815 Tambora eruption in Indonesia, blotted the sun and produced global cooling of about 0.5 degree C for a year; 1816 became known as “The Year without a Summer” or “Eighteen Hundred and Froze to Death.” In New England, although the average summer temperature was lowered only a few degrees, crop-killing frosts occurred in every month. After the first frost, farmers replanted crops, only to see them killed by the next frost. The price of grain skyrocketed, the price of livestock plummeted as farmers sold the animals they could not feed, and a mass migration began from New England to the Midwest, as people followed reports of fertile land there. In Europe the weather was so cold and gloomy that the stock market collapsed, widespread famines occurred and 18-year-old Mary Shelley was inspired to write Frankenstein. Certain strains of crops, such as winter wheat, can withstand lower temperatures, but a lack of sunlight inhibits their ability to grow. In our scenario, daylight would filter through the high smoky haze, but on the ground every day would seem to be fully overcast. Agronomists and farmers could not develop the necessary seeds or adjust agricultural practices for the radically different conditions unless they knew ahead of time what to expect. **In addition to the cooling**, drying and darkness, **extensive ozone depletion would result as the smoke heated the stratosphere**; reactions that create and destroy ozone are temperature-dependent. Michael J. Mills of the University of Colorado at Boulder ran a completely separate climate model from Robock’s but found similar results for smoke lofting and stratospheric temperature changes. He concluded that although surface temperatures would cool by a small amount, the stratosphere would be heated by more than 50 degrees C, because the black smoke particles absorb sunlight. This heating, in turn, would modify winds in the stratosphere, which would carry ozone-destroying nitrogen oxides into its upper reaches. Together the high temperatures and nitrogen oxides would reduce ozone to the same dangerous levels we now experience below the ozone hole above Antarctica every spring. Ultraviolet radiation on the ground would increase significantly because of the diminished ozone. **Less sunlight and precipitation, cold spells, shorter growing seasons and more ultraviolet radiation would all** reduce or **eliminate ag**ricultural **production**. Notably, cooling and ozone loss would be most profound in middle and high latitudes in both hemispheres, whereas precipitation declines would be greatest in the tropics.
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A Transition from COIN to CT solves the rapid deterioration of Afghanistan and it’s spillover into Pakistan – the minimalist approach provides enhanced capacity to diplomatically stabilize Pakistan

Kaplan, journalist phd in poli sci from MIT, 2009

Fred, Slate Magazine, “CT or COIN? Obama must choose this week between two radically different Afghanistan policies” March 24, 2009, <http://www.slate.com/id/2214515>, date accessed 7/26/2010

Some in the CT camp realize that the COIN-dinistas (as critics call them) have a point. Their real gripe with counterinsurgency is that it costs too much and promises too little. Even most COIN strategists acknowledge that a successful campaign, especially in Afghanistan, would require lots of troops (way more than President Obama has committed so far), lots of time (a decade or so), and lots of money (wiping out most or all of the savings achieved by the withdrawal from Iraq)—and even then the insurgents might still win.

A "targeted" CT campaign, its advocates say, would at least demonstrate the West's resolve in the war on terrorism and keep al-Qaida jihadists contained. It's a type of fighting that we know how to do, and its effects are measurable. One might also argue (I don't know if anyone on the inside is doing so) that it could serve as a holding action—a way of keeping Afghanistan from plunging deeper into chaos—while we focus more intently on diplomatic measures to stabilize neighboring Pakistan. If Pakistan blows up, curing Afghanistan of its problems will be irrelevant and, in any case, impossible.

Two is terrorism – The current counterinsurgency approach enhances jihadists’ recruitment efforts

Bacevich, IR prof @ BU, 2009

Andrew J. Bacevich is a professor of international relations at Boston University and the author, most recently, of The Limits of Power. He served as an officer in the U.S. Army from 1969 to 1992.

Harpers’ Magazine: “The war we can't win” November 2009

<http://harpers.org/archive/2009/11/0082687>, date accessed 7/26/2010

So the answer to the question of the hour—What should the United States do about Afghanistan?—comes down to this: A sense of realism and a sense of proportion should oblige us to take a minimalist approach. As with Uruguay or Fiji or Estonia or other countries where U.S. interests are limited, the United States should undertake to secure those interests at the lowest cost possible.

What might this mean in practice? General Petraeus, now in charge of U.S. Central Command, recently commented that “the mission is to ensure that Afghanistan does not again become a sanctuary for Al Qaeda and other transnational extremists,” in effect “to deny them safe havens in which they can plan and train for such attacks.” The mission statement is a sound one. The current approach to accomplishing the mission is not sound and, indeed, qualifies as counterproductive. Note that denying Al Qaeda safe havens in Pakistan hasn’t required U.S. forces to occupy the frontier regions of that country. Similarly, denying transnational extremists safe havens in Afghanistan shouldn’t require military occupation by the United States and its allies.

It would be much better to let local authorities do the heavy lifting. Provided appropriate incentives, the tribal chiefs who actually run Afghanistan are best positioned to prevent terrorist networks from establishing a large-scale presence. As a backup, intensive surveillance complemented with precision punitive strikes (assuming we can manage to kill the right people) will suffice to disrupt Al Qaeda’s plans. Certainly, that approach offers a cheaper and more efficient alternative to the establishment of a large-scale and long-term U.S. ground presence—which, as the U.S. campaigns in both Iraq and Afghanistan have demonstrated, has the unintended effect of handing jihadists a recruiting tool that they are quick to exploit.

IAC – Stability Advantage

Stability is vital to disrupt al-Qaeda’s plans to attack the U.S. with a WMD

Wohlstetter, former advisor to the DOD, 2010

John C. Wohlstetter has been a Senior Fellow for Technology and Society at the Seattle-based Discovery Institute since April 2001. He is a Washington, DC attorney who had a 22-year corporate career in telecommunications. In 1989 he was Senior Adviser for a report commissioned by the Department of Defense. He has degrees from the University of Miami (1969: B.B.A., Finance), Fordham Unviersity School of Law (1977: J.D.) and The George Washington University (1985: M.A. Public Policy, concentration: Telecommunications).

“LFTC - Nuclear Terrorism Threat Growing” February 2, 2010 <http://www.letterfromthecapitol.com/letterfromthecapitol/2010/02/lftc-nuclear-terrorism-threat-growing.html>, date accessed 7/27/2010

Of all the WMD threats, nuclear weapons remain the most dangerous, and the articles below explain why.

WMD terror expert Graham Allison sees "A Failure to Imagine the Worst" as being at the root of our weak response to nuclear terror threats. His Harvard Kennedy School colleague, Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, offers a timeline for Al-Qaeda's nuclear quest in "Al Qaeda's Pursuit of Weapons of Mass Destruction" (Jan. 25, 2010). This introduction to Larssen's full length version ends with this link to his full pdf report (30 pages).

What emerges are five central core truths about al-Qaeda's pursuit of WMD: (1) al-Qaeda's senior leaders are resolutely pursuing WMD capability; (2) al-Qeada devoted significant resources to WMD even as the 9/11 attacks were being prepared; (3) al-Qaeda's always pursues multiple alternate paths to WMD; (4) al-Qaeda's works in concert with other terror groups re WMD; (5) al-Qaeda focuses on bigger attack plans, scorning simple chemical, radiological attacks with low casualty count--9/11 is a benchmark to be exceeded via WMD.

Here is an assessment of growing risks to Pakistan's 60-100 nuke stockpile, by Brooking Institution scholar Bruce Riedel. A 4-pager from Foreign Policy adds highly informative detail on Pakistan's nuclear security arrangements--mostly, but not fully, reassuring. Back right after 9/11 Pakistan President Pervez Musharraf moved his country's arsenal to secure locations in 48 hours, fearing a US strike. Here is a longer piece from the Institute of International Strategic Studies on Pakistan's nuclear oversight reforms (pdf. file at the bottom prints at 12 pages).

The WP 5-page article on Musharraf's actions after 9/11 is especially worth a serious full read. Among the scarier tidbits: (1) Musharraf explored storing Pakistani nukes with--yikes!!!--the Taliban in Afghanistan; (2) Pakistan's arsenal is under Army control and is secure while guarded at bases, but more vulnerable when being moved; (3) the US does not know where all the nukes are stored; (4) at least one Pakistani nuclear scientist had interaction with Arabs close to the Taliban & al-Qaeda.

In a politically incorrect (hence: truthful) summary appraisal of the Muslim Crescent from Africa to Southwest Asia Ralph Peters says toss Afghanistan, contain Pakistan and turn towards India:

AFGHANISTAN: We're there, and we don't know why. We know why we went in 2001, but al Qaeda's long gone. Initially, we were welcomed. Now, the more troops we send, the stronger the Taliban becomes. We're tied to a corrupt, inept government despised by the people. Afghans won’t fight for that government, but they'll give their lives for the Taliban. And we're determined to turn the place into Disney World.

Should we just leave? No. Afghanistan provides a crucial base for striking the terrorists across the border in Pakistan. But a reduced presence and a willingness to back sympathetic Afghan tribes offers far more return on our investment of blood and treasure than trying to turn Islamist fanatics into third-rate Americans. In a war-torn tribal society, you have to pick your tribes.

Afghanistan is worthless in itself. Instead of concentrating on killing our enemies, we’re buying worthless real estate with American blood.

PAKISTAN: 180 million anti-American Muslims, thanks to generations of politicians who took American aid while playing the anti-American card with their constituents. The government won't crack down on the Taliban factions it's preserving for a reconquest of Afghanistan after we exit. It sponsors terror attacks against India, then leaves it to us to calm India down. Promised another $7.5 billion in aid, Pakistan's response has been not only to bite the hand that feeds it, but to gnaw it to a bloody pulp. And, in an act of strategic folly, we've left our troops in Afghanistan dependent upon a single supply line that runs for over a thousand miles through Pakistan.

And the Pakistani media, with the government's blessing, blames us when the Taliban bomb a marketplace. Isn't it about time we got a grip? Around Pakistan's throat?

But what about those nukes? What if they get mad at us and hand them over to terrorists? They won't. But if we're worried about the nukes, plan to destroy them — or leave that job up to India. Leaving the greatest power in history at the mercy of the impossibly corrupt regime in Pakistan guarantees that our troops lives are wasted next door in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan isn't our problem. Pakistan's the problem. And India's the future.

Bottom Line. An al-Qaeda WMD threat persists and grows as Pakistan's stability erodes.
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The impact is extinction

Yonah Alexander, Professor and Director of the Inter-University for Terrorism Studies (Israel, USA), August 28, 2003 “Terrorism myths and realities,” Washington Times, http://www.washtimes.com/commentary/20030827-084256-8999r.htm

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that the international community failed, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself.  Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns.  It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers.  Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements (hudna).  Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist "surprises"?  There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism's expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare.  Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact.  The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism (e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber) with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns.  Two myths in particular must be debunked immediately if an effective counterterrorism "best practices" strategy can be developed (e.g., strengthening international cooperation).  The first illusion is that terrorism can be greatly reduced, if not eliminated completely, provided the root causes of conflicts — political, social and economic — are addressed.  The conventional illusion is that terrorism must be justified by oppressed people seeking to achieve their goals and consequently the argument advanced by "freedom fighters" anywhere, "give me liberty and I will give you death," should be tolerated if not glorified.  This traditional rationalization of "sacred" violence often conceals that the real purpose of terrorist groups is to gain political power through the barrel of the gun, in violation of fundamental human rights of the noncombatant segment of societies. For instance, Palestinians religious movements (e.g., Hamas, Islamic Jihad) and secular entities (such as Fatah's Tanzim and Aqsa Martyr Brigades)) wish not only to resolve national grievances (such as Jewish settlements, right of return, Jerusalem) but primarily to destroy the Jewish state.  Similarly, Osama bin Laden's international network not only opposes the presence of American military in the Arabian Peninsula and Iraq, but its stated objective is to "unite all Muslims and establish a government that follows the rule of the Caliphs."  The second myth is that strong action against terrorist infrastructure (leaders, recruitment, funding, propaganda, training, weapons, operational command and control) will only increase terrorism. The argument here is that law-enforcement efforts and military retaliation inevitably will fuel more brutal acts of violent revenge.  Clearly, if this perception continues to prevail, particularly in democratic societies, there is the danger it will paralyze governments and thereby encourage further terrorist attacks.  In sum, past experience provides useful lessons for a realistic future strategy. The prudent application of force has been demonstrated to be an effective tool for short- and long-term deterrence of terrorism. For example, Israel's targeted killing of Mohammed Sider, the Hebron commander of the Islamic Jihad, defused a "ticking bomb." The assassination of Ismail Abu Shanab — a top Hamas leader in the Gaza Strip who was directly responsible for several suicide bombings including the latest bus attack in Jerusalem — disrupted potential terrorist operations. Similarly, the U.S. military operation in Iraq eliminated Saddam Hussein's regime as a state sponsor of terror.  Thus, it behooves those countries victimized by terrorism to understand a cardinal message communicated by Winston Churchill to the House of Commons on May 13, 1940: "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of terror, victory however long and hard the road may be: For without victory, there is no survival."
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Three is Central Asia-- Increased U.S. engagement in Afghanistan is pushing insurgents into Central Asia destabilizing the region

Ditz 2009

Jason Ditz is the managing news editor for Antiwar.com

Anti-War.com “NATO Chief: Afghan Surge Could Drive Taliban Into Central Asia;Will Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan Become Next Battlefronts in Terror War?” <http://news.antiwar.com/2009/06/24/nato-chief-afghan-surge-could-drive-taliban-into-central-asia/> June 24, 2009

Commenting on a recent spate of Taliban attacks in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer admitted that it was possible that as the international forces escalate military operations in Afghanistan, the insurgency might move north into Central Asia’s former Soviet states.

“If people want to cross borders, NATO cannot prevent that. If extremists want to cross borders into Central Asia to continue their horrific work there, NATO cannot possibly stop that,” Scheffer conceded. He added that NATO’s current mandate doesn’t allow it to conduct operations in those nations.

Since the 2001 US-led invasion of Afghanistan, the former Taliban government has grown in influence in neighboring nations, particularly Pakistan where the group’s presence has led to the founding of several sympathetic groups among the tribesmen along the border.

US officials, including Joint Chiefs chairman Admiral Michael Mullen have expressed concern that the massive surge meant to cope with the growing violence in Afghanistan would worsen the situation in Pakistan, where insurgents are already stretching the government to its limit. This is the first time officials have conceded the danger of the surge extends beyond Pakistan, into Afghanistan’s northern neighbors.

A minimalist policy must be enacted now to avoid the loss of control and stability in Central Asia

Simon and Stevenson, Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and Professor of Strategic Studies at the US Naval War College, 2009

“Afghanistan: How Much is Enough?”, Survival, 51: 5, 47 — 67

Accessed via University of Kansas June 24, 2010

The upshot is that only if the United States establishes a well-calibrated limited policy now will it have the political flexibility to sustain it over the longer-term and thereby to effectively contain the jihadist threat in Central Asia. If, on the other hand, the Obama administration promises more than it can deliver in Afghanistan, a reprise of Vietnam may occur: once failure becomes clear, domestic support will evaporate, the administration will be compelled to withdraw precipitously, and the United States will lose considerable traction in the region.
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Central Asian instability will inevitably draw in major powers

Peimani, PhD International Relations, 2002

Dr. Hooman Peimani has a PhD in International Relations with a focus on regional security from Queen’s University, Canada. As a researcher/analyst, he specializes in political, economic and military/security issues pertaining to West and South Asia.

Failed Transition, Bleak Future: War and Instability in Central Asia and the Caucasus, 142

http://books.google.com/books?id=MlxZjPQ9SFwC&pg=PP1&dq=“Failed+Transition,+Bleak+Future:+War+and+Instability+in+Central+Asia+and+the+Caucasus”&hl=en&ei=uO0nTK6EDcO88gbyiL3EDw&sa=X&oi=book\_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCUQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=The%20impact%20of%20war%20and%20instability%20in%20the%20Caucasus%20or%20Central%20Asia%20will%20not%20be%20confined%20to%20the%20countries%20immediately%20affected.%20Any%20local%20conflict&f=false

The impact of war and instability in the Caucasus or Central Asia will not be confined to the countries immediately affected. Any local conflict could escalate and expand to its neighboring countries, only to destabilize its entire respective region. Furthermore, certain countries with stakes in the stability of Central Asia and/or the Caucasus could well be dragged into such a conflict, intentionally or unintentionally. Regardless of the form or extent of their intervention in a future major war, the sheer act of intervention could further escalate the war, increase the human suffering, and plant the seeds for its further escalation. Needless to say, this could only further contribute to the devastation of all parties involved and especially of the "hosting" CA or Caucasian countries. In fact, certain factors could even kindle a military confrontation between and among the five regional and non-regional states with long-term interests in Central Asia and the Caucasus. This scenario could potentially destabilize large parts of Asia and Europe. The geographical location of the two regions as a link between Asia and Europe--shared to different extents by Iran, Turkey, and Russia-- creates a "natural" geographical context for the expansion of any regional war involving those states to other parts of Asia and Europe. Added to this, Iran, China, Turkey, Russia, and the United States all have ties and influence in parts of Asia and Europe. They are also members of regional organizations such as the Economic Cooperation Organization (Iran and Turkey) or military organizations such as NATO (Turkey and the United States). These geographical, political, economic and military ties could help expand any conflict in which they are involved. For all the reasons mentioned, war and instability in the countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia will be bad news for a great number of countries, near or far. It is therefore in the interest of all the potential parties to any future military conflict in the two regions to avoid actions that could instigate it. They should also refrain from acts that could unnecessarily escalate such conflicts should they occur. On the contrary, they should employ all their powers to contain and to end such conflicts. Perhaps more importantly than any of these, they should all contribute to the efforts of the Caucasian and CA countries to revitalize their economics and resolve their disputes with their neighboring states or within their own national boundaries. One should hope that, for the sake of peace and stability, Iran, China, Turkey, Russia, and the United States will find enough incentives to become contributing partners to a process of economic growth and peaceful resolution of conflicts in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Otherwise, there is little doubt that the current pace of events in the two regions is heading toward a period of war and instability, with a devastating result for the exhausted Caucasian and CA countries. This development will contain a great potential for escalation, with severe implications for the security of many other countries in Asia and Europe.
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This results in nuclear war

Ahrari, Prof of National Security @ the Armed Forces Staff College, 2001

M. EHSAN AHRARI has been Professor of National Security and Strategy of the Joint and Combined Warfighting School at the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Virginia, since 1994. He also served as Associate Dean of the Joint and Combined Warfighting School from 1995-96. From 1990-94 he was Professor of Middle East and Southwest Asian Studies at the U.S. Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Prior to joining the Department of Defense, Dr. Ahrari taught at universities in Mississippi, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Illinois. He also served as Visiting Presidential Scholar at New York University during the summer of 1979, Visiting Scholar at University of California-Berkeley during the summer of 1984, and Visiting Scholar at the Hoover Institution during the summer of 1992. Dr. Ahrari’s areas of specialization include U.S. foreign and defense policy issues related to the Middle East and Central Asia, nuclear proliferation in Southern Asia, and information-based warfare, with a special focus on the Peoples’ Republic of China. He is the author of eight books and dozens of articles in professional journals in the United States, United Kingdom, Norway, and, India. Dr. Ahrari has also lectured, in addition to in the United States, in a number of European, Asian and Middle Eastern countries, and at the NATO headquarters in Mons, Belgium.

Jihadi Groups, Nuclear Pakistan and the New Great Game, <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/jihadi.pdf>, August 2001

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

Even a better counterinsurgency strategy will backfire and further destabilize the region

Zakaria, PhD Harvard and editor of Newsweek International, 2009

Fareed Zakaria, editor of Newsweek International, a Newsweek and Washington Post columnist, weekly host for CNN, and a New York Times bestselling author. He was described in 1999 by Esquire Magazine as “the most influential foreign policy adviser of his generation” and in 2007, Foreign Policy and Prospect magazines named him one of the 100 leading public intellectuals in the world. B.A. from Yale College and a Ph.D. from Harvard University. He has received honorary degrees from numerous universities including Brown, the University of Miami, and Oberlin College. He currently serves as a Trustee of Yale University.

Newsweek: The Case Against a Surge; More troops won't solve Afghanistan, October 19, 2009 l/n

It's true that the security situation in Afghanistan has deteriorated considerably. While it is nothing like Iraq in 2006--civilian deaths are a 10th as numerous--parts of the country are effectively controlled by the Taliban. Other parts are no man's land. But these areas are sparsely populated tracts of countryside. All the major population centers remain in the hands of the Kabul government. Is it worth the effort to gain control of all 35,000 Afghan villages scattered throughout the country? That goal has eluded most Afghan governments for the last 200 years and is a very high bar to set for the U.S. mission there.

Why has security gotten worse? Largely because Hamid Karzai's government is ineffective and corrupt and has alienated large numbers of Pashtuns, who have migrated to the Taliban. It is not clear that this problem can be solved by force, even using a smart counterinsurgency strategy. In fact, more troops injected into the current climate could provoke an antigovernment or nationalist backlash.

It's important to remember that the crucial, lasting element of the surge in Iraq was not the influx of troops, but getting Sunni tribes to switch sides by offering them security, money, and a place at the table. U.S. troops are now drawing down, and yet--despite some violence--the Sunnis have not resumed fighting because Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki is courting their support.
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Democratic liberalism is backsliding now

Diamond, Professor of Political Science and Sociology @ Stanford, 9

Larry, The Impact of the Global Financial Crisis on Democracy, Presented to the SAIS-CGD Conference on New Ideas in Development after the Financial Crisis, Conference Paper that can be found on his Vita

Concern about the future of democracy is further warranted by the gathering signs of a democratic recession, even before the onset of the global economic recession. During the past decade, the global expansion of democracy has essentially leveled off and hit an equilibrium While freedom (political rights and civil liberties) continued to expand throughout the post-Cold War era, that progress also halted in 2006, and 2007 and 2008 were the worst consecutive years for freedom since the end of the Cold War, with the number of countries declining in freedom greatly outstripping the number that improved. Two-thirds of all the breakdowns of democracy since the third wave began in 1974 have occurred in the last nine years, and in a number of strategically important states like Russia, Nigeria, Venezuela, Pakistan and Thailand. Many of these countries have not really returned to democracy. And a number of countries linger in a twilight zone between democracy and authoritarianism. While normative support for democracy has grown around the world, it remains in many countries, tentative and uneven, or is even eroding under the weight of growing public cynicism about corruption and the self-interested behavior of parties and politicians. Only about half of the public, on average, in Africa and Asia meets a rigorous, multidimensional test of support for democracy. Levels of distrust for political institutions—particularly political parties and legislatures, and politicians in general—are very high in Eastern Europe and Latin America, and in parts of Asia. In many countries, 30-50 percent of the public or more is willing to consider some authoritarian alternative to democracy, such as military or one-man rule. And where governance is bad or elections are rigged and the public cannot rotate leaders out of power, skepticism and defection from democracy grow. Of the roughly 80 new democracies that have emerged during the third wave and are still standing, probably close to three-quarters are insecure and could run some risk of reversal during adverse global and domestic circumstances. Less at risk—and probably mostly consolidated—are the more established developing country democracies (India, Costa Rica, Botswana, Mauritius), and the more liberal democracies of this group: the ten postcommunist states that have been admitted to the EU; Korea and Taiwan; Chile, Uruguay, Panama, Brazil, probably Argentina; a number of liberal island states in the Caribbean and Pacific. This leaves about 50 democracies and near democracies—including such big and strategically important states as Turkey, Ukraine, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Africa, certainly Pakistan and Bangladesh, and possibly even Mexico—where the survival of constitutional rule cannot be taken for granted. In some of these countries, like South Africa, the demise of democracy would probably come, if it happened, not as a result of a blatant overthrow of the current system, but rather via a gradual executive strangling of political pluralism and freedom, or a steady decline in state capacity and political order due to rising criminal and ethnic violence. Such circumstances would also swallow whatever hopes exist for the emergence of genuine democracy in countries like Iraq and Afghanistan and for the effective restoration of democracy in countries like Thailand and Nepal.
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War is likely to occur in illiberal democratic transitions—the spread of a bad model makes backsliding, nationalism, and war more likely

Zakaria, PhD in Political Science from Harvard, 97

Fareed, PhD in Political Science from Harvard, editor of Newsweek International, Foreign Affairs, “The Rise of Illiberal Democracy”, November/December, Proquest

The distinction between liberal and illiberal democracies sheds light on another striking statistical correlation. Political scientists Jack Snyder and Edward Mansfield contend, using an impressive data set, that over the last 200 years democratizing states went to war significantly more often than either stable autocracies or liberal democracies. In countries not grounded in constitutional liberalism, the rise of democracy often brings with it hyper-nationalism and war-mongering. When the political system is opened up, diverse groups with incompatible interests gain access to power and press their demands. Political and military leaders, who are often embattled remnants of the old authoritarian order, realize that to succeed that they must rally the masses behind a national cause. The result is invariably aggressive rhetoric and policies, which often drag countries into confrontation and war. Noteworthy examples range from Napoleon III's France, Wilhelmine Germany, and Taisho Japan to those in today's newspapers, like Armenia and Azerbaijan and Milosevic's Serbia. The democratic peace, it turns out, has little to do with democracy.  THE AMERICAN PATH AN AMERICAN SCHOLAR recently traveled to Kazakstan on a U.S. government-sponsored mission to help the new parliament draft its electoral laws. His counterpart, a senior member of the Kazak parliament, brushed aside the many options the American expert was outlining, saying emphatically, "We want our parliament to be just like your Congress." The American was horrified, recalling, "I tried to say something other than the three words that had immediately come screaming into my mind: 'No you don't!'" This view is not unusual. Americans in the democracy business tend to see their own system as an unwieldy contraption that no other country should put up with. In fact, the adoption of some aspects of the American constitutional framework could ameliorate many of the problems associated with illiberal democracy. The philosophy behind the U.S. Constitution, a fear of accumulated power, is as relevant today as it was in 1789. Kazakstan, as it happens, would be particularly well-served by a strong parliament -- like the American Congress -- to check the insatiable appetite of its president. It is odd that the United States is so often the advocate of elections and plebiscitary democracy abroad. What is distinctive about the American system is not how democratic it is but rather how undemocratic it is, placing as it does multiple constraints on electoral majorities. Of its three branches of government, one -- arguably paramount -- is headed by nine unelected men and women with life tenure. Its Senate is the most unrepresentative upper house in the world, with the lone exception of the House of Lords, which is powerless. (Every state sends two senators to Washington regardless of its population -- California's 30 million people have as many votes in the Senate as Arizona's 3.7 million -- which means that senators representing about 16 percent of the country can block any proposed law.) Similarly, in legislatures all over the United States, what is striking is not the power of majorities but that of minorities. To further check national power, state and local governments are strong and fiercely battle every federal intrusion onto their turf. Private businesses and other nongovernmental groups, what Tocqueville called intermediate associations, make up another stratum within society. The American system is based on an avowedly pessimistic conception of human nature, assuming that people cannot be trusted with power. "If men were angels," Madison famously wrote, "no government would be necessary." The other model for democratic governance in Western history is based on the French Revolution. The French model places its faith in the goodness of human beings. Once the people are the source of power, it should be unlimited so that they can create a just society. (The French revolution, as Lord Acton observed, is not about the limitation of sovereign power but the abrogation of all intermediate powers that get in its way.) Most non-Western countries have embraced the French model -- not least because political elites like the prospect of empowering the state, since that means empowering themselves -- and most have descended into bouts of chaos, tyranny, or both. This should have come as no surprise. After all, since its revolution France itself has run through two monarchies, two empires, one proto-fascist dictatorship, and [five republics](#n9). Of course cultures vary, and different societies will require different frameworks of government. This is not a plea for the wholesale adoption of the American way but rather for a more variegated conception of liberal democracy, one that emphasizes both parts of that phrase. Before new policies can be adopted, there lies an intellectual task of recovering the constitutional liberal tradition, central to the Western experience and to the development of good government throughout the world. Political progress in Western history has been the result of a growing recognition over the centuries that, as the Declaration of Independence puts it, human beings have "certain inalienable rights" and that "it is to secure these rights that governments are instituted." If a democracy does not preserve liberty and law, that it is a democracy is a small consolation.  LIBERALIZING FOREIGN POLICY A PROPER appreciation of constitutional liberalism has a variety of implications for American foreign policy. First, it suggests a certain humility. While it is easy to impose elections on a country, it is more difficult to push constitutional liberalism on a society. The process of genuine liberalization and democratization is gradual and long-term, in which an election is only one step. Without appropriate preparation, it might even be a false step. Recognizing this, governments and nongovernmental organizations are increasingly promoting a wide array of measures designed to bolster constitutional liberalism in developing countries. The National Endowment for Democracy promotes free markets, independent labor movements, and political parties. The U.S. Agency for International Development funds independent judiciaries. In the end, however, elections trump everything. If a country holds elections, Washington and the world will tolerate a great deal from the resulting government, as they have with Yeltsin, Akayev, and Menem. In an age of images and symbols, elections are easy to capture on film. (How do you televise the rule of law?) But there is life after elections, especially for the people who live there. Conversely, the absence of free and fair elections should be viewed as one flaw, not the definition of tyranny. Elections are an important virtue of governance, but they are not the only virtue. Governments should be judged by yardsticks related to constitutional liberalism as well. Economic, civil, and religious liberties are at the core of human autonomy and dignity. If a government with limited democracy steadily expands these freedoms, it should not be branded a dictatorship. Despite the limited political choice they offer, countries like Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand provide a better environment for the life, liberty, and happiness of their citizens than do either dictatorships like Iraq and Libya or illiberal democracies like Slovakia or Ghana. And the pressures of global capitalism can push the process of liberalization forward. Markets and morals can work together. Even China, which remains a deeply repressive regime, has given its citizens more autonomy and economic liberty than they have had in generations. Much more needs to change before China can even be called a liberalizing autocracy, but that should not mask the fact that much has changed. Finally, we need to revive constitutionalism. One effect of the overemphasis on pure democracy is that little effort is given to creating imaginative constitutions for transitional countries. Constitutionalism, as it was understood by its greatest eighteenth century exponents, such as Montesquieu and Madison, is a complicated system of checks and balances designed to prevent the accumulation of power and the abuse of office. This is done not by simply writing up a list of rights but by constructing a system in which government will not violate those rights. Various groups must be included and empowered because, as Madison explained, "ambition must be made to counteract ambition." Constitutions were also meant to tame the passions of the public, creating not simply democratic but also deliberative government. Unfortunately, the rich variety of unelected bodies, indirect voting, federal arrangements, and checks and balances that characterized so many of the formal and informal constitutions of Europe are now regarded with suspicion. What could be called the Weimar syndrome -- named after interwar Germany's beautifully constructed constitution, which failed to avert fascism -- has made people regard constitutions as simply paperwork that cannot make much difference. (As if any political system in Germany would have easily weathered military defeat, social revolution, the Great Depression, and hyperinflation.) Procedures that inhibit direct democracy are seen as inauthentic, muzzling the voice of the people. Today around the world we see variations on the same majoritarian theme. But the trouble with these winner-take-all systems is that, in most democratizing countries, the winner really does take all.  DEMOCRACY'S DISCONTENTS WE LIVE IN a democratic age. Through much of human history the danger to an Individual's life, liberty and happiness came from the absolutism of monarchies, the dogma of churches, the terror of dictatorships, and the iron grip of totalitarianism. Dictators and a few straggling totalitarian regimes still persist, but increasingly they are anachronisms in a world of global markets, information, and media. There are no longer respectable alternatives to democracy; it is part of the fashionable attire of modernity. Thus the problems of governance in the 21st century will likely be problems within democracy. This makes them more difficult to handle, wrapped as they are in the mantle of legitimacy. Illiberal democracies gain legitimacy, and thus strength, from the fact that they are reasonably democratic. Conversely, the greatest danger that illiberal democracy poses -- other than to its own people -- is that it will discredit liberal democracy itself, casting a shadow on democratic governance. This would not be unprecedented. Every wave of democracy has been followed by setbacks in which the system was seen as inadequate and new alternatives were sought by ambitious leaders and restless masses. The last such period of disenchantment, in Europe during the interwar years, was seized upon by demagogues, many of whom were initially popular and even elected. Today, in the face of a spreading virus of illiberalism, the most useful role that the international community, and most importantly the United States, can play is -- instead of searching for new lands to democratize and new places to hold elections -- to consolidate democracy where it has taken root and to encourage the gradual development of constitutional liberalism across the globe. Democracy without constitutional liberalism is not simply inadequate, but dangerous, bringing with it the erosion of liberty, the abuse of power, ethnic divisions, and even war. Eighty years ago, Woodrow Wilson took America into the twentieth century with a challenge, to make the world safe for democracy. As we approach the next century, our task is to make democracy safe for the world.
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COIN escalation is perceived as support for an illegitimate regime and promotes a bad constitutional model

Bandow, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, 2009

Doug Bandow is a senior fellow athe Cato Institute. He is a former special assistant to President Reagan and the author of several books, including Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire. Cato Institute: “Recognizing the Limits of American Power in Afghanistan” October 31, 2009 http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=10924

After eight years, Washington has not created the answer in Kabul. Matthew Hoh, a former Marine Corps officer who recently resigned from the State Department, explained: "Like the Soviets, we continue to secure and bolster a failing state, while encouraging an ideology and system of government unknown and unwanted by its people." Ralph Peters, a columnist who backed the Iraq war, criticized protecting "an Afghan government the people despise."

The inadequacies of the Karzai regime are manifest and multiple. The International Crisis Group pointed to "a highly centralized constitutional order in which the legislature has been denied the tools to check an overbearing executive, and a neglected judiciary, which contributes to the climate of impunity and corruption fuelling the insurgency." Malalai Joya, vilified by fundamentalists for daring to run for parliament and promote women's rights, complained: "Your governments have replaced the fundamentalist rule of the Taliban with another fundamentalist regime of warlords."

Then there is the recent flagrant election fraud, which, wrote Hoh, "will call into question worldwide our government's military, economic and diplomatic support for an invalid and illegitimate Afghan government." Karzai's allies claim that the Afghan president has learned from the experience, but what has he learned? If he can get away with rampant fraud, whether or not a second poll is held, he likely will become even less tractable. U.S. escalation will be seen as support for the existing regime, not for the sort of idealized system Washington claims to support.

And Democratic reconstruction in Afghanistan is the bellwether for global democracy promotion

Whitty, IR prof @ Oxford, 2009

Human Secuirty Report Project: “The Impact Of Counter-Terrorism Objectives On Democratization And Statebuilding In Afghanistan” October 5, 2009 <http://www.afghanconflictmonitor.org/2009/10/the-impact-of-counterterrorism-objectives-on-democratization-and-statebuilding.html>, date accessed: 7/26/2010

Afghanistan since 2001 has experienced neither a transition from war to peace, nor from destruction to development, nor yet from authoritarianism to an Islamic democracy. The human costs of this failure, perhaps partly unavoidable given the challenges facing the country and its partners eight years ago, present a continued moral and political challenge to the international community. Democratic development is only one of several dimensions of this challenge. In assessing the influence of external factors on the political development of the country, as in many post-conflict or conflict environments, it is crucial to remember that the promotion of democracy is one of a range of other objectives. In particular, post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding in Afghanistan took place against the backdrop of the “Global War on Terror,” launched in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001. It therefore represents either a pivotal moment in the history of post-conflict democracy promotion or an experiment shaped by unique international factors which can be distinguished from earlier examples and which should be avoided in the future.
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Democracy solves several scenarios for war and extinction

Diamond 95

Larry Diamond, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

The most comprehensive empirical models prove the viability of democratic peace theory

Ward et al, Professor of Political Science, 98

Michael D. Ward, Professor of Political Science, University of Washington, and Kristian S. Gleditsch, graduate research trainee in the Globalization and Democratization Program, et al, at University of Colorado, Boulder, March 1998, The American Political Science Review

As Figure 1 details, democratization-whether in mild or strong degrees-is accompanied by reduction, not increase, in the risk of war. Though we do not present graphs of the converse, changes toward autocracy and reversals of democratization are accompanied by increased risks of war involvement. These risks are proportionally greater than the decline or benefits of further democratization. Thus, there is strong evidence that democratization has a monadic effect: It reduces the probability that a country will be involved in a war. Although the probability of war involvement does not decrease linearly, it does decrease monotonically, so that over the entire range of democracy minus autocracy values, there is a reduction of about 50%. During the democratic transition, at every point along the way as well as at the end points, there is an attendant reduction in the probability of a polity being at war. We also find that reversals toward greater levels of autocracy (not shown) not only increase the probability of war involvement. Apparently, it is more dangerous to be at a given level of democracy if that represents an increase in the level of authoritarianism than it is to be at the same level of democracy if that represents a decrease in the authoritarian character of the regime. Stated differently, reversals are riskier than progress.ll It has been argued that institutional constraints are theoretically important in translating the effect of democracy into foreign policy (Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson, and Woller 1992; Siverson 1995). If the idea of democracy is separated into its major components, then the degree of executive constraints empirically dominates the democracy and autocracy scales (Gleditsch and Ward 1997). Accordingly, we demonstrate that moving toward stronger executive constraints also yields a visible reduction in the risk of war.

It continues…

CONCLUSION Our results show that the process of democratization is accompanied by a decrease in the probability of a country being involved in a war, either as a target or as an initiator. These results were obtained with a more current (and corrected) database than was used in earlier work, and our analyses also focus more clearly on the process of transition. In comparison to studies that look only at the existence of change in authority characteristics, we examine the direction, magnitude, and smoothness of the transition process.

IAC – Democracy Advantage

Democracy is the greatest impetus for nuclear peace

Muravchik, PhD, 1

Joshua Muravchik, Ph.D., Resident Scholar, AEI, Member of the State Dept. Advisory Committee on Democracy Promotion, Adjunct Prof., Institute of World Politics, 7-11/14, Paper presented before the NPEC/IGCC Summer Faculty Seminar, "Democracy and Nuclear Peace," <http://www.npec-web.org/Syllabus/Muravchik.pdf>

The greatest impetus for world peace -- and perforce of nuclear peace -- is the spread of democracy In a famous article, and subsequent book, Francis Fukuyama argued that democracy's extension was leading to "the end of history." By this he meant the conclusion of man's quest for the right social order, but he also meant the "diminution of the likelihood of large-scale conflict between states."1 Fukuyama's phrase was intentionally provocative, even tongue-in-cheek, but he was pointing to two down-to-earth historical observations: that democracies are more peaceful than other kinds of government and that the world is growing more democratic. Neither point has gone unchallenged. Only a few decades ago, as distinguished an observer of international relations as George Kennan made a claim quite contrary to the first of these assertions. Democracies, he said, were slow to anger, but once aroused "a democracy … fights in anger … to the bitter end."2 Kennan's view was strongly influenced by the policy of "unconditional surrender" pursued in World War II. But subsequent experience, such as the negotiated settlements America sought in Korea and Vietnam proved him wrong. Democracies are not only slow to anger but also quick to compromise. And to forgive. Notwithstanding the insistence on unconditional surrender, America treated Japan and that part of Germany that it occupied with extraordinary generosity. In recent years a burgeoning literature has discussed the peacefulness of democracies. Indeed the proposition that democracies do not go to war with one another has been described by one political scientist as being "as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations."3 Some of those who find enthusiasm for democracy offputting have challenged this proposition, but their challenges have only served as empirical tests that have confirmed its robustness. For example, the academic Paul Gottfried and the columnist-turned-politician Patrick J. Buchanan have both instanced democratic England's declaration of war against democratic Finland during World War II.4

While there is a risk associated with democratic transitions, that risk is greater in backsliding democracies – the impact only occurs because of alliances with autocratic states

Ray, Professor of Political Science, 97

[James Lee Ray](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v008/8.2ray.html#top#top), professor of political science at Vanderbilt University, April 1997, Journal of Democracy

Mansfield and Snyder have produced a serious critique, which cannot be brushed aside with simple, short rebuttals. One comprehensive review of this issue reveals that while it is true that democratizing regimes are more war-prone than stable regimes, states involved in transitions to autocracy are even more war-prone. This same analysis also finds that "democratizing" regimes that do get involved in conflict typically have not moved very far in the direction of democracy. In other words, they are still quite autocratic. Another detailed analysis of this controversy finds, again, that transitions to autocracy are more consistently associated with conflict than are transitions to democracy. And even more to the point, this second analysis concludes that transitions to democracy are likely to be dangerous only within a particular context, that is, if the states undergoing such transitions are surrounded by or have important relationships with quite autocratic states. The implication of this and other studies is that the "political distance" (or the difference in regime type) is a crucial determinant of conflict between states. If transitions toward democracy increase political distances or differences vis-à-vis surrounding states, then those transitions to democracy may indeed be associated with conflict. But it is not, apparently, the transitions themselves that cause the conflict. Such evidence also suggests that it is dangerous to encourage democratization only if such a policy succeeds in too limited a fashion, leaving newly democratic states surrounded by more autocratic states.

IAC – Democracy Advantage

Democracy solves all disadvantages – empirical studies prove democratic governments resolve conflicts peacefully

Ndulo, Professor of Law @ Cornell, 3

Muno Ndulo, Advocate of the Supreme Court of Zambia; Professor, Cornell Law School; Director, Institute for African Development, Cornell University, 2003, Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies, Lexis

A 1993 study of 233 internal conflicts around the world, concluded that democracies had a far better record of peacefully managing such conflicts than alternative systems. [54](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v010/10.1ndulo.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT54#FOOT54) The empirical fact that democracies are far less likely to go to war with each other than other regimes further substantiates the relationship between poverty and conflict, and their impact on the democratization process. Authoritarian or totalitarian systems simply do not have the institutions by which conflicts in society can be peacefully expressed and resolved. Dictatorships generally try to deal with conflicts by ignoring or denying them, or by suppressing them using state coercive apparatus. While such methods may indeed control conflicts (albeit usually at a severe cost), they [End Page 323] generally cannot resolve them. [56](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v010/10.1ndulo.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT56#FOOT56) The implication of fundamental issues such as identity and cultural integrity in such conflicts means that almost nothing short of mass expulsions or genocide will make the conflicts disappear. It is generally believed that the ethnic conflict that erupted in the former Yugoslavia in 1990, for example, had been suppressed for almost fifty years during the years of communism, but was always present and unresolved. [57](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v010/10.1ndulo.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT57#FOOT57) An authoritarian system can present an illusion of short-term stability through its use of coercive state power to suppress dissent, but is unlikely to sustain that stability over the long term. In contrast, it is argued that under a democracy, disputes that arise are likely to be processed, debated, and reacted to, rather than resolved definitively and permanently. [58](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v010/10.1ndulo.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT58#FOOT58) In short, democracy operates as a conflict management system. As Harris and Reilly have observed, it is this ability to handle conflicts without having to suppress them or be engulfed by them that distinguishes democratic governance from authoritarian rule. [59](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v010/10.1ndulo.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT59#FOOT59) This does not by any means suggest that democracy is perfect, or that the mere establishment of democratic governance will itself lead to the settlement or prevention of conflicts. There are a number of cases in which democratic institutions are hastily "transplanted" to post-conflict societies without taking root or with a subsequent resumption of hostilities—as in the cases of Burundi, Cambodia and Liberia. [60](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v010/10.1ndulo.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT60#FOOT60) But it is equally true that these cases offer many lessons as to how deals are struck and which choices are of crucial importance to building a sustainable outcome. [61](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v010/10.1ndulo.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT61#FOOT61) Democracy is often messy and difficult, but it is also the best hope for building sustainable solutions to most conflicts in the world. However, democratic institutions have to be strong enough to function effectively and fairly. They can only be strong where the economic conditions are such that they can be sustained.

IAC – Solvency

Observation Two is Solvency

A counter terror force would cooperate with and support local allies preventing Taliban resurgence and providing counter terror intelligence

Long, assistant prof of Int’l Affairs @ Columbia University, 2009

Austin Long is an assistant professor at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs and co-author with William Rosenau of The Phoenix Program and Contemporary Counterinsurgency (RAND, 2009).

Foreign Policy: “What a CT mission in Afghanistan would actually look like” October 13, 2009

<http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/10/13/what_a_ct_mission_in_afghanistan_would_actually_look_like>, date accessed 7/26/2010

In a recent USA Today op-ed, Bruce Riedel and Michael O'Hanlon make the case that a reduced U.S. presence in Afghanistan focused only on counterterrorism missions against al Qaeda won't work. Both men have considerable stature and experience, with Riedel recently heading up a major review of policy in the region for the Obama administration. Yet after numerous personal discussions and debates over the past few weeks with everyone from U.S. military officers to some of the most prominent scholars of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency, I am firmly convinced that a shift to a "small footprint" counter-terrorism mission is not only possible but will best serve U.S. national security. To use a military term of art, the bottom line up front is that the United States could successfully transition to an effective small footprint counterterrorism mission over the course of the next three years, ending up with a force of about 13,000 military personnel (or less) in Afghanistan.

But most of the discussion about what a counterterrorism posture would actually look like on the ground has been vague. Riedel and O'Hanlon sum it up as "a few U.S. special forces teams, modern intelligence fusion centers, cruise-missile-carrying ships and unmanned aerial vehicles." No one has attempted to put flesh on this skeleton in terms of numbers and locations of U.S. troops, so I'm proposing the following as a possible small footprint counterterrorism posture.

First, this posture would require maintaining bases and personnel in Afghanistan. Three airfields would be sufficient: Bagram, north of Kabul, Jalalabad in eastern Afghanistan, and ideally Kandahar, in the insurgency-ridden south of the country. This would enable forces to collect intelligence and rapidly target al Qaeda in the Pashtun regions where its allies would hold sway. Kandahar, in the heart of Taliban territory, might be untenable with a reduced U.S. presence, so an alternate airfield might be needed, potentially at Shindand, though this would not ideal.

In terms of special operations forces, this posture would rely on two squadrons of so-called "Tier 1" operators, one at each forward operating base. These could be drawn from U.S. special mission units or Allied units such as the British Special Air Service or Canada's Joint Task Force 2. In addition, it would require a battalion equivalent of U.S. Army Rangers, U.S. Navy SEALs, U.S. Marine Special Operations Companies, British Parachute Regiment, or some mix, with basically a company with each Tier 1 squadron and one in reserve at Bagram. These forces would work together as task forces (let's call them TF South and TF East), with the Tier 1 operators being tasked with executing direct action missions to kill or capture al Qaeda targets while the other units would serve as security and support for these missions. In addition, two of the four battalions of the 160th Special Operations Regiment, basically one at each airfield, would be used to provide helicopter transport, reconnaissance, and fire support for the task forces. One battalion might be enough but two certainly would, thus ensuring that no targets get away for lack of lift. Note that according to Sean Naylor's reporting my direct action task forces are structured like the regional task forces in Iraq in 2006 that were tasked to hunt al Qaeda in Iraq.

Both task forces would be capable of acting against targets elsewhere in the Pashtun regions, but al Qaeda operatives would likely only feel even relatively secure in a fairly limited geographic area. TF East in Jalalabad would likely need to operate principally in the heartland of the Haqqani militant network (Khost, Paktia, and Paktika provinces) as this would be where al Qaeda's principal ally in the east could best protect its members, who are not generally Pashtun. For similar reasons, TF South would principally operate against al Qaeda targets in Kandahar, where the Quetta Shura Taliban is strongest, and some of the surrounding provinces such as Helmand and Uruzgan.

In addition to these two task forces, I would retain the three Army Special Forces' battalions and other elements that appear to be assigned to Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force-Afghanistan. While TFs South and East would focus purely on direct action, these Special Forces units would partner with local forces to collect intelligence and secure specific areas. These local forces would in many cases be from non-Pashtun ethnic groups (Tajiks, Uzbeks, Hazaras), which would limit their ability to be effective in the Pashtun areaa but would likely include at least a few Pashtun tribes that see more benefit working with the Afghan government and the United States than against them. Rather than serving an offensive purpose against al Qaeda like TF South and East, Special Forces would essentially serve a defensive purpose to secure Afghan allies and reassure them that the United States is not going to abandon them.

This reassurance and support of local allies is a crucial and underappreciated part of a small footprint posture. The non-Pashtun groups were the United States' critical allies in 2001 and remain staunchly opposed to the Taliban and other militants. The Tajiks of the Panjshir Valley, for example, are probably more anti-Taliban than the United States is. With U.S. support, these groups will be able to prevent the expansion of militants outside Pashtun areas. Local allies in Pashtun areas will enable collection of intelligence to support the task force operations. Supporting local allies does not mean abandoning the Afghan government any more than supporting local allies in the Awakening movement in Iraq's Anbar province meant abandoning the government of Iraq. Balancing the two will require some deftness and will be the focus of another post.

Finally, a few more "enablers," to use another military term of art, would be required. First, this posture would need some additional special operations personnel focused on intelligence collection, along with a substantial complement of intelligence community personnel to collect both human and signals intelligence. Second, it would require a substantial complement of unmanned aerial vehicles including Predators, Reapers, and a few other specialized types along with their support personnel. Third, a few AC-130 gunships for air support would be needed, along with combat search and rescue teams from Air Force Special Operations Command.

It should be clear that "small footprint" is a relative term. This special operations posture alone would be roughly five battalions of ground forces, four aviation squadrons, and a few odds and ends, probably in the neighborhood of 5,000 U.S. and NATO troops. In addition, a conventional force component would be needed to serve as a quick reaction force, provide security for the bases, and protect convoys. A conservative estimate for this force would be a brigade or regimental combat team, giving a battalion to each base, another 4,000, roughly. For additional air support, two squadrons of fighter-bombers (F-15E, A-10, etc.) would probably be sufficient, adding another 2,000 personnel.

Finally, my proposed posture would require additional staff, logistics, and support personnel (medical for instance), some but not all of which can be contractors, adding another 2,000 military personnel. This would be a total force of about 13,000 military personnel and some number of supporting intelligence community personnel and contractors. This is a high-end estimate, and some military personnel I have spoken to think this mission could be done with half this number of troops, but the posture described above errs on the side of caution. This is small compared to the current posture in Afghanistan, smaller still than the forces implied in Gen. McChrystal's report, and tiny compared to the peak number of forces in Iraq. On the other hand, it is vastly larger than any other purely counterterrorism deployment, and how we get there from here will be the subject of my next post.

IAC – Solvency

**A counterterror focus maintains the “B-52” effect deterring large-scale conflict while substantially reducing presence, costs, and anti-American sentiment**

Kretkowski 2010

Mr. Paul D. Kretkowski is a consultant and journalist based in San Francisco who writes on a range of topics including soft power, U.S. foreign policy, Middle Eastern politics and information warfare. His writing credits include, among others, Mother Jones, Wired, Business For Diplomatic Action and SFGate.com. Beacon, Mr. Kretkowski's blog, is devoted to exploring the concept and applications of " Soft Power" as articulated by political scientist Joseph Nye.

Beacon: “Against COIN, for CT in Afghanistan and Elsewhere” January 7, 2010

<http://softpowerbeacon.blogspot.com/2010/01/against-coin-for-ct-in-afghanistan-and.html> date accessed 7/26/2010

Focusing on a counterterror-only mission means admitting that Afghanistan and Iraq—and Yemen and Iran—are not, and will not likely become, threats to the U.S. that require tens of thousands of troops. Individuals from those countries (as well as their alleged British, Nigerian or Virginian lackeys) may be threats, but threats that can mostly be handled by a CT strategy, intensified border protection, and other measures. The countries themselves will remain militarily negligible outside their own neighborhood.

A CT strategy would mean keeping a few heavily fortified bases in Afghanistan and Iraq to maintain the "B-52 effect" of being able to suppress large-scale fighting via airpower, while pulling all our other troops out. We would then keep up Predator decapitation strikes and occasional bombing of insurgent hideouts, while providing air support for the Afghan National Army and police.

We would also do what we could—and no more—to strengthen the Kabul and Islamabad governments. Sooner or later that will mean standing back while an unsavory strongman takes charge in one or both countries—someone who can maintain stability if not a Western-style democracy, although we can certainly pressure them to try.

Benefits of a CT Focus

Pulling the bulk of U.S. troops from the two active wars means military spending drops sharply, freeing up greatly needed funds for other uses: to stimulate the domestic economy, to aid in healthcare reform, or simply to reduce the need to issue more debt and thus begin paying down our current tab. (As an added benefit, China and others who want to extract wealth from a less-secure Afghanistan must then foot their own security bill.)

Perhaps we become less hated in Afghanistan and Iraq, perhaps not, but we get out of the nation-building business that President Bush used to deride and can use our political, economic and military assets elsewhere. At that point we begin to rebuild those all-important reserves without which a great nation cannot aid allies, warn off adversaries, and sway those in the middle.

Solvency – Decentralization

The plan’s more decentralize approach solves and allows a majority of troops to return – consistent with Afghan tradition of tribal rule

Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, July 26, 2010

Newsweek: “We're Not Winning. It's Not Worth It. Here's how to draw down in Afghanistan”

Lexis, date accessed: 7/26/2010

Another approach, best termed "decentralization," bears resemblance to partition but also is different in important ways. Under this approach, the United States would provide arms and training to those local Afghan leaders throughout the country who reject Al Qaeda and who do not seek to undermine Pakistan. Economic aid could be provided to increase respect for human rights and to decrease poppy cultivation. There would be less emphasis on building up a national Army and police force.

The advantage of this option is that it works with and not against the Afghan tradition of a weak ruling center and a strong periphery. It would require revision of the Afghan Constitution, which as it stands places too much power in the hands of the president. The United States could leave it to local forces to prevent Taliban inroads, allowing most U.S. troops to return home. Leaders of non-Pashtun minorities (as well as anti-Taliban Pashtuns) would receive military aid and training. The result would be less a partition than a patchwork quilt. Petraeus took a step in this direction last week by gaining Karzai's approval for the creation of new uniformed local security forces who will be paid to fight the insurgents in their communities.

Under this scenario, the Taliban would likely return to positions of power in a good many parts of the south. The Taliban would know, however, that they would be challenged by U.S. air power and Special Forces (and by U.S.-supported Afghans) if they attacked non-Pashtun areas, if they allowed the areas under their control to be used to supply antigovernment forces in Pakistan, or if they worked in any way with Al Qaeda. There is reason to believe that the Taliban might not repeat their historic error of inviting Al Qaeda back into areas under their control. Indeed, the United States should stop assuming that the two groups are one and the same and instead start talking to the Taliban to underscore how their interests differ from Al Qaeda's.

Solvency – Decentralization

A modest focused Counterterrorism strategy stabilizes Pakistan and prevents Al Qaeda return

Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, July 26, 2010

Newsweek: “We're Not Winning. It's Not Worth It. Here's how to draw down in Afghanistan”

Lexis, date accessed: 7/26/2010

So what should the president decide? The best way to answer this question is to return to what the United States seeks to accomplish in Afghanistan and why. The two main American goals are to prevent Al Qaeda from reestablishing a safe haven and to make sure that Afghanistan does not undermine the stability of Pakistan.

We are closer to accomplishing both goals than most people realize. CIA Director Leon Panetta recently estimated the number of Al Qaeda in Afghanistan to be "60 to 100, maybe less." It makes no sense to maintain 100,000 troops to go after so small an adversary, especially when Al Qaeda operates on this scale in a number of countries. Such situations call for more modest and focused policies of counterterrorism along the lines of those being applied in Yemen and Somalia, rather than a full-fledged counterinsurgency effort.

Pakistan is much more important than Afghanistan given its nuclear arsenal, its much larger population, the many terrorists on its soil, and its history of wars with India. But Pakistan's future will be determined far more by events within its borders than those to its west. The good news is that the Army shows some signs of understanding that Pakistan's own Taliban are a danger to the country's future, and has begun to take them on.

All this argues for reorienting U.S. Afghan policy toward decentralization--providing greater support for local leaders and establishing a new approach to the Taliban. The war the United States is now fighting in Afghanistan is not succeeding and is not worth waging in this way. The time has come to scale back U.S. objectives and sharply reduce U.S. involvement on the ground. Afghanistan is claiming too many American lives, requiring too much attention, and absorbing too many resources. The sooner we accept that Afghanistan is less a problem to be fixed than a situation to be managed, the better.

Solvency – Reconciliation

A lighter less robust military presence facilitates negotiations with the Taliban

Stewart, Human Rights prof @ Harvard, 2010

Rory Stewart is the Ryan Family Professor of Human Rights and Director of the Carr Center on Human Rights Policy at Harvard. “Afghanistan what could work?” January 14, 2010, <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2010/jan/14/afghanistan-what-could-work/?page=3>, date accessed: 7/27/2010

This may be fatal for Obama’s ambition to “open the door” to the Taliban. The lighter, more political, and less but still robust militarized presence that his argument implies could facilitate a deal with the Taliban, if it appeared semi-permanent. As the President asserted, the Taliban are not that strong. They have nothing like the strength or appeal that they had in 1995. They cannot take the capital, let alone recapture the country. There is strong opposition to their presence, particularly in the center and the north of the country. Their only hope is to negotiate. But the Taliban need to acknowledge this. And the only way they will is if they believe that we are not going to allow the Kabul government to collapse.

Afghanistan has been above all a project not of force but of patience. It would take decades before Afghanistan achieved the political cohesion, stability, wealth, government structures, or even basic education levels of Pakistan. A political settlement requires a reasonably strong permanent government. The best argument against the surge, therefore, was never that a US operation without an adequate Afghan government partner would be unable to defeat the Taliban—though it won’t. Nor that the attempt to strengthen the US campaign will intensify resistance, though it may. Nor because such a deployment of over 100,000 troops at a cost of perhaps $100 billion a year would be completely disproportional to the US’s limited strategic interests and moral obligation in Afghanistan—though that too is true.

Instead, Obama should not have requested more troops because doing so intensifies opposition to the war in the US and Europe and accelerates the pace of withdrawal demanded by political pressures at home. To keep domestic consent for a long engagement we need to limit troop numbers and in particular limit our casualties. The surge is a Mephistophelian bargain, in which the President has gained force but lost time.

What can now be done to salvage the administration’s position? Obama has acquired leverage over the generals and some support from the public by making it clear that he will not increase troop strength further. He has gained leverage over Karzai by showing that he has options other than investing in Afghanistan. Now he needs to regain leverage over the Taliban by showing them that he is not about to abandon Afghanistan and that their best option is to negotiate. In short, he needs to follow his argument for a call strategy to its conclusion. The date of withdrawal should be recast as a time for reduction to a lighter, more sustainable, and more permanent presence. This is what the administration began to do in the days following the speech. As National Security Adviser General James Jones said, “That date is a ‘ramp’ rather than a cliff.” And as Hillary Clinton said in her congressional testimony on December 3, their real aim should be to “develop a long-term sustainable relationship with Afghanistan and Pakistan so that we do not repeat the mistakes of the past, primarily our abandonment of that region.”

A more realistic, affordable, and therefore sustainable presence would not make Afghanistan stable or predictable. It would be merely a small if necessary part of an Afghan political strategy. The US and its allies would only moderate, influence, and fund a strategy shaped and led by Afghans themselves. The aim would be to knit together different Afghan interests and allegiances sensitively enough to avoid alienating independent local groups, consistently enough to regain their trust, and robustly enough to restore the security and justice that Afghans demand and deserve from a national government.

What would this look like in practice? Probably a mess. It might involve a tricky coalition of people we refer to, respectively, as Islamists, progressive civil society, terrorists, warlords, learned technocrats, and village chiefs. Under a notionally democratic constitutional structure, it could be a rickety experiment with systems that might, like Afghanistan’s neighbors, include strong elements of religious or military rule. There is no way to predict what the Taliban might become or what authority a national government in Kabul could regain. Civil war would remain a possibility. But an intelligent, long-term, and tolerant partnership with the United States could reduce the likelihood of civil war and increase the likelihood of a political settlement. This is hardly the stuff of sound bites and political slogans. But it would be better for everyone than boom and bust, surge and flight. With the right patient leadership, a political strategy could leave Afghanistan in twenty years’ time more prosperous, stable, and humane than it is today. That would be excellent for Afghans and good for the world.

COIN Fails – Taliban

Coalition forces cannot beat the Taliban – organization and sanctuary

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

FIXING A FAILED STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/dorronsoro_fixing_failed_strategy2.pdf>

The level of reinforcements that the Pentagon will ask for will likely be around 45,000 troops, putting the Coalition strength near 150,000 next year. Even that number, however, will not be able to shift the momentum of the war. History shows without much ambiguity that it is impossible to succeed with this level of troops against a well-organized insurgency that is benefiting from a sanctuary. Reinforcements cannot secure the border or even a sufficient number of districts to make a difference. The argument that reinforcements will allow U.S. troops to operate more safely is misleading. If the tactics do not change—if the main strategy continues to be patrols and the control of the countryside—then the number of casualties will only increase. As a Taliban fighter put it: “We don’t worry about reinforcements; they are just more targets.” In addition, it is not possible, for technical reasons, to quickly send massive reinforcements (more than 50,000 troops). A gradual buildup will leave time for the insurgency to adapt. Finally, private security contractors, now a part of all U.S. wars and whose ranks are expected to be further increased in 2010 by the Department of Defense, are not an answer.22 These companies have repeatedly been accused of corruption, inefficiency, and brutality against the local population. No one should be reassured by the fact that the former Blackwater (now Xe Services LLC) has had contracts in Afghanistan since 2002.

Tactical retreat to Pakistan makes defeating the Insurgency impossible

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

“The Taliban’s Winning Strategy in Afghanistan” <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/taliban_winning_strategy.pdf>

The Taliban strategy has been successful so far. They have achieved most of their objectives in the South and East, and they are making inroads in the North. The Taliban are unlikely to change their strategy significantly in the face of the U.S. troop surge. The leadership will probably not concentrate forces to challenge the IC, as they regretted doing in 2005. The Taliban could decide to exert more pressure on cities such as Kabul, Ghazni, and Kandahar, where they are well infiltrated.

The bulk of the new IC resources is going to the South to reinforce the existing military apparatus. This deployment will benefit the Taliban: Success is unlikely in the South and the North is left open to insurgent infiltration. The IC is sending thousands of troops to Helmand, for example, which may prompt the Taliban to retreat tactically to the northern part of the province or to Ghor (or Uruzgan) and return later after IC forces leave. There will not be enough IC forces to take and hold most of the areas now controlled by the insurgency, so the Taliban can leave areas where American troops concentrate and then return when troops redeploy elsewhere. There is no way to force the Taliban to fight when they have a sanctuary in Pakistan or in the mountains. Concentrating U.S. forces in the South will also leave the North open for Taliban gains.

COIN Fails – Mixed Doctrine

COIN and CT are incompatible – the intertwined approach in Afghanistan has produced a painful stalemate with the divergent strategies offsetting the others’ gains.

Boyle, IR prof @ University of St. Andrews, 2010

MICHAEL J. Lecturer in International Relations and a Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews. “Do counterterrorism and counterinsurgency go together?”

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/123318677/PDFSTART>, date accessed: 7/26/2010

This confusion over the differences between counterterrorism and counterinsurgency is not new, but it has become more serious over the last eight years.15 Since the events of September 11, these concepts have regularly been conflated as policy-makers have struggled to come to grips with the threat posed by Al-Qaeda. To some extent, this is natural: Al-Qaeda is a global terrorist organization which intervenes directly in local conflicts (often insurgencies, defined here as organized violent attempts to overthrow an existing government) to bait the US and its allies into exhausting wars of attrition. In other words, it is a terrorist organization which dabbles (sometimes successfully, sometimes less so) in insurgencies. But the fact that the threats of terrorism and insurgency are so often intertwined in contemporary conflicts does not make them fundamentally equivalent or susceptible to the same remedies. Nor does it warrant extending counterinsurgency operations on a global level, as some prominent authors have suggested.16 The fusion of the threats from terrorism and insurgency, so often described as symptomatic of the complexity of the modern security challenges, can be misread to imply that the responses to them should be similar or equivalent. In fact, while intermixed in practice, these threats remain distinct, and require a policy response which disaggregates and prioritizes threats and separates those actors who have a negotiable political programme from those who remain incorrigible.

Similarly, the fact that terrorists and insurgents operate in the same theatre, and in some cases function in tandem, is not an argument for a response that seamlessly interweaves elements of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency. Indeed, there is no reason to assume that counterterrorism and counterinsurgency strategies are fully compatible or mutually reinforcing. The record of the war in Afghanistan suggests rather that both models of warfare involve tradeoffs or costs that may offset the gains made by the other. Unless these tradeoffs are properly managed, the simultaneous deployment of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency opera- tions may operate at cross-purposes and make long-term strategic success more elusive. The fact that US and UK leaders have been so willing to split the difference between counterterrorism and counterinsurgency—and to ignore the offset- ting costs of each—may help to account for the current painful stalemate in Afghanistan.

This article will argue that counterterrorism and counterinsurgency are two distinct models of war which can operate at cross-purposes when jointly applied to low-intensity conflicts such as that in Afghanistan. The conflation of these two different models of warfare stems from an intellectual error, which assumes that a fused threat (for example, between a nationalist insurgent group like the Taleban and a transnational terrorist group like Al-Qaeda) must necessarily be met by a joint or blended counterterrorism and counterinsurgency approach. In fact, these two models of warfare involve divergent assumptions about the roles of force, the importance of winning support among the local population, and the necessity of building a strong and representative government. Such approaches are not necessarily mutually reinforcing or even compatible. At the tactical and strategic level, there are at least four possible offsetting costs—popular backlash, countermobilization of enemy networks, a legitimacy gap and diminished leverage—that may be incurred when counterterrorism and counterinsurgency are deployed simultaneously. At the political level, the conflation of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency risks producing an overly interventionist foreign policy which distracts and exhausts the US and UK as they treat an ever-increasing number of localized insurgencies as the incubators of future terrorist threats.

COIN Fails – Weak Afghan State

The resources to support a robust COIN strategy in Afghanistan are not available from either party – NATO is overstretched and the Afghan state is too weak

Leaver, policy outreach director for the Foreign Policy In Focus project at the Institute for Policy Studies, 2009

Yes Magazine: “How to Exit Afghanistan: Five pillars of an exit strategy for Afghanistan,” <http://www.yesmagazine.org/peace-justice/how-to-exit-afghanistan>, October 1, 2009

As U.S. and NATO troops start the ninth year of war, there is little progress to be shown. This year has proven to be the most deadly for U.S. and coalition troops since the war began. And over 1,500 Afghan civilians died in the first six months of 2009, according to the United Nations.

Sadly, the sacrifices these solders made have not resulted in better conditions for Afghans on the ground. Agricultural production is at its lowest since the war began, only 23 percent of the population has access to clean drinking water, and 40 percent lives below the poverty line. Life expectancy in Afghanistan is 44 years. Three million Afghans have fled their country. According to a UN threat assessment, 40 percent of Afghanistan is today either Taliban-controlled or at high risk for insurgent attacks.

Beyond the human toll, the war is placing a severe financial burden on the United States. To date, the U.S. has spent more than $220 billion in Afghanistan. Over 90 pecent of that spending has been for the military. Today, the U.S. is spending $4 billion a month in Afghanistan, eclipsing the costs of Iraq for the first time since 2003.

Policymakers in Washington are debating two questions: What is the proper mission for troops? Should the United States send additional soldiers?

Yet there are more important questions to be asked: Is there a role for troops at this point at all? What does an exit strategy look like and when can we get there?

What Mission Can Be Accomplished?

Even if General Stanley McChrystal, the commander of U.S. troops in Afghanistan who has asked for an as yet unspecified number of new soldiers, gets all of the troops he wants, is the mission possible? McChrystal's counterinsurgency strategy seems unobtainable, even in his own review. He notes that the Afghan state is too weak to build the support needed for a robust counterinsurgency campaign and that NATO may not have the training, equipment, or motivation for success. Indeed, Afghanistan is causing some experts to question NATO's ability to last much beyond its 60th anniversary this year.

Furthermore, McChrystal's plan is highly dependent on the training of the Afghan National Army (ANA). Such training has been a dismal failure in the past eight years, even as the United States has spent $17.6 billion instructing the ANA. Saying that we now can do better is a dubious proposition at best. Rebuilding the Afghan military is no small task, no matter how many trainers McChrystal sends.

The alternative suggested by many of the earlier strategic reviews and now championed by Vice President Joe Biden, is to narrow the mission to focus on al-Qaeda and the Taliban with the more limited goal of stopping Afghanistan from becoming a safe haven for terrorists. This is the counter-terrorism strategy that President Bush pursued with little success. The problem with even this more limited objective is that neither NATO nor the United States could achieve it without staying in Afghanistan forever.

Sending more troops and resources to George Bush's war has little chance of success. Even if it did succeed, such a strategy would likely further damage the U.S. economy, military, and our standing in the world in the process.

COIN Fails – AT Iraq proves

COIN hasn’t succeeded in Iraq

Bacevich, IR prof @ BU, 2009

Andrew J. Bacevich is a professor of international relations at Boston University and the author, most recently, of The Limits of Power. He served as an officer in the U.S. Army from 1969 to 1992.

Harpers’ Magazine: “The war we can't win” November 2009

<http://harpers.org/archive/2009/11/0082687>, date accessed 7/26/2010

Fixing Afghanistan is not only unnecessary, it’s also likely to prove impossible. Not for nothing has the place acquired the nickname Graveyard of Empires. Americans, insistent that the dominion over which they preside does not meet the definition of empire, evince little interest in how the British, Russians, or others have fared in attempting to impose their will on the Afghans. As General David McKiernan, until recently the U.S. commander in Afghanistan, put it, “There’s always an inclination to relate what we’re doing now with previous nations,” adding, “I think that’s a very unhealthy comparison.” McKiernan was expressing a view common among the ranks of the political and military elite: We’re Americans. We’re different. Therefore, the experience of others does not apply.

Of course, Americans like McKiernan who reject as irrelevant the experience of others might at least be willing to contemplate the experience of the United States itself. Take the case of Iraq, now bizarrely trumpeted in some quarters as a “success” and even more bizarrely seen as offering a template for how to turn Afghanistan around. Much has been made of the United States Army’s rediscovery of (and growing infatuation with) counterinsurgency doctrine, applied in Iraq beginning in early 2007 when President Bush launched his so-called surge and anointed General David Petraeus as the senior U.S. commander in Baghdad. Yet technique is no substitute for strategy. Violence in Iraq may be down, but evidence of the promised political reconciliation that the surge was intended to produce remains elusive. America’s Mesopotamian misadventure continues. Pretending that the surge has redeemed the Iraq war is akin to claiming that when Andy Jackson “caught the bloody British in the town of New Orleans” he thereby enabled the United States to emerge victorious from the War of 1812. Such a judgment works well as folklore but ignores an abundance of contrary evidence.

More than six years after it began, Operation Iraqi Freedom has consumed something like a trillion dollars—with the meter still running—and has taken the lives of more than 4,300 American soldiers. Meanwhile, in Baghdad and other major Iraqi cities, car bombs continue to detonate at regular intervals, killing and maiming dozens. Anyone inclined to put Iraq in the nation’s rearview mirror is simply deluded. Not long ago, General Raymond Odierno, Petraeus’s successor and the fifth U.S. commander in Baghdad, expressed the view that the insurgency in Iraq is likely to drag on for another five, ten, or fifteen years. Events may well show that Odierno is an optimist.

COIN Fails – AT Iraq proves

Successful elements of Iraq COIN operations wont translate to Afghanistan – geography, government institutions, and insurgency infighting

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

FIXING A FAILED STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/dorronsoro_fixing_failed_strategy2.pdf>

Comparisons between the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are too often made as if the two situations were similar. They are not. There are no lessons to draw from the success of the surge in Iraq, which itself is more debatable than Washington conventional wisdom recognizes. First, the Iraqi insurgency is extremely fragmented and fraught with infighting. The Taliban, however, are a much more cohesive movement with central leadership and little internal strife. Second, part of the Iraqi insurgency was a frontal attack on the old Iraqi social order, namely the tribal system. In Afghanistan, tensions between the insurgency and local tribes are limited. The Taliban have managed to make the eastern tribes politically irrelevant without much overt violence; no tribes are available to build the kind of Awakening movement that had been instrumental in Iraq. Third, fighting in Iraq has always been geographically limited (mostly to Anbar province and Baghdad), and the insurgency is primarily urban; in Afghanistan, the situation is the opposite. Fourth, the Iraqi insurgency has no sanctuary in neighboring Syria or Iran, while Pakistan offers the Taliban a sanctuary. Finally, state institutions were ready to be reactivated in Iraq; in Afghanistan, where a “dis-institutionalization” process is occurring, the re-creation of the army in a few years is just not doable the same way as it was in Iraq.

COIN Fails – “clear” Impossible

The COIN strategy – clear, hold, build—will fail to secure provinces and serve to solidify relations between the Afghan people and the Taliban

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

FIXING A FAILED STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/dorronsoro_fixing_failed_strategy2.pdf>

In 2009, the Coalition has tried to define a new strategy—aiming to marginalize the insurgency by regaining control of the countryside in the provinces most affected by the insurgency. With the Iraq war, the U.S. Army has rediscovered classic counterinsurgency theory. The current “shape, clear, hold, and build” strategy requires control of territory and a separation of insurgents from the population. Troops clear an area, remain there, and implement an ambitious development program intended to gain the support of the population. The central concept is to stop thinking about territory—a mistake made during the first years of the war—and focus instead on the population.3 Yet the context in which these theories were created is quite specific: First, there was a state, albeit a colonial one; second, the insurgency was initiated by a group of nationalist intellectuals who, as far as the rural population was concerned, were outsiders. The failure of the current policy stems from the underestimation of the Taliban and the impossibility of “clearing” an area of insurgents.

The relationship between the Taliban and the population is one key element of the new strategy. A common misperception is that the insurgents are terrorizing the Afghan people and that the insurgents’ level of support among the people is marginal. This has led to the objective of “separating the Taliban from the population” or “protecting the population” from the Taliban. Yet at this stage of the war, and specifically in the Pashtun belt, there is no practical way to separate the insurgency from the population in the villages, and furthermore there is no Afghan state structure to replace the Coalition forces once the Taliban have been removed. In fact, this approach reflects a misunderstanding about just who the Taliban are. Even if it is possible to find examples where the Taliban are not local and oppressive to villagers, the situation in the Pashtun belt is much more complex. The Taliban have successfully exploited local grievances against corrupt officials and the behavior of the foreign forces, framing them as a jihad. Moreover, the Taliban are generally careful not to antagonize the population. They are much more tolerant of music and of beardless men than before 2001, and Mullah Omar has repeatedly made clear that the behavior of the fighters should be respectful (for example, paying for the food they take). Most of the insurgents are local and, especially in case of heavy fighting, the local solidarities tend to work in favor of the Taliban and against foreigners in a mix of religious and nationalist feelings.

How does the Coalition control the supposedly cleared areas? Trust between Coalition forces and the Afghan people (especially the Pashtuns) simply does not exist, and, after eight years in the country, the battle for hearts and minds has been lost. The Coalition forces still have not worked out how to be accepted locally—that it is counterproductive to patrol villages with soldiers who are ill-equipped to overcome linguistic and cultural barriers and whose average stay is six months. This miscalculation has been compounded by the past poor behavior of some Coalition forces— the beating of prisoners, arbitrary imprisonment, aggressive behavior on the road—and the unwitting bombing of civilians.

The absence of a state structure in the Pashtun belt means that military operations, other than a token Afghan army presence, are predominantly foreign in composition. Because the police are corrupt or inefficient, there is no one left to secure the area after the “clear” phase. And because the pro- government groups are locally based, they can go outside their area only with great difficulty. The so-called ink spot strategy—subduing a large hostile region with a relatively small military force by establishing a number of small safe areas and then pushing out from each one and extending control until only a few pockets of resistance remain—is not working because of the social and ethnic fragmentation: Stability in one district does not necessarily benefit neighboring ones, since groups and villages are often antagonists and compete for the spoils of a war economy. In this context, securing an area means staying there indefinitely, under constant threat from the insurgency.

Finally, given the complexity of the strategy—one that requires a deep understanding of Pashtun society—one must ask whether the Coalition has the bureaucratic agility and competence to implement it and outsmart the Taliban, who are obviously quite good at playing local politics. There is no reason for confidence in this regard, so the Coalition should pursue a simpler strategy in Afghanistan.

COIN Fails – “clear” Impossible

The COIN strategy cannot defeat the Taliban – IEDs, Pakistan sanctuary, and indistinguishable from villagers

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

FIXING A FAILED STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/dorronsoro_fixing_failed_strategy2.pdf>

Once again, the Coalition has underestimated the Taliban’s tactical abilities. The insurgents chose not to fight U.S. troops frontally in the South of Helmand. In May 2008, the Taliban suffered heavy casualties there after an operation by U.S. Marines. They escaped Garmser and fled more north than toward the Pakistani border. There they regrouped on terrain that is more favorable to them and fought hard against the British. Insurgent casualties have been relatively low (probably fewer than 200) because of a heavy reliance on improvised explosive devices (IEDs). Thus the Taliban have not been substantially weakened, even in the short term. The policy of clearing is plainly not working. The insurgents are woven into the population, and there is no way to distinguish them from ordinary villagers. As a consequence, the area targeted by the Coalition forces remains unsafe, and because the Afghan National Army is too weak to substitute, the troops can’t withdraw without allowing the Taliban to regain control. Indeed, in the North of the province, the British were unable to clear significant areas of a Taliban whose strategy and coordination have improved since 2006, when their strong warrior ethic drove the Taliban to directly confront the Coalition forces with almost a suicidal zeal. Working in small units (usually 10–12 men) and carrying enough ammunition for ten days, they typically stay on the “front line” for a month before returning to their safe areas in Pakistan or north of Helmand. Thus the government is unable to secure entire districts—at best, it can hope to control the centers of these districts.

So, Coalition forces have failed to clear a significant portion of the province of Taliban fighters. The border with Pakistan remains wide open; it cannot be controlled with only U.S. troops. Predictably, the Pakistanis are not helping, allowing Taliban groups sanctuary when they need it. Only one district—Nad Ali—has been secured by a heavy U.S. military presence, and even then, not totally because IEDs are deployed there. There is no guarantee that the Taliban—in the North and South of the province—will not return. On election day (August 20), the provincial center of Lashkar Gah was hit by more than ten rockets, and security inside the town remains extremely bad. The stated official objective of the operation in Helmand was to clear the area and allow the population to vote in the presidential election. However, as a sign of continuing insecurity, voter turnout was likely below 5 percent in the province.

Hegemony Advantage – COIN 🡪 Overstretch

The COIN strategy in Afghanistan will fail but not until it overstretches the U.S. military, costs an “astronomical” amount and destroys Afghan political institutions

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

In These Times: “The Case for Negotiations” May 24, 2010

<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=40863>, date accessed 7/26/2010

The coalition's strategy in Afghanistan is at an impasse. The renewed efforts undertaken since the summer of 2009 have failed to temper the guerrilla war. A few tactical successes are possible, but this war cannot be won. The coalition cannot defeat the Taliban as long as Pakistan continues to offer them sanctuary. And increasing resources to wage the war is not an option. The costs of continuing the war--to use Ambassador Karl Eikenberry's expression in the leaked telegram to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton--are "astronomical."

The entire U.S. strategy revolves around a swift Afghanization of the conflict, yet the coalition's Afghan partner is weaker than it was a year ago. The state's presence in the provinces has declined sharply and the legitimacy of President Hamid Karzai's government is contested.

As a result of the massive fraud in the August 2009 presidential elections, the government has no popular legitimacy, and the legislative elections slated for fall 2010 will probably undermine the political system even further because fraud is inevitable. It is unlikely that the Afghan regime will ever be able to assume responsibility for its own security.

As a result, the coalition faces an endless war accompanied by an intolerable loss of life and treasure. A less costly alternative would be to negotiate a broad agreement with the Taliban leadership to form a national unity government, with guarantees against al Qaeda's return to Afghanistan. But even if such negotiations might occur, they hold no guarantee of success.

Yet the cost of their failure is negligible compared with the potential gain: a relatively swift way out of the crisis that preserves the coalition's essential interests. Time is not on the coalition's side. The United States should contact Taliban leaders as soon as possible rather than waiting for the situation to deteriorate further.

In pursuit of a losing strategy

The Taliban cannot be defeated militarily because the border with Pakistan is and will remain open for the insurgents. The Pakistani army, which refuses to launch an offensive against the Afghan Taliban, has never considered taking action against the Taliban leadership based in Pakistan. The February arrest of acting Taliban military commander Mullah Abdul Ghani Baradar is probably a sign that the Pakistani military wants more control over the insurgency to prepare for the negotiation process.

What's more, the insurgency is now nationwide and cannot be contained by counterinsurgency (COIN) operations in two or three southern provinces. The COIN strategy cannot succeed because of the immense resources it requires. In a marginal, strategically unimportant district such as Marjah, the coalition would have to keep thousands of troops for years to prevent the Taliban's return. To replicate such strategy, even in one province, would overstretch the U.S. military.

In addition to COIN, military strategists think they can quickly weaken the Taliban through the creation of militias, the co-opting of Taliban groups and targeted assassinations. These policies will not strengthen the Afghan government's legitimacy or influence; to the contrary, they are destroying the Karzai government's credibility. The effects of this strategy are irreversible, and with the acceleration of political fragmentation, the coalition is faced with the prospect of a collapse of Afghan institutions.

The Karzai government is unlikely to engage in institutional reform, given that it is increasingly dependent on the networks that ensured its fraudulent re-election. Consequently, the coalition is having more and more trouble influencing Karzai. The weakness of the central political institutions means that the development of the army and the police force--the coalition's priorities--is occurring in a vacuum. Transferring security responsibilities to our Afghan partner will probably not be possible in the foreseeable future.

Afghans perceive their representative institutions as illegitimate. Between 10 percent and 15 percent of Afghan voters are believed to have supported Karzai during the 2009 presidential elections. All indications point to a high level of cynicism among the people and their rejection of the government; in fact, they massively refrained from voting even in places where security was reasonably good.

The legislative elections scheduled for September 2010 will further erode faith in the political system. The lack of security makes it impossible to hold credible elections in at least half of Afghanistan. And in February 2010, Karzai seized control of the ECC (Electoral Complaints Commission); there is no longer an independent institution to validate the process.

Aside from fraud and corruption, Karzai's lack of legitimacy is linked to his presumed lack of autonomy vis-à-vis the coalition. Internal U.S. Army studies, and the experiences of numerous journalists and researchers indicate that a majority of the population in combat zones now considers the foreign forces as occupiers. Military operations are polarizing the population against foreign forces and further weakening Karzai's regime, which appears irreparably unpopular and illegitimate. The coalition is perceived as the main provider of insecurity. Villagers do not want to see the establishment of coalition outposts that can bring only bombings and IEDs.

Furthermore, the coalition is hurt by the dependence of Karzai on his local allies, who generally oppose the coalition's objectives. The coalition is also undermined when the Afghan government aggressively distances itself from the coalition when civilians are killed by "friendly fire."

The failed Karzai government

The government in Kabul is now too weak to reassert control over the periphery of the country. As a result, the coalition is increasingly dependent on local strongmen who it helped put in place or with whom it has worked.

The weakening of the Afghan regime is very bad news for the coalition, which is promoting Afghanization in order to reduce its own investment. It is hard to build a military that is independent of the institutional network that constitutes the state. Problems such as ethnic tensions, local and national corruption, and the lack of a clear purpose make it hard to motivate soldiers and officers.

The coalition should recognize that an autonomous Afghan army is a very distant goal. The coalition's large offensive to "clear" Taliban territory will not work, because the Afghan army and the police are not ready. If the coalition tries to secure Taliban territory on a long-term basis, it will overstretch itself and casualties will increase significantly.

Modest objectives would be more realistic. Most observers recognize the impossibility of a military solution. Nonetheless, different arguments have been put forward to reject negotiations. First, the coalition needs more time. Reinforcements are not yet fully in place, so talk of failure is premature. Second, experts such as Pakistani journalist Ahmed Rashid explain that the Taliban have reached the height of their influence, implying that the coalition would be in a stronger position in the future.

One can counter that the coalition should begin negotiations now while it still has the means to exert military pressure. There is nothing to indicate that the Taliban are going to slow their advance. They are pursuing a strategy that includes expanding their influence in the cities. And nothing indicates that the Karzai regime won't be even weaker a year from now.

COIN 🡪 Instability

Counter-insurgency efforts can’t stabilize Afghanistan the surge strategy empowers warlords and fractures the state this offers a geostrategic advantage to Iran

Simon and Stevenson, Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and Professor of Strategic Studies at the US Naval War College, 2009

“Afghanistan: How Much is Enough?”, Survival, 51: 5, 47 — 67

Accessed via University of Kansas June 24, 2010

Counter-insurgency in Afghanistan also would probably fail. Counter- insurgency generally works only when the domestic government resisting the insurgents enjoys the respect and support of most of the domestic population. Rising perceptions of Hamid Karzai’s government as ineffectual and corrupt, and especially suspicions that it rigged the 20 August national election, indicate that it does not have that kind of credibility among Afghans. On the operational level, provisional and qualified counter-insurgency success in Iraq is not a persuasive precedent for a comparable result in Afghanistan. One indirect indication is the difficulty the Obama administration is having in figuring out how to measure such success.7 While Iraq’s prime insurgency challenges were essentially compartmentalised in the confined space and among the relatively small populations of Anbar, Diyala and Ninewah provinces and in Baghdad, Afghanistan’s hazards permeate its Texas- sized national territory. Thus, applying the surge formula to Afghanistan, however it is adjusted, is likely to empower warlords, increase factionalism and ultimately make Afghanistan harder to sustain as a functioning unitary state. This would make Afghanistan more susceptible to being used as a strategic pawn by a number of regional actors, including Iran as well as India and Pakistan.

COIN 🡪 Instability

The nature of the COIN strategy is violent and intrusive – execution of the strategy only emboldens and increases recruitment for the insurgency

Bandow, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, 2009

Doug Bandow is a senior fellow athe Cato Institute. He is a former special assistant to President Reagan and the author of several books, including Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire. Cato Institute: “Recognizing the Limits of American Power in Afghanistan” October 31, 2009 http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=10924

An essential aspect of this strategy, however, is withdrawing allied troops, since many Afghan fighters are determined to resist any foreign occupiers. A continuing occupation, no matter how well-intentioned from our perspective, will generate "more casualties, irritation and recruitment for the Taliban," in the words of Nicholas Kristof.

In fact, the longer more U.S. forces remain, the harder more insurgents will resist. In 2007, for instance, 27 often feuding groups coalesced in Pakistan in response to U.S. airstrikes. In Afghanistan the population has not turned on the Taliban the way Iraqis turned on the al-Qaeda. Lt. Col. Daniel L. Davis, who served in both Afghanistan and Iraq, advocated a U.S. withdrawal over the next 18 months: "Many experts in and from Afghanistan warn that our presence over the past eight years has already hardened a meaningful percentage of the population into viewing the United States as an army of occupation which should be opposed and resisted."

Unfortunately, there are limits to Washington's ability to ameliorate this result. Argued Hugh Gusterson, of George Mason University: "The Pentagon will try to minimize the insult through cultural sensitivity training and new doctrines that emphasize befriending the locals, but they will fail because it's in the very nature of counterinsurgency that occupying forces must be intrusive to be effective. And when you have thousands of foreign troops being shot at, accidents and atrocities happen. The more such troops you have, the more accidents and atrocities you get."

COIN 🡪 Instability

Enhanced COIN operations fail – they radicalize the population and increase security vulnerabilities for populations throughout the country – transitioning to a CT strategy solves

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

FIXING A FAILED STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/dorronsoro_fixing_failed_strategy2.pdf>

On its current trajectory, how is the Afghan war likely to play out? Within a few years, mounting casualties will likely turn public opinion against the war and force a European, then an American, withdrawal; the Karzai regime—illegitimate and too weak to combat a nationwide insurgency alone—will collapse, and the Taliban will resume power following civil war in the North. This worst-case scenario is more likely than ever, given the accelerated deterioration of the country’s security situation. The window of opportunity for a radical shift in International Coalition policy to avoid defeat has been seriously shortened by the loss of the Pashtun belt, the mounting insurgency in the North, and the penetration of the insurgency into most of the towns in the South and East.

More resources will not shift the momentum, and one should not confuse a flawed strategy with a lack of troops. The failure of the U.S.– British operations in Helmand province (July–August 2009) is a clear indication that the new population-centric counterinsurgency strategy of “shape, clear, hold, and build” does not work; it is unrealistic to assume that the Coalition will be able to regain ground against the insurgency in the Pashtun countryside. More resources cannot rectify a wrong strategy. While there are calls to double the number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan, that would not be enough to take back the rural districts from the Taliban and seal the border (a precondition for success).1

Without a different strategy, reinforcements would be not only useless, but also counterproductive. An increase in the number of troops would fuel the opposition of the Afghan population, which would likely view the presence of more foreign troops as a military occupation. Spiraling violence and casualty rates are already encouraging polarization and exacerbating violence. Comparisons with the Iraqi surge are simply wrong, mostly because there can be no “surge” when troops are deployed in an open-ended way. The Coalition’s communiqués stating that the foreign presence will go on for two generations—intended to reassure the Afghan partner—are massive diplomatic blunders in a country where feelings toward outsiders are ambivalent at best. In addition, more troops mean more casualties, and more casualties would further alienate public opinion in the United States and Europe. After the Canadians and the Dutch, who will soon withdraw from fighting, it is clear that some European countries are looking for a way out. At the same time, it is increasingly difficult to publicly support the discredited Karzai regime and the rationale for the war, especially because al-Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan. The current strategy, which is based on expecting quick results, especially with regard to the Afghan National Army, is unrealistic and self-defeating. It is simply not feasible to transform a (mostly illiterate) force of 60,0002 into a well- functioning army of 250,000 in only a few years, regardless of outside assistance. Afghanization—enabling Afghans to take primary responsibility for their security—could potentially take a decade. Lower casualties should be a recognized objective of a new strategy, and the debate should be more about the assessment of the current strategy than about troop numbers. The United States must reallocate its limited resources to correspond with its interests.

What exactly are the U.S. interests in this war? The Taliban are not threatening Western countries. The war in Afghanistan does not make the United States safer; on the contrary, the current conflict is strengthening radical networks that have a global agenda. The only logical link between fighting al-Qaeda and fighting the Taliban is that, if the insurgency takes the cities, al-Qaeda could have a sanctuary and shift part of its operations from Pakistan to Afghanistan. To avoid that situation, the Coalition needs to secure the urban centers in the East and South and help build an Afghan partner that is capable of fighting and containing the insurgency. It does not mean that the control of the border will be perfect or that the Taliban will be defeated.

The alternative strategy I suggest is based on protection of urban centers, reallocation of aid to urban centers and relatively peaceful districts, and more aggressive counterinsurgency in the northern provinces. This strategy does not require more resources. It lowers the level of casualties and gives the Coalition more time to Afghanize the war. In addition, the focus on cities and the end of large-scale offensives, like the one in Helmand province, would mean more acceptance from the population. If the Afghan government is able to keep the major cities and towns in the South and East, al-Qaeda will not consider Afghanistan as a sanctuary, first because al-Qaeda requires modern communication technology and infrastructure of urban areas to prepare international operations, and second because of the threat of counterterrorism operations. This new direction lays the groundwork for de-escalation of the conflict in Afghanistan and allows the United States to focus its resources on the real threat, al-Qaeda.

COIN 🡪 Instability

Focus on COIN has increased Taliban recruitment

Dorronsoro, scholar at the Carnegie Endowment expert on Afghanistan, 2009

Gilles Dorronsoro, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, is an expert on Afghanistan, Turkey, and South Asia. His research focuses on security and political development in Afghanistan, particularly the role of the International Security Assistance Force, the necessary steps for a viable government in Kabul, and the conditions necessary for withdrawal scenarios.

Previously, Dorronsoro was a professor of political science at the Sorbonne, Paris and the Institute of Political Studies of Rennes. He also served as the scientific coordinator at the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, Turkey.

FIXING A FAILED STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/dorronsoro_fixing_failed_strategy2.pdf>

There are major consequences of the Helmand failure. First, most of the Afghans perceive the Taliban as victorious; despite the deployment of thousands of Coalition troops, the area cannot be secured. In McChrystal’s own words:

The reason I believe we need to be successful is as we have come in and talked about fighting this war with a more coin [counterinsurgency]–focused strategy. (...) I think it is important that everybody’s watching. I don’t mean just in the United States or Europe—the Taliban is watching, the people of Afghanistan are watching. If we make a public commitment to effective [counterinsurgency] ops ... it is important we be true to what we said in the first most visible example of that.13

Second, the fight for Helmand has motivated others to join the Taliban both there and in other provinces. Their foreign status does not rile the local population because they target foreign troops. Meanwhile, mounting Coalition casualties continue to turn Western public opinion against the war—a trend that seems difficult to reverse. One hundred and thirty-two soldiers died in Helmand in 2009 (from January 1 to October 19), almost a third of the total.

COIN 🡪 Instability Pakistan

Surging large amounts of troops into Afghanistan causes US-Pakistan war – Pakistan cooperation with US COIN directly undermines its ability to maintain domestic stability

Akhtar, IR prof @ Karachi University, 2010

“Pakistan's Instability: The US War Factor: Analyzing The US War Impact on Pakistan's National Security”

[http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?c=Article\_C&cid=1262372328640&pagename=Zone-English-Muslim\_Affairs/MAELayout#\*\*1](http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?c=Article_C&cid=1262372328640&pagename=Zone-English-Muslim_Affairs/MAELayout#**1), January 26, 2010, date accessed: 7/26/2010

Pakistan's National Interest

Islamabad has adopted double standards in dealing with the Baluchistan militants and the Pashtun militants. In this emerging security environment, Pakistan will have to be content with its role as a junior partner of India. Therefore, the sooner Islamabad extricates itself from the US "war on terror," the better it is for its security and independence.

Doesn't Islamabad realize that its military operation against the militants would leave its border with India vulnerable to a New Delhi offensive? If Pakistan permits the US to attack the suspected training centers of militants on its territory, will it be able to prevent India from doing so?

With Islamabad embroiled in internecine strife, it cannot negotiate with India from a position of strength. It may be forced to make a compromise that might be detrimental to its national interest.

Pakistan's preoccupation with tribal rebellion would not permit it to deal with separatist ethnic forces in Baluchistan. Undoubtedly, this is a threat to the territorial integrity of Pakistan.

After the total failure of the military operation in Baluchistan, the federal government has come round to the painful conclusion that political and not military action can bring militancy to an end. Granting general amnesty to the dissidents and engaging them in a meaningful dialogue on contentious issues is a laudable initiative.

The same gesture should be made to the militants in the tribal areas. But Islamabad has adopted double standards in dealing with the Baluchistan militants and the Pashtun militants, as if there were good militants and bad ones. This discriminatory policy would intensify the Pashtun insurgency and might drive them toward even more escalation.

The rulers have seen the consequences of military operations in the former East Pakistan, Baluchistan, Karachi, Sind, and FATA (federally administered tribal areas). If anything, the situation has only worsened. The surge of US troops, the expansion of war beyond the borders of Afghanistan, and the attacks on Quetta and Muridke as envisaged by Obama's new strategy would mean that US troops are at war with the people of Pakistan.

Any Solution?

The Obama Administration would be better advised to concentrate on its exit strategy, and to that end, it is imperative that it involve the UN in its peace-making efforts aimed at the establishment of a broad-based government in Afghanistan, because the Karzai Government has no legitimacy.

To fill the vacuum, the UN peacekeeping force, made up of troops of states not involved in the Afghan war, may be deployed until a government of national unity is able to assume full responsibility. Here the US can contribute to the postwar reconstruction of Afghanistan under the aegis of the UN.

The insurgency in the tribal region is the spillover effect of US military occupation of Afghanistan, but Pakistan faces a far greater threat: the threat of ethnic violence as manifested in the bloody clashes among various linguistic groups in urban and rural Sind. These have been overshadowed by the counterinsurgency operations in FATA, but they may erupt at any moment, thus destabilizing the state.

The problem of ethnicity shall have priority over all other matters, lest there might be a disastrous implosion some day. Baluchistan is a case in point: The need of the hour is to provide a credible guarantee for the preservation of the province's language, culture, and tradition in a participatory federal democracy.

Presence Undermines Democracy

U.S. forces reinforce corrupt officials and the illegitimate Karzai regime – Karzai will never gain capital within Afghanistan this means there is no alterative to the insurgency for Afghans

Traub 2010 Foreign Policy, “COIN Toss: Is Hamid Karzai worth the fight in Afghanistan? We'd better learn the answer soon -- or give up the counterinsurgency game”

James Traub is a contributing writer for The New York Times Magazine, where he has worked since 1998. From 1994 to 1997, he was a staff writer for The New Yorker.

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/06/29/coin\_toss

In cashiering McChrystal, Obama said that Gen. David Petraeus will pursue the same policy as his predecessor. I hope that's not true; I hope that when Petraeus undertakes his own review he'll conclude that the military tail is wagging the civilian dog. U.S. and NATO troops continue to rely for security and logistical support on some of the most brutal and venal figures in Afghanistan, thus securing short-term advantage at the cost of deepening the alienation of the Afghan people. How can Karzai be pressed to move against corruption if U.S. forces are themselves reinforcing it? And Karzai must be pressed to release his death grip on political power, allowing parliament and the courts to exercise authority and accepting that power must be decentralized in a country with a long tradition of local autonomy. If ordinary Afghans are to take real risks to defend the state from the Taliban, then the government they directly experience has to be empowered -- which is another reason why Karzai must first replace some of the worst actors at the local level.

Can Petraeus, whose dickering with members of Iraq's Sunni Awakening movement shows a flair for negotiation, push Karzai to make concessions he apparently doesn't believe in? That could be a Sisyphean effort. The only way to persuade Karzai to buy into NATO's war is probably to agree to buy in to his, which is to say the effort to persuade Taliban commanders to put down their arms, join the government, and thus preserve Karzai's own position. The carrot might have to be paired with a stick: If Karzai remains intransigent over the next six months or so, the United States will have to accept that the counterinsurgency effort cannot succeed and begin an earlier withdrawal of troops. Petraeus is probably the wrong man for such a messy, fluid, fragile deal. It's the kind of bargain those mealy-mouthed politicians McChrystal and his team despised are so good at striking.

Presence Undermines Democracy

Withdrawal promotes genuine democratic transition – allows enfranchisement of all Afghan ethnicities

Margolis, political science author, 2009

Eric Margolis is contributing foreign editor for Sun National Media Canada. He is the author of War at the Top of the World and the new book, American Raj: Liberation or Domination?: Resolving the Conflict Between the West and the Muslim World.

“How to Bring Peace to Afghanistan” <http://www.lewrockwell.com/margolis/margolis161.html> August 25, 2009

An election held under the guns of a foreign occupation army cannot be called legitimate or democratic. That’s a basic tenet of international law.

Nevertheless, the US and its NATO allies have been lauding last week’s faux presidential elections in Afghanistan as both a sign of growing support for Hamid Karzai’s Western-backed government and the birth of democracy in Afghanistan.

In reality, the carefully stage-managed vote in Afghanistan for candidates chosen by Western powers is unlikely to bring either peace or democracy to this wretched nation that has suffered thirty years of nonstop war.

On the contrary, American generals have intensified warnings that the military situation in Afghanistan is rapidly "deteriorating" and are calling for yet more troops in addition to the recent major manpower increase authorized by President Barack Obama. Sixty-eight thousand US combat troops, 40,000 NATO soldiers, and 75,000 mercenaries are apparently not enough.

Welcome to Vietnam Mission Creep, Part II.

Taliban and its nationalist allies rejected last week’s vote as a fraud designed to validate continued foreign occupation and open the way for Western oil and gas pipelines. Taliban, which speaks for many of Afghanistan’s majority Pashtun, said it would only join a national election when US and NATO troops withdraw.

Charges of a rigged election are unfortunately correct. All parties were banned from the supposedly "free election." Only candidates who favored continued US and NATO occupation ran. The US paid for the elections and advertising, funded the Election Commission, and spread around large amounts of largesse to tribal warlords. Foreign observers reported extensive fraud and vote rigging.

Enfranchisement of Pashtun tribes is a prerequisite to stability

Margolis, political science author, 2009

Eric Margolis is contributing foreign editor for Sun National Media Canada. He is the author of War at the Top of the World and the new book, American Raj: Liberation or Domination?: Resolving the Conflict Between the West and the Muslim World.

“How to Bring Peace to Afghanistan” <http://www.lewrockwell.com/margolis/margolis161.html> August 25, 2009

Compared to this predetermined vote, Iran’s recent elections look almost Swiss by comparison. Afghan elections run by the Soviets in 1986 and 1987 were fairer and more open: opposition parties were allowed to run.

After all the pre-election hoopla in Afghanistan, to paraphrase Omar Khayyam, we come out the same door we went in.

Election results won’t be in for two weeks. But the winner will be whomever Washington decides is to be its man in Kabul.

That will likely be Hamid Karzai or Northern Alliance front-man, Dr. Abdullah Abdullah. The Obama administration is fed up with Hamid Karzai and mutters about dumping him, but can’t find an acceptable alternative. Abdullah, with his close links to Iran and Russia, makes Washington nervous.

What the US would really like is a new version of the late Najibullah, the iron-fisted strongman who ran Afghanistan for the Soviets.

The Western powers have marketed the Afghan War to their voters by claiming it is all about democracy, women’s rights, education and nation building. President Barack Obama claims the US is in Afghanistan to fight Al-Qaida. But Al-Qaida barely exists. Its handful of members long ago decamped to Pakistan.

This war is really about oil pipeline routes and Western domination of the energy-rich Caspian Basin. And of course pressure on Obama from the right that the US cannot afford to lose a second war under his command.

Afghanistan’s Pashtun tribes, who make up 55% of the population, remain excluded from power. Afghanistan is a three-legged ethnic stool. Take away the Pashtun leg and stability is impossible.

There will be neither peace nor stability in Afghanistan until the Pashtun majority is enfranchised. This means dealing directly with Taliban, which is part of the Pashtun people.

Presence Undermines Democracy

Escalating COIN operations in support of Karzai undermines U.S. democratic legitimacy

Corn, phd and state department analyst, 2009

Dr. Tony Corn is the author of “World War IV as Fourth-Generation Warfare” (Policy Review, January 2006). He is currently on leave from the State Department and writing a book on The Long War. This article is a follow-up to “The Art of Declaring Victory and Going Home: Strategic Communication and the Management of Expectations” published in Small Wars Journal on September 18, 2009.

Small Wars Journal: “Toward a Kilcullen-Biden Plan? Bounding Counterinsurgency in Afghanistan”

<http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/312-corn.pdf>, 2009

“Counterinsurgency is 80 percent political, 20 percent military.” As simplistic as it might be, the standard formula still provides the best point of departure for assessing the Afghan situation since the August 20 elections.

When, on March 17, the Obama Administration agreed to a 17,000 troop surge, the goal was clearly to create a more secure environment for the upcoming August 20 elections. COIN expert David Kilcullen himself argued at the time that "it would be the height of folly to commit to a large-scale escalation now,” and that the U.S. should simply use the extra 17,000 troops to stabilize the situation, but delay the big decision about escalation until after Afghanistan's presidential election in August.6

As it turned out, this limited surge ended up being a relative failure - on election day there were reportedly more than 400 Taliban attacks and, as a result, voter turnout was only 39 percent (compared to 70 percent in 2004).7

More importantly, given the extent of the fraud, the August 20 election turned out to be an even bigger political failure which - though anticipated by some U.S. policy analysts8 - clearly took by surprise an American political class focused on domestic issues.

If counterinsurgency is eighty percent political, twenty percent military, the logical point of departure of any discussion on Afghanistan ought to be the Galbraith report of October 4-19, rather than the McChrystal report of August 30. The report of the recently-fired number two of the UN Mission (UNAMA) deals mostly with political matters, and constitutes the most recent first-hand account available; the report of the ISAF Commander deals mostly with military matters, and was written long before the full-extent of the fraud had become public knowledge.9

At the end of his detailed testimony on the fraud and obfuscation that occurred before, during and after the August elections, Ambassador Peter Galbraith concludes unequivocally: “President Obama needs a legitimate Afghan partner to make any new strategy for the country work. However, the extensive fraud that took place on August 20 virtually guarantees that a government emerging from the tainted vote will not be credible with many Afghans.”10

“Politics is perception.” Irrespective of the final verdict of the electoral commissions and/or the rhetorical contortions of NATO leaders, the elections are by now perceived as illegitimate by the Afghan population at large. If the Obama Administration has so far kept a low profile on this all-important issue, it is presumably because it did not want to confront the UN mission to Afghanistan before the UN Security Council’s decision to extend ISAF’s mandate for another year (October 8).

Now that NATO’s mandate has been extended and that the UN itself has (obliquely) acknowledged the magnitude of the electoral fraud, the worst mistake the U.S. and NATO allies could do would be to downplay the legitimacy problem, and to signal a willingness to continue to do business as usual with the “devil we know.” By condoning in Afghanistan the kind of fraud it condemned four months earlier in Iran, the West would not buttress Karzai’s legitimacy - it would simply, irremediably, undermine its own legitimacy in the eyes of the Afghan population.

Though hundreds of tribal leaders and officials from southern Afghanistan gathered in Kabul on September 2 to protest against the fraud, President Karzai, like the Bourbons of lore, appears to have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. The fact that Karzai has gone as far as to blame the fraud investigation (rather than the fraud itself) for the increase in violence and the decrease of foreign investment (how do you say chutzpah in Pashto?) only shows that he has lost touch with reality and that a coalition government cannot be a sustainable proposition in the long-term.

The Karzai problem is now bigger than the insurgency problem, and the insurgency problem itself remains bigger than the ISAF problem. As the ISAF Commander, General McChrystal, to be sure, could not but devote special attention to the performance of its troops (“ISAF is not adequately executing the basics of counterinsurgency warfare”), but ISAF is twenty percent of the equation at most. As David Kilcullen put it:

Counterinsurgency is only as good as the government it supports. NATO could do everything right - it isn’t - but will still fail unless Afghans trust their government. Without essential reform, merely making the government more efficient or extending its reach will just make things worse. Only a legitimately elected Afghan president can enact reforms, so at the very least we need to see a genuine run-off election or an emergency national council, called a loya jirga, before winter. Once a legitimate president emerges we need to see immediate action from him on a publicly announced reform program, developed in consultation with Afghan society and enforced by international monitors. Reforms should include firing human rights abusers and drug traffickers, establishing an independent authority to investigate citizen complaints and requiring officials to live in the districts they are responsible for (fewer than half do).11

Of the two possible scenarios put forward by Kilcullen, the first one (a genuine run-off) does not appear to be a possibility in the short-term. As Galbraith pointed out - “by itself, a runoff is no antidote for Afghanistan's electoral challenges. The widespread problems that allowed for fraud in the first round of voting must be addressed,” and these systemic problems cannot be solved before the winter season. Even if they could, voter turnout, given current security conditions, could be even lower than 39 percent - thus imparting little legitimacy to the ultimate winner.