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NEGATIVE PHILOSOPHY

Unilateral withdrawal is not victory

Dr. James Carafano 2014. (graduate of West Point; master's degree and doctorate from Georgetown Univ; master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; adjunct professor at Georgetown Univ and the Institute of World Politics and has served as a visiting professor at National Defense University; previously served as an assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point) Learn from Iraq: don’t abandon Afghanistan 30 Mar 2014 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2014/3/learn-from-iraq-dont-abandon-afghanistan>

Former secretary of state, national security adviser and Nobel Peace Prize winner Henry Kissinger is, by all measures, a foreign policy heavy weight. At a recent black-tie dinner, he stood—stoop-shouldered and peering imperiously over his signature thick, black-frame glasses—and remarked: “Unilateral withdrawal is not victory.”

Criterion for US troop presence in Afghanistan should be National Security – not an artificial deadline

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) 27 May 2014 Obama Just Set a New Timeline for Withdrawing Troops from Afghanistan. Why That’s a Mistake. <http://dailysignal.com/2014/05/27/obama-just-set-new-timeline-withdrawing-troops-afghanistan-thats-mistake/>

It doesn’t make sense to put a timeline on the U.S. troop commitment to the country. The number of troops and the duration of their presence in Afghanistan should be driven by national security imperatives, not the president’s desire for a particular political legacy.

Artificial deadline for withdrawal means all our sacrifices could be in vain

Dr. Kim R. Holmes 2014. (PhD history from Georgetown Univ.; Distinguished Fellow at The Heritage Foundation; former research fellow at the Institute for European History in Germany and former adjunct professor of European security and history at Georgetown Univ; former assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs in G.W. Bush adminstration) 16 June 2014 When war-weariness leads to more war <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2014/6/when-war-weariness-leads-to-more-war>

By withdrawing from Afghanistan on a timetable dictated by politics, not military conditions on the ground, we are leaving our friends to their own fate. This implies not only that the original purpose of fighting the war — i.e., preventing safe havens for terrorists who can kill us — was not worth it, but also that all our sacrifices could be in vain.

REVERSE ADVOCACY

Afghan tribal elders support US troop presence. The only ones who oppose it are the Taliban

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) 11 Feb 2014 How to Ensure That a U.S. Troop Drawdown Does Not Destabilize Afghanistan <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2014/02/how-to-ensure-that-a-us-troop-drawdown-does-not-destabilize-afghanistan>

It is now clear that Karzai is sabotaging his own country’s future. A formal assembly of Afghanistan’s tribal elders urged him to sign the BSA [bilateral security agreement] late last year, and nearly all of the electoral candidates for the April elections have expressed their support for maintaining a residual U.S. force presence. The only entity that supports Karzai’s refusal to sign the BSA is the Taliban, which has long called for the ouster of all international forces from the country.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

“Afghan military incompetent” – Response: It’s doing better but cannot make progress without US support

Dr. James Carafano 2014. (graduate of West Point; master's degree and doctorate from Georgetown Univ; master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; adjunct professor at Georgetown Univ and the Institute of World Politics and has served as a visiting professor at National Defense University; previously served as an assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point) 22 July 2014 American Diplomacy: Between a "Soft" and a "Hard" Place <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2014/7/american-diplomacy-between-a-soft-and-a-hard-place>

In Kabul, Kerry avoided both the pitfalls of poor diplomacy. A deal was certainly doable. Both Abdullah Abdullah and Ashraf Ghani are Western educated. They want to keep the United States and other allies engaged in the country. The last thing either man wants is to be left standing alone, between the warlords and the Taliban. Furthermore, they still need the United States. The Afghan military is performing better and more consistently than expected. Compared to the Iraqi military, they look like the Army of the Potomac at Appomattox. But there is little chance that progress could be sustained without coalition support.

US forces need to stay on in Afghanistan to help peace & stability take hold

Dr. James Carafano 2014. (graduate of West Point; master's degree and doctorate from Georgetown Univ; master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; adjunct professor at Georgetown Univ and the Institute of World Politics and has served as a visiting professor at National Defense University; previously served as an assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point) Learn from Iraq: don’t abandon Afghanistan 30 Mar 2014 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2014/3/learn-from-iraq-dont-abandon-afghanistan>

The Obama administration’s Afghan strategy is a virtual carbon copy of its withdrawal from Iraq. It assumes that once the imminent threat of the collapse of the regime has passed, it’s OK to head for the exit. But absence of imminent failure is a poor criterion for declaring victory—no better than George W. Bush’s unfortunate high-five under the “Mission Accomplished” banner after the initial invasion of Iraq. That’s not to say that the United States should plan major, unending commitments to a country after a fight. But once the levels of violence have come down, some further commitment is usually necessary to help peace and stability become “the new normal” and let good governance takes root.

Counterinsurgency strategy is working, and it’s the only way to deny safe haven to terrorists in Afghanistan

Dr. Frederick W. Kagan, Dr. Kimberly Kagan, Jeffrey Dressler and Carl Forsberg 2011. (Frederick Kagan is the director of the Critical Threats Project at the American Enterprise Institute; PhD in Rusian/Soviet military history; former professor of military history at the U.S. Military Academy. Kimberly Kagan is president of the Institute for the Study of War; PhD in history; served on Afghanistan commander Gen. Stanley McChrystal's strategic assessment team. Dressler and Forsberg are research analysts at the Institute for the Study of War.) “Defining Success in Afghanistan” <http://www.understandingwar.org/sites/default/files/DefiningSuccessinAfghanistanElectronicVersion.pdf>

It is not possible to deny safe haven to terrorists in Afghanistan without also pursuing a counterinsurgency strategy. The neutralization and ultimate defeat of the insurgency is a necessary prerequisite for preventing the return of al Qaeda and other transnational terrorist groups that thrive in the political vacuum that the insurgency creates. As long as local networks willing to support extremists exist and can operate freely in Afghanistan, terrorists will be able to use those networks however intense our direct-action operations might be. The current counterinsurgency strategy is the only approach that can disrupt and ultimately eliminate those local networks, thereby preventing the terrorists from returning to Afghanistan and ensuring that America achieves its vital national security objectives.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Al Qaeda terrorism.

Link: Without US military presence, CIA operations must shut down and counterterrorism efforts suffer

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) 27 May 2014 Obama Just Set a New Timeline for Withdrawing Troops from Afghanistan. Why That’s a Mistake. <http://dailysignal.com/2014/05/27/obama-just-set-new-timeline-withdrawing-troops-afghanistan-thats-mistake/>

It is no secret that some White House officials, namely Vice President Joe Biden, favor leaving a very minimal presence of around 1,000 troops. But recent credible reporting has made it clear that such a small troop presence would be detrimental to U.S. national security. According to an article that ran earlier this month in the Los Angeles Times, U.S. intelligence officials are drawing down their operations in Afghanistan along with the military draw down. They say that without forward operating bases and logistical support from the U.S. military, the CIA will be unable to sustain its operational tempo in the country. Without a robust intelligence presence in Afghanistan, U.S. counterterrorism efforts will suffer.

Link: Leaving some troops in Afghanistan after 2014 would allow us to disrupt Al Qaeda

Andrew Exum 2012. (fellow at the Center for a New American Security. He is a U.S. Army veteran of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan) 3 Apr 2012 “Some Troops Will Stay Past 2014” NEW YORK TIMES <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/04/03/should-the-us-leave-afghanistan-now/some-troops-will-have-to-stay-past-2014>

The U.S. military can continue to carry out the president’s policy -- which is to disrupt, dismantle and defeat al-Qaeda -- with smaller numbers of troops in Afghanistan. Special operations forces can continue to degrade the leadership of Afghanistan’s insurgent groups on the one hand while providing training and assistance to Afghan government forces on the other hand. The war, then, is not so much ending as transitioning to a period in which U.S. forces hope to fight by, with and through their Afghan allies -- rather than against the Taliban on their own.

Brink: We can successfully defeat Al Qaeda but only if we don’t give up the fight in Afghanistan

Jamie Fly 2012. (M.A. in German and European Studies from Georgetown University; former Director for Counterproliferation Strategy at the National Security Council in the GWBush administration) Apr 2012 Reclaiming the Moral Case for Afghanistan , COMMENTARY magazine <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/reclaiming-the-moral-case-for-afghanistan/>

In other words, the moral case for Afghanistan is not only a matter of our being virtuous for the sake of virtue. Because we increasingly have the heretofore neglected population on our side, we can still win. As a result of the heroic efforts of coalition forces, al-Qaeda has largely been forced to relocate to the tribal areas of Pakistan or outposts in Yemen and Somalia. Still, the Afghan government’s stability is threatened as Taliban forces struggle to retake many districts. They can be stopped. But only if our leaders give our troops free reign to do so and avoid the temptation to give up the fight.

Impact: Global terrorist threat. Historical example: Iraq after US pullout – would happen in Afghanistan too

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) 27 May 2014 Obama Just Set a New Timeline for Withdrawing Troops from Afghanistan. Why That’s a Mistake. <http://dailysignal.com/2014/05/27/obama-just-set-new-timeline-withdrawing-troops-afghanistan-thats-mistake/>

It is vital that the U.S. partner for as long as necessary with the Afghans to [prevent a Taliban resurgence](http://www.c-span.org/video/?318719-1/us-afghanistan-relations), which is fundamental to combating the global terrorist threat. We have seen the impact of the U.S. completely withdrawing from Iraq, where al-Qaeda has made a comeback. While Obama’s pledge to leave nearly 10,000 troops post 2014 is better than leaving fewer, his timeline for their withdrawal is disappointing news for Afghanistan and U.S. counterterrorism efforts in the region.

Impact: Global terrorism

Fawzia Koofi 2012. (a woman candidate for the Afghan presidential elections in 2014) April 2012, NEW YORK TIMES, Dark Days If the U.S. Left Now <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/04/03/should-the-us-leave-afghanistan-now/dark-days-would-return-if-the-us-left-now>

If the West abandons Afghanistan once again our country will become a playground for global terrorism and a risk to the world. I understand the pressure on President Obama to pull out of an unpopular war at a time of economic crisis. But by pulling out now we risk undoing all the fragile gains of the last 11 years.

Impact: Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan means attack on another big Western city

Dr. Frederick W. Kagan 2012. (PhD in Russian/Soviet military history; former professor of military history at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point; resident scholar and the director of the Critical Threats Project at the American Enterprise Institute) 3 Apr 2012 Al Qaeda Allies Remain Strong, NEW YORK TIMES <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/04/03/should-the-us-leave-afghanistan-now/al-qaeda-allies-remain-to-be-defeated-in-the-east>

Ryan Crocker, the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, recently told The Telegraph, “Al-Qaeda is still present in Afghanistan. If the West decides that 10 years in Afghanistan is too long then they will be back, and the next time it will not be New York or Washington, it will be another big Western city.”

2. Afghan Democracy at Risk

Link: US mission in Afghan is successfully building democracy – we should not give up

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) Afghan election: After encouraging turnout, Obama must stick with support for war-torn country, 8 Apr 2014 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2014/4/afghan-election-after-encouraging-turnout-obama-must-stick-with-support-for-war-torn-country>

American support for the war in Afghanistan is abysmally low at less than 20 percent. Reports of widespread Afghan government corruption, the persistence of Taliban safe havens in Pakistan, and President Karzai’s ranting against U.S. policy have led to calls for the U.S. to end the mission there altogether. But Saturday’s elections should restore a measure of optimism about Afghanistan’s future. The high turnout in the face of Taliban threats and violence should remind Americans why the U.S. went to war in the first place and what’s at stake if we give up on the mission prematurely.

Impact: Democratic elections are key to civil rights for women and minorities in Afghanistan

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) Afghan election: After encouraging turnout, Obama must stick with support for war-torn country, 8 Apr 2014 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2014/4/afghan-election-after-encouraging-turnout-obama-must-stick-with-support-for-war-torn-country>

This election and continued U.S. engagement in the country is particularly important for women and ethnic minorities. Unlike when the Taliban ruled the country and prevented women from attending school, let alone participating in the politics and economic life of the country, one of the election candidates, Zalmay Rassoul, included a woman vice president on his ticket. The other two top presidential contenders, former Afghan Foreign Minister Dr. Abdullah Abdullah and former Afghan Finance Minister Dr. Ashraf Ghani Ahmadzai, also are committed to democratic values and experienced in dealing with western officials.

3. Taliban resurgence

Link: US should not pull out of Afghanistan – we need to block a Taliban resurgence

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) Afghan election: After encouraging turnout, Obama must stick with support for war-torn country, 8 Apr 2014 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2014/4/afghan-election-after-encouraging-turnout-obama-must-stick-with-support-for-war-torn-country>

Now is not the time for the U.S. to give up on the Afghan mission and turn its back on the country. Instead, it should reinvigorate its commitment to fund and train the Afghan security forces. The White House should also state clearly its commitment to leaving a substantial troop presence of at least 10,000 forces, assuming the new Afghan President signs the BSA. While Karzai’s position on the BSA was irresponsible and unforgiveable, the Obama administration also sent mixed messages on the number of troops it was prepared to leave behind. The global terrorist threat is evolving, not dissipating. It is vital that the U.S. work to prevent a Taliban resurgence. The Afghans have demonstrated their determination to build a democratic country and willingness to defy the Taliban in doing so. The U.S. must show it is fully behind them.

Impact: Brutal repression for Afghan women under the Taliban

Jamie Fly 2012. (M.A. in German and European Studies from Georgetown University; former Director for Counterproliferation Strategy at the National Security Council in the GWBush administration) Apr 2012 Reclaiming the Moral Case for Afghanistan , COMMENTARY magazine <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/reclaiming-the-moral-case-for-afghanistan/>

The Taliban enforced a strict morality code for both men and women, but women and girls bore the brunt of the most brutal repression. Women were prohibited from working outside the home except in certain fields and, in many cases, from leaving their homes unless accompanied by a close male relative. As the group Physicians for Human Rights noted the same year that Leno gave her briefing, “No other regime in the world has methodically and violently forced half of its population into virtual house arrest.” In addition to enforcement of laws requiring women to wear a burka completely covering their bodies, schools for girls were closed and basic health care was often denied. It is not surprising that such a moral wasteland came to serve as the staging ground for Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda as they planned the attacks of 9/11. Bin Laden’s ideology and that of his Taliban hosts sprang from the same vile swamp.

Impact: Horrific oppression of women by the Taliban

Jamie Fly 2012. (M.A. in German and European Studies from Georgetown University; former Director for Counterproliferation Strategy at the National Security Council in the GWBush administration) Apr 2012 Reclaiming the Moral Case for Afghanistan , COMMENTARY magazine <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/reclaiming-the-moral-case-for-afghanistan/>

In August 2010, after years of both military gains and setbacks, *Time* ran a cover story about an 18-year-old Afghan woman named Aisha. Her nose and ears had been cut off by a Taliban commander for having fled abusive in-laws. Provocatively titled “What Happens If We Leave Afghanistan,” the article and attendant images provoked a discussion about whether the United States was about to abandon the women and girls of Afghanistan to renewed oppression under the Taliban.

Impact: Lack of human rights = more likely to promote terrorism, because they don’t value human life

Jamie Fly 2012. (M.A. in German and European Studies from Georgetown University; former Director for Counterproliferation Strategy at the National Security Council in the GWBush administration) Apr 2012 Reclaiming the Moral Case for Afghanistan , COMMENTARY magazine <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/reclaiming-the-moral-case-for-afghanistan/>

An Afghanistan that does not protect the rights of women, children, and minorities would be a devastating failure for the United States. As Hillary Clinton noted back in 2001, “A post-Taliban Afghanistan where women’s rights are respected is much less likely to harbor terrorists in the future. Why? Because a society that values all its members, including women, is also likely to put a higher premium on life, opportunity, and freedom—values that run directly counter to the evil designs of the Osama bin Ladens of the world.”

4. Afghan Civil war

Link & Brink: The moment US troops leave, civil war could break out

Fawzia Koofi 2012. (a woman candidate for the Afghan presidential elections in 2014) April 2012, NEW YORK TIMES, Dark Days If the U.S. Left Now <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/04/03/should-the-us-leave-afghanistan-now/dark-days-would-return-if-the-us-left-now>

The moment United States troops leave, we risk being plunged back into the darkness of Taliban rule or even a civil war. Civil war is a distinct possibility because there are many progressive, democratic, peace loving people in my country who would rather die than see us return to those terrible days.

Link: Afghan civil war would allow Al Qaeda to flourish

Dr. Frederick W. Kagan 2012. (PhD in Russian/Soviet military history; former prof. of military history at U.S. Military Academy at West Point; resident scholar and the director of the Critical Threats Project at the American Enterprise Institute) 3 Apr 2012 Al Qaeda Allies Remain Strong, NEW YORK TIMES <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/04/03/should-the-us-leave-afghanistan-now/al-qaeda-allies-remain-to-be-defeated-in-the-east>

Our efforts in Afghanistan aim at preventing Al Qaeda’s return by preventing the Taliban and Haqqani Networks from gaining control of the Afghan state, as well as by preventing the lawlessness and civil war that allow Al Qaeda to flourish globally.

Impact: See DA #1. Al Qaeda resurgence = terrorism

5. National dishonor

Link: Abandoning the Afghan people would be dishonorable

Jamie Fly 2012. (M.A. in German and European Studies from Georgetown University; former Director for Counterproliferation Strategy at the National Security Council in the GWBush administration) Apr 2012 Reclaiming the Moral Case for Afghanistan , COMMENTARY magazine <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/reclaiming-the-moral-case-for-afghanistan/>

Similarly, recent decisions to downsize the Afghan security forces need to be reconsidered; and the administration needs to devote a renewed sense of urgency to negotiations with the Afghan government, not the Taliban, over a strategic partnership agreement that makes clear America’s long-term interests in the fate of Afghanistan and its people. American policymakers may very well decide to abandon the Afghan people, but few seem willing to admit how dishonorable that would be.

Link: Failing to defeat the Taliban would be dishonorable and do long-term damage to our national character

Jamie Fly 2012. (M.A. in German and European Studies from Georgetown University; former Director for Counterproliferation Strategy at the National Security Council in the GWBush administration) Apr 2012 Reclaiming the Moral Case for Afghanistan , COMMENTARY magazine <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/reclaiming-the-moral-case-for-afghanistan/>

On February 23, the *New York Times* ran an article with a headline that, in 2002, could have appeared only in a satirical paper such as the *Onion*: “Beheadings Raise Doubts That Taliban Have Changed.” The governing force in Afghanistan in the 1990s performed such beheadings, and bodily mutilations, and deadly stonings, in stadiums and compelled thousands to attend and watch. They are no different today. The moral and strategic imperatives in Afghanistan are one and the same: Defeat the Taliban. Any other course is not only harmful to our national interest but also dishonorable—and will do long-term damage to our national character.

Impact: Honor matters. Last time we lost national credibility, a lot of really bad things happened to our foreign policy

George Kourous 2000. (masters thesis for Master of Arts, International Affairs, Center for International Studies, Ohio Univ) SHADOW BOXING: International Credibility and U.S. Foreign Policy in the Cold War, (brackets and ellipses in original) <http://shadowboxing.kourous.net/2.international.pdf>

The image of the last American helicopters fleeing Saigon in 1975 made an indelible impression upon U.S. officials, who worried that America’s failure had worked “to weaken [allies] and embolden...adversaries,” one analyst observes. “[T]he effect was to raise serious doubts about the credibility of American power.” Kissinger later lamented that “[t]he collapse in 1975…ushered in a period of American humiliation, an unprecedented Soviet geopolitical offensive all over the globe, and pervasive insecurity, instability, and crisis.” And ten years after the fall of Saigon, Richard Nixon wrote that the   
defeat in Vietnam paralyzed America’s will to act in other Third World trouble spots and therefore encouraged aggression...Over the next five years, Soviet clients and proxy forces unleashed a geopolitical offensive that led to stunning reversals for the United States in virtually every region of the world, [for example] the fall one by one of Laos, Cambodia, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia, South Yemen and Nicaragua.  
As Washington’s national security establishment mulled over its failure in Vietnam, the post-Watergate presidency of James Carter tried to chart a foreign policy course that did not assume the inviolability of U.S. commitments as its underlying principle, but which instead sought to substitute a sort of “moral credibility” for the conventional notion of credibility. For many the results proved disastrous and, unsurprisingly, when global events appeared to indicate an increased threat to U.S. interests, the pressured administration quickly returned to more familiar strategies.

6. Instability in Pakistan

Link: Early US withdrawal will spread instability to Pakistan, raising concerns about the safety of their nuclear weapons

Lisa Curtis 2014. (has testified before Congress more than a dozen times; former senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency in the late 1990s; worked in the Foreign Service in the mid-1990s, when she was assigned to the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) 11 Feb 2014 How to Ensure That a U.S. Troop Drawdown Does Not Destabilize Afghanistan <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2014/02/how-to-ensure-that-a-us-troop-drawdown-does-not-destabilize-afghanistan>

But allowing frustration with Karzai to lead to a total U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan this year would be a monumental mistake. The recent increase in al-Qaeda violence in Iraq should serve as a warning that failure to maintain a residual force presence in Afghanistan post-2014 would increase instability throughout South and Central Asia and embolden a vast network of Islamist terrorists with global ambitions. Moreover, renewed instability in Afghanistan would also likely spill over into Pakistan, where terrorist attacks are on the rise and the U.S. intelligence community’s concerns over the safety and security of its nuclear weapons arsenal are growing.

Impact: Nuclear risk. Pakistan is the most likely scenario for use of nuclear weapons and instability adds to the risk

Christopher Clary 2013. (master’s degree from US Naval Postgraduate School; country director for South Asian affairs in the Office of the Secretary of Defense; previously served as a research associate in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School ) Oct 2013 The Future of Pakistan’s Nuclear Weapons Program, National Bureau of Asian Research <http://www.nbr.org/publications/element.aspx?id=702>

Pakistan remains one of the most likely sources of nuclear risk globally—through theft of Pakistani nuclear material, unauthorized use of weapons during conflict, or intentional use in war. This stems from the large number of dangerous groups based in Pakistan, regional instability in its neighborhood, and the country’s increasing reliance on nuclear weapons rather than conventional military force for deterrence.

7. Drone campaign jeopardized

Link: Faster pull-out from Afghanistan would jeopardize the drone campaign against Al Qaeda

Lisa Curtis 2012. (former member of the professional staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ; former White House-appointed senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency; served abroad in the Foreign Service at the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) 1 Feb 2012 “Hasty Afghan Troop Drawdown Could Jeopardize Drone Campaign” <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/02/01/hasty-afghan-troop-drawdown-could-jeopardize-drone-campaign/>

The effectiveness of the drone campaign is dictated largely by the degree of access the U.S. has in the region and the kind of relationships it has with the ruling governments. If the U.S. pulls its troops out of Afghanistan too quickly and/or fumbles the negotiation of a Strategic Partnership Agreement with the Karzai government that would allow the U.S. to sustain a troop presence after 2014, it will jeopardize its ability to continue effective counterterrorism operations in the region, such as the drone strikes.

Link: Drone strikes have recently taken out many top Al Qaeda leaders

Brink: Drone campaign has put us within reach of defeating Al Qaeda

Peter Bergen and Jennifer Rowland 2012. Peter Bergen (CNN's national security analyst, is a director at the New America Foundation.) and Jennifer Rowland (a program associate at the New America Foundation, a Washington-based think tank which seeks innovative solutions across the ideological spectrum), March 27, 2012. “CIA drone war in Pakistan in sharp decline,” CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/03/27/opinion/bergen-drone-decline/index.html?hpt=hp_bn7>

And despite its deteriorating relations with Pakistan, the United States killed a number of key al Qaeda leaders with drone strikes in 2011. Al Qaeda's top operative in Pakistan and purported conduit between the terrorist group and the Pakistani Taliban, Ilyas Kashmiri, was reported killed in a strike on June 4. Then, on August 22, a drone reportedly killed al Qaeda's top operational planner, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman, dealing another heavy blow to the organization. And in September, a drone strike killed Abu Hafs al-Shihri, the man believed to be responsible for planning al Qaeda's operations in the region. The continued success of strikes against al Qaeda's top leaders led Defense Secretary Leon Panetta to declare in July that the United States was "within reach of strategically defeating al Qaeda." According to senior U.S. counterterrorism officials, al Qaeda's leadership bench has been so thinned by the drone campaign that there are only two real leaders of the organization left: bin Laden's successor as overall leader of the group, Ayman al-Zawahiri, and Abu Yahya al-Libi.

Link: Drone strikes are the most effective tool for destroying Al Qaeda

Lisa Curtis 2011. (former member of the professional staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ; former White House-appointed senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency; served abroad in the Foreign Service at the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) 29 Aug 2011 “ Drone Strikes Protect America from al-Qaeda’s Terror” <http://blog.heritage.org/2011/08/29/drone-strikes-protect-america-from-al-qaedas-terror/>

In another major blow to al-Qaeda, a U.S. drone strike last Monday in the North Waziristan tribal area of Pakistan killed the organization’s new number two commander, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman. The successful strike demonstrates the importance of continuing the drone missile campaign along Pakistan’s border with Afghanistan as a cornerstone of the mission to degrade and eventually defeat al-Qaeda. Pakistani officials and media outlets regularly criticize the drone missile strikes as a violation of Pakistani sovereignty. But the U.S. is highly unlikely to relent in its drone campaign since the tactic has proven to be the most effective tool for the U.S. to destroy al-Qaeda’s leadership and disrupt its ability to plot and train for attacks across the globe.

Impact: Terrorism. Drone attacks on Al Qaeda successfully prevent terrorism against US targets

Dr. James Jay Carafano 2011. (PhD ; graduate of West Point, Carafano holds a master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; served as a visiting professor at National Defense University and Georgetown Univ; director of the Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation ) Drones Save American Lives, 25 Sept 2011 <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/09/drones-save-american-lives>

There is a reason White House counterterrorism chief John Brennan recently felt confident enough to declare that al-Qaida was “on the ropes.” Progress came from taking the offensive. A decade of strenuous effort to disrupt terrorist sanctuaries, take out leaders, pre-empt planning and operations, disaggregate networks, thwart terrorist travel and communications, and disrupt fundraising and recruiting is paying off. And, without question, the drone missile strikes in Pakistan’s tribal areas have helped put al-Qaida on the defensive. Similar operations conducted against an al-Qaida affiliate in Yemen have paid dividends as well. The results speak for themselves. Successful terrorist attacks on U.S. targets — both at home and overseas — have been on a continual rate of decline since 2005.

8. Haqqani Network

Link: The Haqqani network is a web of terrorism, criminal enterprises and evil operating in Afghanistan

Dr. James Jay Carafano 2013. (PhD ; graduate of West Point, Carafano holds a master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; served as a visiting professor at National Defense University and Georgetown Univ; director of the Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation ) 1 Dec 2013 America will pay for leaving the Haqqani devil in Afghanistan's den <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2013/12/america-will-pay-for-leaving-the-haqqani-devil-in-afghanistans-den>

The Haqqani network is not just another menacing web of terrorist and criminal enterprises. For decades, it has been an entrepreneur of evil. It practically invented the practice of recruiting “foreign fighters.” The Haqqanis always saw enlisting and training fighters from other countries as more than a tool for turning back the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. They expected their battle-hardened brothers would martyr themselves or return home; either way, it would inspire others to carry the cause of Islamist extremism on an ever-widening front. After the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan, the Haqqanis helped set up training camps for the next generation of foreign fighters. Indeed, they helped Osama bin Laden set up shop in Afghanistan. When the Taliban tangled with bin Laden and considered throwing him out of Afghanistan, it was the Haqqanis who stepped in and brokered a truce. After NATO forces ousted the Taliban and al Qaeda from Afghanistan, the Haqqanis supported the counteroffensive to reestablish the Muslim extremists in the country.

Link & Brink: US presence in Afghanistan post-2014 is key to blocking Pakistan support for the Haqqani network

Lisa Curtis 2013. (former member of the professional staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ; former White House-appointed senior adviser to the assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs; worked as an analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency; served abroad in the Foreign Service at the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and India) Testimony before the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific Committee on Foreign Affairs United States House of Representatives October 29, 2013 <http://www.heritage.org/research/testimony/2013/10/after-the-withdrawal-the-way-forward-in-afghanistan-and-pakistan-part-ii>

Maintain a robust residual force presence in Afghanistan post-2014 and ensure that people in the region know that the U.S. will remain engaged there diplomatically, financially, and militarily even after 2014. The major reason that Pakistan continues to support the Haqqani network (and other Taliban proxies) is the belief that the U.S. will fully withdraw from Afghanistan before the situation is stable and that the Haqqanis provide the best chance to secure Pakistan’s interests in the country. Announcing the U.S. intention to leave a robust number of forces in Afghanistan beyond 2014 would signal the Pakistanis that the U.S. is committed to finishing the job in Afghanistan.

Link & Impact: Removing troops and ignoring Haqqani will allow it to spread global Islamist insurgency

Dr. James Jay Carafano 2013. (PhD ; graduate of West Point, Carafano holds a master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; served as a visiting professor at National Defense University and Georgetown Univ; director of the Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation ) 1 Dec 2013 America will pay for leaving the Haqqani devil in Afghanistan's den <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2013/12/america-will-pay-for-leaving-the-haqqani-devil-in-afghanistans-den>

Ignoring the Haqqanis makes it easier for Obama to justify drawing down troops and withdrawing from South Asia. He can simply define victory in a manner that does not actually require him to safeguard U.S. interests in the region or diminish future threats to our nation.  But America will likely pay a price for walking away with the nightmare network intact. “Many jihadis in the region,” Brown and Rassler write, “will be emboldened by the U.S. drawdown and eventual departure from Afghanistan, viewing the event as a victory in their quest to reclaim Muslim lands and rid those areas of Western influence.”  Now, the Haqqani network will get to define for itself the role it will play in the region’s future. If it follows true to form, it will no doubt continue to work against America’s interests in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It will also likely keep its ties and support for the global Islamist insurgency that now actively operates from South Asia to North Africa.