TOPICALITY ISSUES ON THE PEACEKEEPING TOPIC

Stefan Bauschard, Director of Debate, St. Mark's School of Texas

"The United States Federal Government should establish a foreign policy substantially increasing its support of United Nations peacekeeping operations."

The Federal Government

The actor in this year's resolution is the "federal government." The only potential dispute in any topicality debate over this term will be whether or not that actor includes only the head of our central government and its agents that operate out of Washington, D.C. or whether that actor also includes the state governments, as the state governments are part of the federal system. Some definitions point to the central authority in Washington (A2-3) and others (A4-5) include the state governments. Upon consultation with a variety of dictionaries, it does not seem that the capitalization, or lack thereof, of the term has any significance, at least in terms of establishing what set of actors that the term refers to.

Since this is a foreign policy topic, it is unlikely that the negative would be able to make a persuasive case for the need for the affirmative to act through the states. There are some examples, however, of states providing humanitarian aid in various regions of the world and if such humanitarian assistance is topical, the affirmative may suggest that particular states should provide it. You can never be too prepared with appropriate definitions.

In the event that the affirmative tries to do something through the state governments, it will be important on the negative to win that the "federal government" refers to the central government in Washington, D.C. This will be important for you to win links to your generic disadvantages and for you to be able to defend the competitiveness of your states' counterplan. You should not have any difficulty doing this, as this is how the term "federal government" has traditionally been understood in debate. Given that you can probably win this topicality argument if you need to, many of the issues in this book have been framed from the perspective that this is how the term "federal government" will be understood.

On a related note, negative teams may also occasionally try to catch affirmatives off guard with atypical definitions of federal government, particularly ones involving foreign governments. For example, some teams have argued, "the federal government is the central government of Brazil." Hopefully, the presence of the term "United States" in the resolution should also suffice in distinguishing which federal government is the agent of the resolution. There are, however, some definitions that refer to the "United States of Brazil".

Should

The term "should" in the resolution is typically interpreted to mean "ought"—expressing "obligation, duty, propriety, or desirability" (A6). It really does not have any significance in most topicality debates. It exists primarily to provide a contextual basis for flat the affirmative is arguing that the plan should be done, not necessarily, that it would be done.

It can also be argued that "should" is the past tense of "shall", essentially meaning, that the federal government should have supported UNPKOs at some point in the past. This interpretation means that in order to be topical, an affirmative must argue for increasing support of UNPKOs that would have been a good idea at some point in the past. For example, affirmative could argue that the federal government should have acted through the U.N. to prevent the Rwandan genocide. The affirmative should point out that, in common usage, the past tense of shall is "should have," and that there is good definitional support for the notion of should as a future obligation (A7).

Establish

Establish is one of those words in the English language that can mean two seemingly opposite things. Definitions of "establish" articulate two different meanings: to bring into existence ("To originate and secure the permanent existence of; to found; to institute; to create and regulate" (WORDS AND PHRASES, Permanent Edition, p. 249) and to "make stable or firm" (ibid)).

The MERRIAM WEBSTER definitions of "establish" provide two different meanings: to bring into existence and to put on a firm basis (8). Both definitions are accurate descriptions of the meaning of the word, but crafty negatives always try to argue that establish only means to bring into existence. They will argue that this "interpretation" of the word provides them with more unique, generic disadvantages because if the affirmative can simply "firm up" an existing foreign policy they will always be able to win that the disadvantages are non-unique.

One thing worth pointing out here is that the negative's definition of "to bring into existence" is not exclusive. In other words, the definition that the negative cites doesn't exclude "to put on a firm basis." In fact, you will notice that the negative is only reading half of the definition of the word, though they won't let on to that. When you argue this, negatives will argue that they get to "interpret" the word in a way that provides for the best debate. This is an extremely ridiculous idea of what "interpreting" the meaning of a word is. What the negative and the affirmative should be able to interpret is the definitions of the word (what does "bring into existence" mean?). The negative shouldn't get to interpret the word in a way that changes its definitional meaning! Affirmatives need to be careful not to let the negatives get away with this, not only in regard to this violation, but in regard to other topicality violations as well.

Another very important affirmative answer to this argument is that the word "establish" modifies "foreign policy" and not "peacekeeping operations." The affirmative has to establish a foreign policy that supports UNPKOs, it does not actually establish the PKO.

Similarly, negatives can argue that establish should be interpreted to mean "firm up" because it limits affirmatives to improving existing operations and that that set of existing operations (13 as of the time of this writing) is predictable and easy to research. But again, the definitional support for the notion of establish as to create is easy to find (A9).

Policy

"Policy" refers to a purposive course of action followed by government or nongovernmental actors in response to some set of perceived problems. The affirmative will want to choose some particular course of action that is designed to support peacekeeping operations.

One controversy related to "policy" is whether or not a policy is a goal or course of action. While most definitions suggest the latter, Cabb, a professor of Political Science at Vassar wrote in 1965 that there are "two elements in foreign policy of any nation: objectives and means for reaching them" (AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE NUCLEAR AGE, p. 65). Negatives have taken advantage of "goal" part of the definition to argue that the affirmative has to change the goals of our foreign policy to be topical.

This violation has a few problems. First, as the above quote indicates, there is more than one way to define foreign policy. The negative's interpretation is very arbitrary. Second, it is unlikely that this could be accomplished based on the restrictions of the resolution. This year's resolution requires the affirmative to increase support of UNPKOs. If the status quo supports PKOs, the affirmative could
Foreign Policy

The term “foreign policy” was likely added to the resolution to prevent affirmatives from engaging in primarily domestic actions like building tanks or training troops that would have the indirect benefit of supporting UNPKOs.

Although a definition of foreign policy that claims the foreign policy is “more than domestic” is not likely to provide much of a limiting function, definitions of foreign policy that require it to be an “interaction” between states is likely to be more practically useful. This interpretation was popular on the weapons of mass destruction topic, and is likely to be popular again.

The AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE defines “foreign policy” as “the diplomatic policy of a nation in its interactions with other nations” (2000). The MERRIAM WEBSTER ONLINE DICTIONARY defines “foreign policy” as “the policy of a sovereign state in its interaction with other sovereign states” (2004). The negative can use these definitions to argue that the plan must take place through an interaction with other sovereign states. This may require the plan to use controversial items such as negotiations, diplomacy, or consultation.

Substantially

In the resolution, “substantially” is an adverb modifying the word “increase.” The “increase” in “support” must be by a “substantial” amount.

It is difficult for the negative to use the word “substantial” to limit much affirmative action because there are no precise, generally agreed on, definitions of the term. Dr. Rich Edwards, the author of the yearly FORENSICS QUARTERLY, explains that the “legal encyclopedia Words and Phrases presents more than 300 pages of fine-print definitions of this term.” He explains the origin of such different definitions:

The context for these definitions should be understood: each one involves the judgment of a court in a particular case concerning what the word means in the context of that case. It is natural that debaters will try to use any of these legal definitions, but it must always be done with a key question in mind: “Is the context for this court case similar to the way that the word ‘substantially’ is used in the debate resolution?” There is, for example, a major difference in the meaning of the word “substantially” in the phrase “substantially all” from the resolutional phrase of “substantially increase.” Many of these definitions warn that the word is not a term of precision. In State v. Rose the court held that “the term ‘substantially’ is relative and must be considered within the context of the particular fact situation; in essence, it means less than totally or the whole, but more than imaginary” (Words and Phrases, Vol. 40, 1995, p. 458).

Often, negatives will read definitions of “substantial” that claims “substantial is “X percentage” and that the affirmative fails to meet “X percentage” so they are not topical. The problem with this interpretation is that these interpretations are arbitrary in different contexts.

Although tying the affirmative down to a specific number may be difficult, there are various definitions of the word substantial that may be helpful to the negative without being unrealistic for the affirmative.

First, the negative can argue that the affirmative’s plan has to be “permanent.” FISHER v. FISHER ruled that “to establish ‘substantial change’ in former spouse’s circumstances, as would warrant modification of child support awarded pursuant to dissolution judgment, change must be significant, material, involuntary and permanent in nature” (Words & Phrases, Vol. 40, 2001, p. 632). The negative can argue that the affirmative’s plan has to exist permanently and if it does it links to politics and budget DAS because it can make permanency looks various budget and political agreements.

Second, the negative can argue that the increase in assistance must be “material.” Another Words and Phrases definition says that “substantial” means material, not seeming or imaginary, real, true, important, essential, having good substance, strong, stout, firm” (Words and Phrases, Vol. 40, 1964, p. 762).

Negatives can argue that the affirmative cannot merely do something like make a “diplomatic” statement, but that it has to provide some type of “material” support – like aid or troops.

Increasing

“Increase” is generally defined as to “become greater or larger” (DICTIONARY.COM, dictionary.reference.com/search?q=increasing). So, after the plan, there needs to be more support than there is now.

One related and important topicality controversy this year will be over what it means to “support” UNPKOs – can the affirmative only lend aid/diplomatic assistance to one of the thirteen existing operations or can it support the creation of a new operation? Definitions of the word “increasing” do not make it clear and there are good arguments on both sides.

There are several definitions of “increase” emphasize the issue of the pre-existence of the thing which is to be increased. One of the definitions found in Corpus Juris Secundum makes this distinction: the term presupposes the existence in some measure, or to some extent, of something which may be enlarged, connotes a change or alteration in the original, and has been defined as meaning to extend or enlarge in size, extent, quantity, number, intensity, value, substance, etc. (Corpus Juris Secundum, 1944, p. 546).

There are definitions, however, that deny that the word increase supposes pre-existence. A Georgia court, for example, in King v. Herron, ruled that “increase” could refer to something which starts at zero and gets larger: “Salary change of from zero to $12,000 and $1,200 annually for mayor and councilmen respectively was an increase in salary and not merely the ‘fixing’ of salary” (Words & Phrases, Vol. 20A, 2001, p. 241).

Several arguments favor defining “increasing support” to mean assistance to current operations: 1) It is predictable – the negative can research existing operations and prepare to debate changes in them, 2) You cannot support something that doesn’t exist. 3) As just discussed, “increase” means to “make greater.” In order to increase support, then, you arguably have to expand the amount of support given to current operations.

Other arguments favor defining “increasing support” to mean assistance to creating new operations. 1) It makes disadvantages relative more “unique” – there are more general disadvantages and arguments against expanding the number of UNPKOs than there are to making small changes in current ones. 2) This interpretation is more predictable because it will be difficult, if not impossible, to predict all of the different types of assistance (like assistance for AIDS prevention, demining, etc) that could be given to current operations. 3) There are practical limits – there will only be so many proposals to expand peacekeeping into new areas, creating a practical, effective limit on the number of such cases. 4) Assisting with the creation of new PKOs will bolster overall “support” for the existing system of UNPKOs. 5) As discussed in the section on U.S. policy, the U.S. currently gives little, if any, support to any of the operations discussed in the introductory section. In fact, the U.S. currently provides no troop support for the UN operation in Lebanon (http://www.stimson.org/fo/po/7SN-PO20030620565). Moreover, the U.S. provides almost no support to existing operations, so if you have to support an operation we already support there would be almost no affirmatives. Hardly any U.S. personnel work under U.N. control at the following
information shows:

Table 3. U.S. Personnel under U.N. Control
(As of August 31, 2003)
Operation Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNTSO (Middle East)</td>
<td>3 (obs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIK (Kosovo)</td>
<td>404 (402 police + 2 observers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOMIG (Georgia)</td>
<td>2 (obs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIS/ET (East Timor)</td>
<td>37 (police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMEE (Bhilwara &amp; Eritrea)</td>
<td>7 (obs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Marjorie Ann Browne, September 24, 2003
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division CRS, United Nations Peacekeeping:

And only 14 currently operate under UNPKOs!

Current U.S. Military Participation in Peacekeeping:
Thousands of U.S. military personnel participate full-time in a variety of activities that fall under the rubric of peacekeeping operations, most endorsed by the United Nations. Unlike certain years in the 1990s, very few U.S. military personnel currently serve under U.N. command. As of June 30, 2003, 15 U.S. military personnel were serving in five U.N. peacekeeping or related operations. These operations are located in the Middle East (3 U.S. military observers [or “milobs”] and one troop in two operations), Georgia (2 milobs), Kosovo (2 milobs), and Eritrea (7 milobs).

In this instance, if you can only increase support for operations the U.S. supports there are only four case areas! 6) Requiring the affirmative to increase support to existing operations by doing things like providing demining assistance means that the topic becomes less about UN Peacekeeping and more about what the U.S. may just be particularly good at doing in a specific geographic area that the UN currently has a PKO in—like demining. 7) Strong generic ground—like disadvantages and kritiks of peacekeeping are more useful to the negative than a limit. Most debates are won or lost on generics, particularly debates against new affirmatives, and not some specific case cards.

Regardless of which interpretation you may think is more accurate, the negative will have a reasonable topicality argument that they can make against the affirmative. Different affirmatives that fit under each interpretation will be discussed below.

Support

One of the most interesting terms to unpack this year is the word “support.” I think that there are a couple ways to define it.

First, the word “support” can be defined in a way that requires the affirmative to provide tangible/physical assistance to UNPKOs. This would include things like money, troops, or tanks. Contextually, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping explains that “Many countries have voluntarily made additional resources available to support United Nations peacekeeping efforts on a non-reimbursable basis in the form of transportation, supplies, personnel and financial contributions above and beyond their assessed share of peacekeeping costs” (HOW PEACEKEEPING IS FINANCED, 2003, www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/intro/5.htm). You could argue that the definition of “substantial” as being “material” that was discussed above reinforces this interpretation. And so does the military’s definition of the term. The U.S. Department of Defense, in its Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, defines “support” as “the action of a force that aids, protects, complements, or sustains another force in accordance with a directive requiring such action” (Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, 2003, p. 511).

Second, the word “support” can be defined to suggest that it is possible for the United States to provide only diplomatic support. Dictionary.com defines “support” to mean “To argue in favor of; advocate” (dictionary.reference.com/search?q=support).

Affirmatives, in order to try to escape politics and spending disadvantages will likely seek out affirmatives that do not require that they provide tangible assistance—military or economic. Negatives will try to force them to do so, arguing that disadvantages to tangible assistance are important to negative ground.

While the negative can make a reasonable claim regarding the need to limit the affirmative to the provision of concrete assistance, the limitation that the negative will attempt to draw is rather arbitrary. Definitions of “support” clearly conclude that both meanings are possible and it is arguably educational that debaters should be able to engage the “diplomatic side” of peacekeeping.

U.N. Peacekeeping Operations

As Rich Edwards explains in the FORENSICS QUARTERLY, “The wording in the resolution matches precisely one of the major departments within the United Nations bureaucracy, namely, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations.” Marrack Goulding, one of the former directors of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations lists in his 2003 book, Peacemaker, the essential defining elements of the missions conducted by this department:

Peacekeeping, the primary topic of this book, has evolved a long way since its debut in 1948. Its defining characteristics remain unchanged, however. A peacekeeping operation invariably includes military personnel, and often police as well, who are made available to the United Nations by their governments. The operation is established by the Security Council. It is placed under the command of the Secretary-General who is required to report regularly to the Council. It is deployed with the consent of the parties to an actual or potential conflict and is required to be neutral and impartial between them. If it is armed, it will be authorized to use its arms only in self-defence. Its tasks, or “mandates,” are agreed in advance with the parties. The costs of the operation, including some reimbursement of the costs incurred by the troop-contributing governments, are apportioned amongst all the member states of the United Nations. (Goulding, 2003, pp. 14-15).

One likely source of confusion on this year’s topic is that the affirmative may conflate “peacemaking, peacebuilding, peace enforcement and peacekeeping” and argue that they all are either the same thing or, more likely, that peacekeeping includes elements of each. The STRATEGIC REVIEW FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA, explained in November of 2002 that:

At present UN forces carry out four types of peace missions worldwide. These are:

Peacekeeping: A deployment of UN troops, with the authorisation of the parties in conflict to maintain an already negotiated ceasefire and prevent any renewal of hostilities. This is often called a peacekeeping force.

Peacemaking: Aimed at bringing parties to a conflict closer together through peaceful means such as mediation and negotiation.

Peace enforcement: This is applied under Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, where multinational military forces, under the UN banner, are authorised to use military force to enforce peace agreements.

Peace building: This focuses on reconciliation and reconstruction of a country after a civil war. The international community intervenes to develop political, economic and security...
infrastructure so that conflict can be solved in a durable way. For UN officials, the distinction between peacekeeping and peacemaking is a simple matter of determining whether there is coercion and whether all parties consent to the presence of the UN peacekeepers. A former Netherlands representative at the Security Council, Hugo Scheltema, used the term peacemaking to refer to peace enforcement measures under Chapter VII. He stated that “the essence of peacekeeping is that it is not peacemaking. There is no coercion and no enforcement under Chapter VII of the Charter. Any peacekeeping operation is based on consensus of all parties concerned.” (Osman, 2002, p. 6)

Mohamed Osman, professor of political science at the London School of Economics, also distinguishes peacemaking from peacekeeping in the 2002 book, THE UNITED NATIONS AND PEACE ENFORCEMENT: WARS, TERRORISM, AND DEMOCRACY:

Forces deployed to enforce any mandatory measures are different from peacekeeping forces. They do not necessarily obtain the consent of any of the warring parties and they may be instructed to abandon impartiality at a certain stage or to direct their weapons, from the outset, against one side (Osman, 2002, p. 16).

While negative teams will argue that “peacekeeping operations” should be narrowly defined as applying only to situations where all parties to a dispute have consented to the presence of UN troops. There certainly are numerous definitions available to support such a view. Affirmative teams can, however, present evidence showing that modern UN peacekeeping operations have moved well beyond such limitations. Christopher Coleman, Senior Political Affairs Officer in the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations, describes this change in the 2003 book, LEVERAGING FOR SUCCESS IN UNITED NATIONS PEACE OPERATIONS:

Two major changes, witnessed in the last decade, have redefined peacekeeping and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. These two changes are fundamental to understanding the objectives of peacekeeping operations and the leverage required to achieve them. The first, by now very familiar, is that the nature of conflict has changed. We are rarely faced with purely interstate violence anymore. But neither are we dealing with internal conflicts. Rather, conflicts today are a confusing mix; their core is essentially internal, but they are complicated by the cross-border involvement of state or nonstate actors. And their consequences can quickly become international, because of destabilizing refugee flows as well as factions pursuing each other regardless of the border lines. This has demanded the adoption of a new strategy of peacekeeping, which can be summed up in very broad terms as the “institutionalization of politics.”

Conflicting interests are inherent in any society, and United Nations peacekeeping operations do not presume to remove conflict from the societies that they are trying to assist. Rather, they seek to remove those conflicts from the battlefield and to facilitate the use of legitimate institutions, in such areas as elections, human rights or law enforcement, so that all constituencies have, and feel that they have, meaningful political and economic access. Much of the task of today’s operations, therefore, is to assist the parties to strengthen existing institutions, or even to create new ones. (United Nations Department of Public Information, LEVERAGING FOR SUCCESS, 2003)

Although restrictive descriptions of peacekeeping distinguish it from peacemaking, these descriptions do not necessarily exclude what you may think of as “peace building or peace enforcement.” These, particularly “peacebuilding,” could include the provision of humanitarian assistance or election monitoring.

The Security Council Press Release, SC/7014 in 2002 explains that the peacekeeping is what occurs after peacekeepers have been inserted to keep the peace:

Peacekeeping takes place only after a crisis emerges, but peacemaking may begin long before that. In a variety of ways, the United Nations can try to prevent new disputes from flaring up, or existing disputes from escalating into conflicts. This may involve making personal contacts, using the “good offices” of the Secretary-General, sending fact-finding missions or installing an early warning system. Peace-building means efforts to identify and support areas which tend to consolidate peace. (Security Council Press Release, 2002)

Support for this view also comes from the Website of the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations:

Military personnel and structure remain the backbone of most operations. Increasingly, however, the many faces of peacekeeping include civilian police officers, electoral experts and observers, deminers, human rights monitors, specialists in civic affairs and governance and experts in communications and public information. Their responsibilities range from protecting and delivering humanitarian assistance to helping former opponents carry out complicated peace agreements; from assisting with the demobilization of former fighters and their return to normal life to supervising and conducting elections; from training civilian police to monitoring respect for human rights and investigating alleged violations; and from coordinating the transition of a territory to autonomous status to setting up a transitional administration of a territory as it moves towards independence. (United Nations Department of Public Information, UN PEACEKEEPING IN THE SERVICE OF PEACE, 2003).

The removal of landmines is funded by the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and has often been characterized as central to UN peacekeeping. An example of evidence to support this position comes from the Nov. 13, 2003 issue of UN NEWS:

Mine action is a dynamic component of peacekeeping operations that contributes to the way the United Nations plans and conducts its operations, the UN’s chief peacekeeping official said today. The Under-Secretary for Peacekeeping Operations, Jean-Marie Guenon, told an open briefing of the Security Council in New York that early planning by mine action specialists is essential to any efficient emergency peacekeeping operations. (UN NEWS, 2003)

As Rich Edwards notes, “While some statements on the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations Website would seem to support a definition of peacekeeping expansive enough to include humanitarian operations, other statements could be used by negative teams to exclude such assistance. In the following example, the UN Website indicates that humanitarian projects work closely with peacekeepers,” implying that such projects are not the same as peacekeeping (Ibid, p. 56). The UN PKOs website explains that:

Field staff of United Nations agencies and offices, among them the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Food Programme, the UN Children’s Fund and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights often work closely with peacekeepers. Together, they help alleviate suffering, deal with the problems of refugees and displaced persons and contribute to reconciliation and reconstruction. Peacekeepers have been called upon to support the activities of these United Nations partners as well as the efforts of non-governmental and other organizations engaged in humanitarian assistance to people affected by conflicts and their aftermath. (United Nations Department of Public Information, UN PEACEKEEPING IN THE SERVICE OF PEACE, 2003)

What is very important to note is that the affirmative does not
necessarily need to win that they are a part of a PKO, but only that they support a PKO. Peacebuilding, and some elements of peace enforcement, arguably support PKOs. The only thing the affirmative needs to win is that those other elements support the PKO.

There are a couple of topicality twists on the term “operations.” First, you could argue that “operations” is plural and that the affirmative has to support more than one. This literal interpretation of the topic is rather silly since the negative would always counterplan with one and not the other and since all of the literature on the topic will either talk about supporting a particular operation or all of the operations. Second, you could argue that there is a difference between supporting peacekeeping in general and peacekeeping operations in particular. The latter is potentially a reason to limit the plan to supporting the existing operations or at least to say the support must benefit one of those existing operations.

Conclusion

The first half of the resolution, which claims that the “United States Federal Government should establish a foreign policy,” is likely to be the site of a number of “generic” and “cheap” topicality debates. These include debates over what the federal government really is, the tense of the word “should,” and what it means to “establish” a “foreign policy.” While disputes over the meaning of these terms provide a number of “cheap shot” topicality violations, the arguments are not all that intellectually challenging.

The second half of the resolution, which directs the US to establish a foreign policy “increasing support of United Nations peacekeeping operations,” will present more interesting debates over what those operations are, and more importantly, what are legitimate ways to support such operations. Both the affirmative and negative have strong arguments for how to best “interpret” the meaning of this part of the resolution.

---

**Topicality Outline**

I. United States (A1)

II. Federal Government
   A. Includes the states (A2-3)
   B. Is the central government (A4-5)

III. Should
   A. Obligation/duty (A6)
   B. Future (A7)

IV. Establish
   A. Establish is to make permanent (A8)
   B. Establish is to create (A9)

V. Foreign Policy (10)

VI. Policy
   A. Course of action and goals (A11-13)
   B. Course of action (A14)
   C. Goals (A15)
   D. The actions (A16)

VII. Substantially
   A. Interpret in context (A17)
   B. In the main (A18)
   C. Without material qualification (A19)
   D. Of real worth, importance (A20)
   E. In substance (A21)
   F. Majority/most (A22-3)
   G. At least 90% (A24)

VIII. Increasing
   A. Increasing is enlargement (A25)
   B. Increase is to become larger (A26)
   C. Increase means to grow (A27)
   D. Increase means to grow something that exists (A28)

IX. Support
   A. Maintenance (A29)
   B. Foundation (A30)
   C. Professional advisement (A31)
   D. Commitment made by the President (A32)
   E. Congressional implementation (A33)
   F. Legislation for an operation (A34)
   G. Includes a timetable and a strategy (A35)
   H. Financial assistance (A36)
   I. Includes troops and money (A37)
   J. Is not relinquishing control of U.S. troops (A38)
   K. Includes assistance from many agencies (A39)

X. Peacekeeping operations
   A. General definition of peacekeeping (A40)
   B. Many facets of peacekeeping (A41-3)
   C. Four different operations are part of peacekeeping (A44)
   D. UN peacekeeping includes many different departments (A45)
   E. Inclusive/affirmative definitions
      1. It’s a broad term (A46)
      2. It’s the use of troops (A47)
      3. It involves non-military tasks (A48)
      4. Peace monitoring is peacekeeping (A49)
      5. Civilian policy elements are part of PKOs (A50-51)
      6. Demining is part of peacekeeping (A52)
      7. Civilian staff that support logistics are part of peacekeeping (A53)
      8. Human rights officers are involved in PKOs (A54)
      9. The modern definition has expanded to include human rights monitoring (A55)
     10. No practical distinction between peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding (A56)
     11. Peacekeeping includes economic reconstruction (A57)
   F. Exclusive/negative definitions
      1. “Peace operations” is more than peacekeeping (A58)
      2. Peacekeeping is distinct from nation-building (A59)
      3. Peacekeeping is distinct from humanitarian intervention (A60)
      4. Development assistance is not part of peacekeeping (A61)
      5. War crimes tribunals are not PKOs (A62)
      6. PKOs are restricted to military operations (A63)
      7. Defensive wars are not PKOs (A64)
      8. Human rights protection and democracy development are part of peacebuilding (A65)
      9. Peacebuilding is about reconstruction (A66)
   G. PKO Support
      1. Ways to support PKOs (67-8)
      2. UNDP action supports UN Peacekeeping (69)
      3. Assisting with reconciliation and war crimes tribunals supports PKOs (70)