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1NC – Substantial = 50%

A. Interpretation: a substantial reduction in military presence is 50%

H.R.1269, 1993, “Comprehensive Base Closure Reform and Recovery Act of 1993,” http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/F?c103:1:./temp/~c103E1L8RN:e2810:

 (a) CLEANUP SCHEDULE FOR CERTAIN BASES ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST- (1) Before a military installation described in subsection (c) is closed or substantial reductions in its operations have occurred, at least 75 percent of the remedial action required on the installation pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) shall be completed. (2) Not later than two years after a military installation described in subsection (c) is closed or substantial reductions in its operations have occurred, all of the remedial action required on the installation pursuant to such Act shall be completed. (b) MEANING OF SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTIONS- For purposes of subsection (a), substantial reductions in the operations of a military installation shall be considered to have occurred if more than 50 percent of the personnel assigned to the installation, including employees and members of the Armed Forces, have been reassigned and moved to another installation.

Military presence includes personnel, equipment, training, visits, and intelligence

Bradford Dismukes, analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses, 3-1994, “National Security Strategy and Forward Presence: Implications for Acquisition and Use of Forces,” Center for Naval Analyses, http://cna.org/sites/default/files/research/2793019200.pdf

A principal aim of presence is to make crisis response unnecessary, just as the latter seeks to eliminate the need for large-scale combat. In addition to permanent and rotational forces forward on the ground, forces deployed at sea, and prepositioned equipment, the means of overseas presence are: Exercises and training of U.S. forces with those of friends and allies • Unilateral training by U.S. forces on foreign soil • U.S. C3I systems, especially in their bilateral and multilateral roles • Arrangements for the access by U.S. forces to facilities overseas • Stationing and visits abroad by senior U.S. military officials • Visits to ports and airfields by U.S. naval and air forces • Public shows by U.S. demonstration teams such as the Thunderbirds and a host of public affairs activities including military musical groups • Staff-to-staff talks and studies with foreign military organizations and analytical groups • U.S. participation on multilateral staffs • Exchanges of military people between the U.S. and friends and allies • Military training of foreign personnel in the U.S. and in their home countries • Training of military officers of former totalitarian and some developing states in the roles of the military in a civil society • Foreign military sales and funding and co-production of military equipment with other nations.122 This last would logically include an arms transfer policy dimension. With the exception of the Missile Technology Transfer Regime and various transparency reporting provisions of confidence-building agreements, there are not yet any arms control aspects to this part of presence, although these too would appear to called for. This listing is taken from the National Military Strategy and from the unclassified introduction to Annex O of the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan, distributed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in December 1992.

B. Violation – The aff does not reduce US military presence by 50%

1NC – Substantial = 50%

C. Reasons to Prefer –

1. Limits – our interpretation creates a clear brightline between what is and isn’t topical. The aff justifies and infinitely regressive list of cases that qualify as substantial.

2. Ground – we lose links to core topic disads like troop reductions.

3. Predictability – They allow an infinite number of tiny affirmatives that close one base or only withdraw some troops.

D. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education

2NC – Substantial = 50%

A substantial reduction is 50%

J. W. Smith, founder of the Institute for Economic Democracy, 1994, The World’s Wasted Weath 2: Save our Wealth, Save our Environment, p. 217

With the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the world becoming aware that the Soviets were reducing their military a planned 50 percent, President Bush declared, and immediately started to implement, a substantial reduction in nuclear arms. The Soviets responded promptly and wished to broaden the agreement and lower their military still further. Almost as soon as Boris Yeltsin became Russia’s president, he met with President George Bush and stated they were removing all submarine nuclear missile systems, turning that $100 billion a year towards producing for the civilian economy, and that all tactical nuclear weapons were to be collected in Russia for destruction. Of course, this wall came too late for the Soviet economy; the Soviet Union had already collapsed/ The Cold Ear had accomplished its purpose.

A substantial reduction is at least 50%

HR 3189, 9-25-2003, http://www.theorator.com/bills108/hr3189.html

SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTION- The term `substantial reduction'—(A) means, as determined under regulations of the Secretary and with respect to a qualified beneficiary, a reduction in the average actuarial value of benefits under the plan (through reduction or elimination of benefits, an increase in premiums, deductibles, copayments, and coinsurance, or any combination thereof), since the date of commencement of coverage of the beneficiary by reason of the retirement of the covered employee (or, if later, January 6, 2004), in an amount equal to at least 50 percent of the total average actuarial value of the benefits under the plan as of such date (taking into account an appropriate adjustment to permit comparison of values over time); and `(B) includes an increase in premiums required to an amount that exceeds the premium level described in the fourth sentence of section 602(3).'

Aff – AT: Substantial = 50%

15,000 troops is substantial

Kornely K. Kakachia, Associate Professor of Department of Political Science at Tbilisi State University, 8-2008, “An End to Russian Military Bases in Georgia?: The Implications of Past Withdrawals,” PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo No. 24, http://ceres.georgetown.edu/esp/ponarsmemos/page/55918.html

The USSR maintained a substantial military presence in Georgia. The geopolitical position of Georgia made it strategically important and warranted locating several Soviet military bases within its territory. In mid-1993 an estimated 15,000 Russian troops and border guards remained on Georgian territory. Russia, as the successor state of the USSR, inherited its geopolitical interest in the South Caucasus and particularly in Georgia.

7800 troops is substantial

Tania Branigan, staff writer, 12-11-2007, “Brown commits British troops for the foreseeable future,” The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/dec/11/military.afghanistan

Britain will retain a substantial military presence in Afghanistan for some time, Gordon Brown said yesterday, as he met President Hamid Karzai in Kabul to discuss the country's future. Military sources believe that British troops are likely to be there for a decade, albeit in reduced numbers in the later stages. "There are around 7,800 at the moment. There will be around that level in the foreseeable future," said the prime minister, who earlier met soldiers fresh from the battle at Musa Qala as he toured Camp Bastion in Helmand province.

Withdrawing troops from cities alone is a substantial reduction

Lowell H. Schwarts, political scientist at RAND, and Jeff Michaels, UPI political analyst, 8-29-2005, “Exiting Iraq,” RAND, http://www.rand.org/commentary/2005/08/29/UPI.html

A second end state would be similar to the current situation in Afghanistan. The United States would withdraw its forces from urban centers and substantially reduce its total presence in Iraq to around 15,000 to 20,000 troops, although regional U.S. force levels would remain high. U.S. troops would be stationed in remote areas and would only conduct missions against counter-insurgency and terrorist targets. Most security operations would be conducted by Iraqi forces, although U.S. airpower and other military assets could be called in if necessary.

Aff – AT: Substantial = 50%

Withdrawing ground forces from South Korea is a substantial reduction of military presence

Koo Youngnok, director of the American studies institute and Professor Political science at Seoul National University, 11-1980, “Future Perspectives on South Korea’s Foreign Relations,” Asian Survey, Vol. 20, No. 11

The goal of the U.S. is to avoid being drawn into another land war in Asia. In fact, the U.S. wishes to have freedom of choice in the extent and nature of commitment and, by withdrawing its ground forces from South Korea, it would undoubtedly increase that level of choice. This is the crucial policy question and the basis of the clash of interests between the two allies, although the issue has never been officially mentioned or articulated in these terms. This is also the main source of the South Korean feeling of insecurity. In a nutshell, the basic question concerning the withdrawal of U.S. ground forces and the removal of tactical nuclear weapons can be put as follows: can South Korea and the United States maintain an effective deterrence system even in the face of a substantial reduction of U.S. military presence in Korea? It is said that the strengthening of South Korea's ground forces in addition to "the power of continuing American air, naval and logistic presence in Korea and in the Pacific," will provide full capability for defending South Korea.9 But the more critical question is not the doubt about the South Korean and American capability of defending the South against North Korean aggression. The more serious question is whether or not the reduction of U.S. forces will mean a substantial reduction of the level of deterrence, thereby conceivably tempting the Pyongyang regime to commit aggression. Actually, the key to any decision to commit aggression is to be found with the potential aggressor-in this instance, Kim Ii Sung. One can never be certain what level of deterrence is necessary for discouraging a potential aggressor. As Henry A. Kissinger has succinctly stated: "It (deterrence) seeks to keep an opponent from a given course by posing unacceptable risks. For purposes of deterrence, the opponent's calculations are decisive. A bluff taken seriously is more useful than a serious threat interpreted as a bluff. For political purposes, the meaningful measurement of military strength is the assessment which do not happen. But it is never possible to demonstrate why something has not occurred."10

Phased withdrawal of 7000 troops is substantial

AP, Associated Press, 10-19-2005, “U.S. to reduce number of Marines on Okinawa,” http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/9860535/

WASHINGTON — The United States and Japan agreed Saturday to step up military cooperation and substantially reduce the number of Marines on the strategically important southern island of Okinawa. The agreement calls for the phased withdrawal of 7,000 Marines from Okinawa to the Pacific island of Guam, a move that is expected to take six years.

Substantial Definitions

Substantial means important

Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1988, p.1336

Substantial 5. of considerable worth or value; important

Substantial means of considerable amount

oxford english dictionary, 2nd Edition, 1989, Vol. XVII, p.67

Of ample or considerable amount, quantity, or dimension.

Substantial means of importance or Worth

black's law dictionary, 6th Edition, 1990, p.1428

Of real worth and importance.

Substantial means real

Wordnet 3.0, 2010, “Substantial,” http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=substantial&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=0000000

substantial, real, material

1NC – Reduce Excludes Eliminate

1. Interpretation –

Military Presence = troops

Oxford dictionary, 2010, http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/view/entry/m\_en\_us1280472#m\_en\_us1280472

[in singular] a group of people, especially soldiers or police, stationed in a particular place:the USA would maintain a presence in the Indian Ocean region

Reduce excludes eliminate

Words and Phrases, Volume 4

Rev.Laws, c.203, § 9, provides that, if two or more cases are tried together in the superior court, the presiding judge may “reduce” the witness fees and other costs, but “not less than the ordinary witness fees, and other costs recoverable in one of the cases” which are so tried together shall be allowed. Held that, in reducing the costs, the amount in all the cases together is to be considered and reduced, providing that there must be left in the aggregate an amount not less than the largest sum recoverable in any of the cases. The word “reduce,” in its ordinary signification, does not mean to cancel, destroy, or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower, or bring to an inferior state.—Green v. Sklar, 74 N.E. 595, 188 Mass. 363.

1. Violation – The aff eliminates the United States’ military presence in a country
2. Reasons to Prefer

They unlimit the topic by allowing for reductions and eliminations. This makes at least six new affirmatives and an infinite number of K advantages, overburdening the neg.

1. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education

2NC – Reduce Excludes Eliminate

Reduce means to diminish to a smaller number

**Oxford English Dictionary, 2010**

reduce, v.

To bring down or diminish to (formerly {dag}unto) a smaller number

Reduce means to cut down, not eliminate

Wordnet 3.0, 2010, “reduce,” http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=reduce&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=

reduce, cut down, cut back, trim,

Aff – AT: Reduce Excludes Eliminate

Reduce includes eliminatie

**CCH editors, 2008,** US Code, Reg. §54.4980F-1, Income Tax Regulations, p. 1129.

 (c) Elimination or cessation of benefits. For purposes of this section, the terms reduce or reduction include eliminate or cease or elimination or cessation.

Reduce can include an elimination

**Federal Register, 2009**, “Code of Federal Regulations, Title 26, Internal Revenue, Pt. 1,” p. 815
(7) Eliminate; elimination; reduce; reduction. The terms eliminate or elimination when used in connection with a section 411(d)(6)(B) [26 USCS § 411(d)(6)(B)] protected benefit mean to eliminate or the elimination of an optional form of benefit or an early retirement benefit and to reduce or a reduction in a retirement-type subsidy. The **terms reduce** or reduction when used in connection with a retirement-type subsidy mean to reduce or a reduction in the amount of the subsidy. For purposes of this section, an elimination includes a reduction and a reduction includes an elimination.

Reduce is to lessen in any way

Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1988, p.1126

Reduce 1a. to lessen in any way, as in size, weight, amount, value, price, etc.; diminish

Reduce Definitions

Reduce means to scale down

Wordnet 3.0, 2010, “reduce,” http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=reduce&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=

reduce, scale down

Reduce means to consolidate

Mirriam-Webster’s dictionary 2010, Britannica Online

Reduce: to draw together or cause to converge : CONSOLIDATE <reduce all the questions to one

Reduce means to diminish in size or number

Mirriam-Webster’s dictionary 2010, Britannica Online

Reduce: to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number

Reduce is to make smaller

Oxford English Dictionary, 6-2010, “Reduce, v.”

Reduce: To contract, condense; to make smaller, diminish.

Reduction is permanent

J. Bergan **Reynolds,** judge in the supreme court of new york, appellate division, third department,8-13-**1959** “IN THE MATTER OF DORIS A. MONTESANI, PETITIONER, V. ARTHUR LEVITT, AS COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., RESPONDENTS,” http://ny.findacase.com/research/wfrmDocViewer.aspx/xq/fac.%5CNY%5CNY4%5C1959%5C19590813\_0044926.NY.htm/qx

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13]  The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

1NC – Military Presence Excludes Combat Troops

1. Interpretation: Military presence excludes combat forces

James S. Thomason et. al, Senior Analyst, Strategy, Forces and Resources Division, Institute for Defense Analyses, Rovert Atwell, Robert Bocey, William Cralley James Delaney, Michael Fischerkeller, Kongdan Hassig, Charles Hawkins, Gene Porter, 7-2002, “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence: Evidence and Options for DoD “ Institute for Defense Analyses,

Our working definition of US overseas military presence is that it consists of all the US military assets in overseas areas that are engaged in relatively routine, regular, non-combat activities or functions.1 By this definition, forces that are located overseas may or may not be engaging in presence activities. If they are engaging in combat (such as Operation Enduring Freedom), or are involved in a one-time non-combat action (such as an unscheduled carrier battle group deployment from the United States aimed at calming or stabilizing an emerging crisis situation), then they are not engaging in presence activities. Thus, an asset that is located (or present) overseas may or may not be “engaged in presence activities,” may or may not be “doing presence.” We have thus far defined presence activities chiefly in “negative” terms—what they are not. In more positive terms, what exactly are presence activities, i.e., what do presence activities actually entail doing? Overseas military presence activities are generally viewed as a subset of the overall class of activities that the US government uses in its efforts to promote important military/security objectives [Dismukes, 1994]. A variety of recurrent, overseas military activities are normally placed under the “umbrella” concept of military presence. These include but are not limited to US military efforts overseas to train foreign militaries; to improve inter-operability of US and friendly forces; to peacefully and visibly demonstrate US commitment and/or ability to defend US interests; to gain intelligence and familiarity with a locale; to conduct peacekeeping activities; and to position relevant, capable US military assets such that they are likely to be available sooner rather than later in case an evolving security operation or contingency should call for them.2

1. Violation: the aff withdraws combat troops
2. Reasons to prefer
3. **Limits – They allow for an infinite number of cases involving permutations of combat and non-combat forces and missions – this lets the aff eliminate a combat mission without changing the overall presence.**
4. **Ground – Including combat forces changes the mission of our military presence - means we lose links to core neg disads like deterrence and readiness**
5. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education

2NC – Military Presence Excludes Combat Troops

Military presence excludes combat

Bradford Dismukes, analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses, 3-1994, “National Security Strategy and Forward Presence: Implications for Acquisition and Use of Forces,” Center for Naval Analyses, http://cna.org/sites/default/files/research/2793019200.pdf

An important distinguishing characteristic of overseas presence — the absence of combat—places it on a continuum of increasing violence with the other strategic tasks, crisis response and sustained combat. Each form of the application of power aims to influence political behavior. Presence is nonviolent (though it is their potential for violence that makes forward forces influential); crisis response involves the threat, or the actual practice, of limited violence; sustained combat seeks to change an adversary's behavior through large- scale violence aimed at destroying his armed forces in the field, denying him the means to control or continue to support his operations, and so on. Thinking about the three strategic functions as points or bands on a continuum fits the real world; yet the three define the need for distinct kinds of capabilities.

Military presence excludes combat

Sheila E. Widnall Former Secretary of the Air Force, and Ronald R. Fogleman, chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force, Spring 1995, “Global Presence,” Joint Forces Quarterly, http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/jfq\_pubs/jfq2007.pdf

At the foundation of this approach is power projection. Power projection is a means to influence actors or affect situations or events in America’s national interest. It has two components: warfighting and presence. Warfighting is the direct application of military force to compel an adversary. Presence is the posturing of military capability, including nonbelligerent applications, and/or the leveraging of information to deter or compel an actor or affect a situation. A sound national military strategy depends on coherent warfighting and presence strategies.

.

2NC – Military Presence Excludes Combat Troops

Presence does not include combat operations

Charles W. Greer, Lieutenant Colonel in the US Army, 1991, “The Future of Forward Presence”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA234227&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf

To establish a conceptual framework for this paper, I developed the following definition of forward presence within the context of national defense: the visible employment of US military personnel and/or military material as a deterrent outside of the continental United States (OCONUS) at any point along the operational continuum short of involving major US conventional forces in combat. My simplistic definition could be subject to endless scholarly debate. It includes small unit combat operations of limited scope and duration and peacetime contingency operations such as Desert Shield in Saudi Arabia, but it excludes the subsequent combat operation designated Desert Storm. It includes our military activities in Alaska and Hawaii. It excludes any diplomatic, economic, social or psychological activities that do not have a military component. The term “employment” in the definition could be criticized as denoting action or movement which could exclude what some may term passive measures such as storage of material or unmanned (i.e., automated) sites or systems. However, there is always some activity associated with these so-called passive measures (e.g., maintenance, data collection, etc), and the term employment also encompasses emplacement. The more controversial aspect of my definition lies in the terms “deterrent” and “visible.” Deterrence is “the prevention from action by fear of the consequences. Deterrence is a state of mind brought about by the existence of a credible threat of unacceptable counteraction.” Once major conventional forces are engaged in protracted combat operations, it is clear that deterrence, by definition, has failed. Visibility is inextricably linked to deterrence. Visible to whom? To those we wish to deter. This is reminiscent of the old philosophical question, “If a tree falls deep in the forest and there is no one there to hear it, does it make a sound?” In the case of forward presence, the answer is “no.” Target audience is the key to the concept of visibility. A target audience may be the world at large, the senior leadership of a specific country or movement, the control cell of a terrorist organization or countless other possibilities. Therefore, forward presence, by definition, also includes covert activities using military personnel and/or material, as long as the activity is visible to the targeted audience and deters that group or individual from taking an undesired action. An invisible presence is both contradictory and serves no useful deterrent purpose, which goes to the heart of the issue. Deterrence is the ultimate purpose of forward presence.

Aff – AT: Military Presence Excludes Combat Troops

Withdrawing troops is a substantial reduction

Christopher Preble, director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, 6-10-2003, “After Victory: Toward a New Military Posture in the Persian Gulf,” CATO, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=1336

Donald Rumsfeld's announcement that U.S. troops will be removed from Saudi Arabia represents a significant and welcome change in U.S. policy toward the Persian Gulf. This wise decision to shift U.S. forces out of the kingdom should be only the first of several steps to substantially reduce the American military presence in the region. In addition to the removal of troops from Saudi Arabia, U.S. forces should be withdrawn from other Gulf states, including Qatar, Kuwait, and Iraq, and the U.S. Navy should terminate its long-standing policy of deploying a carrier battle group in the Persian Gulf.

Plan is a reduction of military presence

Craig Whitlock, staff writer, 2-23-2010, “US plans for possible delay in Iraq withdrawal,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/22/AR2010022202933.html

U.S. commanders have already reduced the presence in Iraq to about 96,000 military personnel, Odierno said -- the first time since the 2003 invasion that fewer than 100,000 U.S. troops have been in the country. The U.S. military presence reached a peak of 166,000 troops in October 2007.

Time tabled withdrawal is a reduction of military presence

World Tribune, 2-19-2010, “U.S. military force in Iraq drops below 100,000,” http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/WTARC/2010/me\_iraq0133\_02\_19.asp

In 2007, the U.S. military reached a peak of 175,000 troops as part of a sustained campaign against Al Qaida. About a year later, amid the flight of Sunni and Shi'ite insurgents, Washington began reducing its military presence in Iraq, with 77,000 soldiers leaving over the last 15 months.

Aff – AT: Military Presence Excludes Combat Troops

Obama thinks withdrawing troops is a reduction in military presence

Greg Sargent, editor of Election Central, 9-10-2007, “Obama On Petraeus: Start Bringing Troops Home Right Now,” TPM, http://tpmelectioncentral.talkingpointsmemo.com/2007/09/\_obama\_on\_petraeus\_start\_bring.php

Obama's statement on Petraeus is in, and this line leaps out at us: “I can only support a policy that begins an immediate removal of our troops from Iraq’s civil war, and initiates a sustained drawdown of our military presence.”

Military presence includes combat operations

RobertPape**,** Professor in Political Science, Director of the Program for International Security Politics at the University of Chicago,2005**,** Dying to win: the strategic logic of suicide terrorism, p. 109

The standard I use is American military presence, defined as heavy combat operations on the homeland of Sunni Muslim majority countries for a sustained period prior to the onset of al-Qaeda’s suicide terrorist campaign against the United States in 1995. If American military presence, so defined, has expanded to include still more countries during the course of al-Qaeda’s suicide campaign, then I include those new countries as well, since they could also serve as recruiting grounds for al-Qaeda’s ongoing suicide campaign. “American military presence” includes cases where American combat forces are based in the country or where the United States provides explicitly or widely understood security guarantee that could be implemented using its forces in an adjacent country. It does not include cases where American military advisors are present or where the country’s military and the U.S. military conduct joint training exercises.

Military Presence Definitions

Presence is the deployment of military forces explicitly with a political goal

Bradford Dismukes, analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses, 3-1994, “National Security Strategy and Forward Presence: Implications for Acquisition and Use of Forces,” Center for Naval Analyses, http://cna.org/sites/default/files/research/2793019200.pdf

Beyond the direct defense of the United States, U.S. conventional forces fulfill three strategic functions: overseas presence, immediate crisis response, and sustained, large-scale combat. The definitions of the three provide the framework for decision on forces. Basically, forces needed for other tasks—for example, peace-keeping and peace enforcement—are lesser cases of these three. (The Bush Administration grouped the latter two together under the label "Crisis Response." The Bottom-Up Review does not address crisis response except by implication as part of phase 1, before large-scale combat in a "major regional contingency." Mr. Aspin tends to put the label presence on all forward forces whether they are forces for presence (as will be specified) or whether they are engaged in the tasks of crisis response.) A basic problem with overseas presence is that the term describes both a military posture (military means) and a military mission (military means and political objectives). In the case of presence as a mission, the objective is influence on behalf of a variety of U.S. political goals. This ambiguity is made worse by the fact that the term has been in use since at least the 1960s, but it has never been defined in the JCS dictionary of military terms. As a strategic task of the armed forces, overseas presence is here defined as the routine operation of forces forward (the means) to influence what foreign governments,113 both adversary and friend, think and do (the ends) without combat.114 Overseas presence does not constitute a strategy, though it or a similar term may in time become the shorthand name for the national strategy. The national strategy is one of engagement of U.S. power in the key regions to promote their stability and democratic development. As described in the body of this paper, a national strategy would integrate the components of U.S. power to achieve stability in the short term and build cooperative relations in the long term. The latter would address the dangers inherent in the international system, outlined in table 1, on page 23.

Presence refers to troops

The Oxford Essential Dictionary of the U.S. Military, 2002 “Presence,” http://www.answers.com/topic/presence

n.a group of people, especially soldiers or police, stationed in a particular place: maintain a presence in the region.

1NC – In Means Throughout

1. Interpretation – In means throughout

Words and Phrases, Volume 4

Colo. 1887. In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout” such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

1. Violation – The aff only reduces military presence in one area of a country
2. **Reasons to Prefer:**

**1. Predictability – they unlimit the topic, allowing an infinite number of single base or single region affirmatives.**

**2. Ground – our interpretation ensures links based of the countries in the resolution. They allow the aff to spike out of specific regional instability disads.**

1. Topicality is a voter for education and fairness

Aff – AT: In Means Throughout

In means a certain position

Oxford English Dictionary 1989, “in”

Of position or location.

In means within

Oxford English Dictionary 1989, “in”

Within the limits or bounds of, within (any place or thing).

In denotes location

Merriam-Webster’s dictionary, 2010, “in,” Brittanica Online Encyclopedia

In: used as a function word to indicate inclusion, location, or position within limits

**In means within bounds**

**American Heritage Dictionary, 2009,** http://education.yahoo.com/reference/dictionary/entry/in

In: a. Within the limits, bounds, or area of: was hit in the face; born in the spring; a chair in the garden.

Police Presence Definitions

Police presence refers to legally legitimate civilian public police forces

Mathieu Deflem, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of South Carolina, and Suzanne Sutphin, Research Assistant Professor in the Research, Evaluation, and Emerging Community Issues Division at the University of South Carolina, 11-2006, “Policing Post-War Iraq:

Insurgency, Civilian Police, and the Reconstruction of Society,” Sociological Focus, Vol. 39, No. 4

Our analysis of the police situation in Iraq focuses on developments since an end to major combat operations was announced in the Spring of 2003. Unless explicitly noted otherwise, the term police in this paper refers to the institution and function of civilian public police forces that are formally legitimated within the context of national states with the tasks of crime control and order maintenance. Importantly, we make no assertion that the police in Iraq has acquired a degree of popular legitimacy comparable to that of law enforcement agencies in other nations, especially those with a long history of democratization. Relatedly, when we use such terms as insurgency and terrorism in this paper, we imply no essentialist positions but instead rely on a constructionist viewpoint and therefore precisely rely on the terms that are being used, especially on the part of the agents of control, to refer to acts of violence that are responded to accordingly by police agencies and other institutions of social control. Considering the rapidly evolving and changing nature of the Iraqi situation, also, it is important to note that this article was completed in August 2006, at a time when discussions on the insurgency in Iraq were for several months already implying a shift towards civil war.

Police presence = US police forces abroad used for training or acting as local police forces

James Dobbins et al,Director, International Security and Defense Policy Center, RAND National Security Research Division,John G. McGinn, Keith Crane, Seth G. Jones, Rollie Lal, Andrew Rathmell, Rachel M. Swanger, Anga R. Timilsina**,** 2003**,** “America’s Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq,” RAND,

http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1753/MR1753.ch9.pdf

A more recent innovation has been dispatching U.S. and international police to supplement the efforts of military forces to provide security for local inhabitants. These initiatives have differed greatly in scope and scale. Some have principally consisted of training programs for local law enforcement officers; others have been major operations that have included deploying hundreds or thousands of armed international police to monitor, train, mentor, and even substitute for indigenous forces until the creation of a proficient domestic police force. Figure 9.3 shows numbers of foreign police per thou- sand inhabitants over time for the four cases that featured significant deployments of international police.

Presence refers to US police stationed abroad

The Oxford Essential Dictionary of the U.S. Military, 2002 “Presence,” http://www.answers.com/topic/presence

n.a group of people, especially soldiers or police, stationed in a particular place: maintain a presence in the region.